Lang. Teach. (2012), **45.2**, 143–179 © Cambridge University Press 2012
doi:10.1017/S0261444811000528

State-of-the-Art Article

Materials development for language learning and teaching

Brian Tomlinson Leeds Metropolitan University
brianjohntomlinson@gmail.com

This article reviews the literature on the relatively new field of materials development for language learning and teaching. It reports the origins and development of the field and then reviews the literature on the evaluation, adaptation, production and exploitation of learning materials. It also reviews the literature, first, on a number of controversial issues in the field, next, on electronic delivery of materials and, third, on research in materials development. It identifies gaps in the literature and makes proposals for future progress in materials development and in the research within the field. Much of the literature focuses on materials for learning English but the same principles apply to materials for learning any L2, as has been acknowledged by some of the authors whose publications focus on materials for learning other languages.

1. Introduction

In this article, 'materials for language learning' will be taken to be anything that can be used to facilitate the learning of a language, including coursebooks, videos, graded readers, flash cards, games, websites and mobile phone interactions, though, inevitably, much of the literature focuses on printed materials. Materials can be informative (informing the learner about the target language), instructional (guiding the learner in practising the language), experiential (providing the learner with experience of the language in use), eliciting (encouraging the learner to use the language) and exploratory (helping the learner to make discoveries about the language). As different learners learn in different ways (Oxford 2002) the ideal materials aim to provide all these ways of acquiring a language for the learners to experience and sometimes select from. However, the reality is that most commercially produced materials focus on informing their users about language features and on guiding them to practise these features, a fact that is highlighted by Richard's (2001: 251) comment that 'instructional materials generally serve as the basis of much of the language input that learners receive and the language practice that occurs in the classroom'. The same point is made by Tomlinson et al. (2001) and Masuhara et al. (2008) in their reviews of currently used adult EFL coursebooks: both conclude that the emphasis in most coursebooks is on providing explicit teaching and practice.

'Materials development' refers to all the processes made use of by practitioners who produce and/or use materials for language learning, including materials evaluation, their adaptation,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

design, production, exploitation and research. Ideally, all of these processes should be given consideration and should interact in the making of language-learning materials.

Given how important language-learning materials are, it is surprising how little attention they have received until recently in the literature on applied linguistics. It was not until the mid-1990s that materials development began to be treated seriously by academics as a field in its own right. Before then it tended to be considered as something that practitioners did or as a sub-section of methodology, in which materials were usually presented as examples of methods in action rather than as examples of the principles and procedures of materials development. A few books and articles in the 1970s and 1980s focused on such issues as materials evaluation and selection or on giving practical advice on writing materials (see section 2). However, it has been the books of the mid-nineties onwards (e.g. McDonough & Shaw 1993, 2003; Cunningsworth 1995; Tomlinson 1998a, 2003a, 2008a; McGrath 2002; Harwood 2010a) that have stimulated universities and teacher-training institutions to give more time to how materials can be developed and exploited to facilitate language acquisition. This is a development which had already been stimulated by the formation in 1972 of SELMOUS (Special English Language Materials for Overseas University Students), which focused on materials development for English for academic purposes, and in 1993 by MATSDA (the Materials Development Association), which runs conferences and workshops and publishes the journal *Folio*. Also around this time, associations such as JALT in Japan, MICELT in Malaysia and TESOL in the USA set up materials development special interest groups. Nowadays there are a number of dedicated materials development M.A.s (e.g. at the International Graduate School of English (IGSE) in Seoul) and many universities now run post-graduate materials development modules. In many countries Ph.D. students and teachers are researching factors that contribute to the successful development and exploitation of materials, and the findings of some of these studies are published in Tomlinson & Masuhara (2010).

Materials development is now not only undertaken by practitioners but is also a field of academic study. As a practical activity it involves the production, evaluation and adaptation of materials. As a field it investigates the principles and procedures of the design, writing, implementation, evaluation and analysis of materials. Ideally, these investigations both inform and are informed by the development and use of materials. This is the case in a number of recent publications (e.g. Mukundan 2009a; Mishan & Chambers 2010; Tomlinson 2010a, 2011a; Harwood 2010a; Tomlinson & Masuhara 2010, 2012) whose authors are both practising writers of language-learning materials and academics theorising about materials development.

2. History of publications on materials development

The bibliography in Cunningsworth's (1984) book on evaluating and selecting materials contains some references to materials (e.g. Moskowitz 1978; Richards 1978) but none to materials DEVELOPMENT. A few books and papers on materials development were published around that time, such as Madsen & Bowen (1978) and Swales (1980), who asserted that the good teacher is constantly adapting materials, and Candlin & Breen (1980), who

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

were concerned with evaluating and designing materials, but most references to materials development came in books and articles on methodology, which exemplified methods and approaches by quoting extracts from coursebooks (as does Cunningsworth 1984). This situation continued throughout the eighties, notable exceptions being Dubin & Olshtain's (1986) book on course design and Grant's (1987) book on making the most of your textbook. There were articles on specific aspects of materials development in the seventies and eighties in such journals as *ELT Journal* and *Modern English Teacher*, but it was not until the mid-nineties that more books on materials development started to appear. In the USA, Byrd (1995) published a guide for materials writers and in England books were published by Cunningsworth (1995) on choosing your coursebook, Graves (1996) on teachers as course developers and Tomlinson (1998a) on the principles and procedures of materials development. The last of these was published as a collection of papers by presenters at MATSDA Conferences, events which also stimulated many articles on materials development in various established journals and in *Folio*. At this time, books on language teaching methodology also gave more attention to materials development and illustrated their approaches with samples of published materials; for example, McDonough & Shaw (1998, 2003), which is being revised with examples from contemporary materials as McDonough, Shaw & Masuhara (2012).

Publications in the early 2000s include Fenner & Newby (2000) on approaches to materials design in European coursebooks, Richards (2001) on curriculum development with frequent reference to materials development, and McGrath (2002) on materials evaluation and design, which was probably the first book to not only provide applications of theory to the practice of evaluating, adapting and supplementing materials but also to make principled suggestions for systematising materials design. My own book (Tomlinson 2003a) provided courses on materials development with a possible textbook, as it contains chapters on most aspects of materials development, including such practical considerations as design and illustration. Practical guidance is also a feature of Tomlinson & Masuhara (2004), a book written in English for inexperienced teachers in South-East Asia but since translated into Korean and Portuguese. In Malaysia Jayakuran Mukandan started to run MICELT conferences for Universiti Putra Malaysia, focusing on issues of materials development and attracting large numbers of practitioners from all over South-East Asia (Mukundan 2003, 2006a, 2009a). Also at around this time the Regional English Language Centre (RELC) in Singapore were inviting experts on materials development to speak at their conferences, including, in 2003, one on Methodology and Materials Design in Language Teaching (Renandya 2003).

Recent publications on materials development have focused more on the application of theory to aspects of materials development. Tomlinson (2007a) is primarily a book about language acquisition but many of its chapters include applications of theory to materials development (e.g. applications of research on recasts, on visual imaging, on the use of the inner voice and on comprehension approaches). Tomlinson (2008a) starts with a chapter on language acquisition and language-learning materials and then focuses on research evaluating the potential effects of language-learning materials in each major area of the world. Harwood (2010a) explores the issues involved in the principled design, implementation and evaluation of materials and includes chapters on a genre-based approach to developing materials for writing, a principled approach to developing materials for content-based approaches for

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reading, and designing materials for community-based adult ESL programs. Tomlinson & Masuhara (2010) report projects from all over the world in which research has been conducted on the effectiveness of materials designed to apply the principles of, for example, extensive reading approaches, process and discovery approaches to the development of writing skills, and process drama and problem-solving approaches. Gray (2010) departs from this concern with the effectiveness of materials and focuses on the representational practices in textbook development and, in particular, on the effects of producing global coursebooks as promotional commodities which give English meaning in highly selective ways. In Tomlinson (2011a) an introduction to the principles and procedures of materials development is followed by chapters on the application to materials development of approaches based on corpora, tasks, self-access and new technologies. And the most recent publication in the field of materials development I know of, Tomlinson & Masuhara (2012), explores the application to materials development of the research findings of numerous areas of applied linguistics, as well as the implications of practice for the development of theory. Each chapter begins with a review of current research, followed by an evaluation of published materials in the light of research findings, with suggestions and illustration how to apply these findings to materials development.

The literature on materials development has come a long way, now focusing less on ways of selecting materials and more on the application of theory to practice and practice to theory. But in my view there are certain aspects of materials development which have not yet received enough attention. I would like to read publications exploring the effects on the learners of different ways of using the same materials (for example, as a script or a resource; as a sequential course or a course for learner navigation; as a core component or a supplement). Most of all, however, I would like to read publications reporting and applying the results of longitudinal studies not just of the effects of materials on the attitudes, beliefs, engagement and motivation of learners but on their actual communicative effectiveness. For the field of materials development to become more credible it needs to become more empirical. For example, research projects could compare the delayed effect on learners' communicative competence of different types of materials used by the same teacher to 'teach' the same points to equivalent classes of learners. Or they could give individuals of equivalent competence a choice of different materials routes to the same communicative goals, and compare their progress. Similarly, they could compare the effects of materials produced in different ways (e.g. text driven vs. teaching point driven) to achieve the same objectives.

3. Materials evaluation

3.1 Establishing criteria and developing evaluation instruments

Much of the early literature on materials development attempted to help teachers and materials developers to develop criteria for evaluating and selecting materials. For example, Tucker (1975) proposed a four-component scheme for measuring the internal and external value of beginners' textbooks, Davison (1976) proposed a five-category scheme for the evaluation and selection of textbooks and Dauod & Celce-Murcia (1979) provided checklists

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of criteria for evaluating coursebooks. Candlin & Breen (1980) proposed criteria for evaluating materials and, unlike many of their contemporaries, also proposed the use of these criteria when developing materials. Rivers (1981) provided categories and criteria for evaluating materials, Mariani (1983) wrote about evaluation and supplementation, Williams (1983) developed criteria for textbook evaluation and Cunningsworth (1984) provided a very detailed checklist of evaluation criteria 'for evaluating teaching material' (p. 74). Breen & Candlin (1987) published a principled guide for both evaluators and producers of materials and Sheldon (1987, 1988) suggested criteria for both evaluating and developing textbook material. Skierso (1991) provided probably the most comprehensive checklist of criteria for textbooks and teachers' books by combining checklists from various sources. Cunningsworth (1995), Harmer (1991, 1998), Roberts (1996), Ur (1996), Brown (1997), Hemsley (1997) and Gearing (1999) also proposed checklists for evaluating materials. Many of the lists of evaluation criteria in the literature above are specific to a context of learning and cannot be transferred to other contexts without considerable modification. There are exceptions: Matthews (1985), for example, insists that any evaluation should start from a specification of the teaching situation, Cunningsworth (1995) stresses the importance of determining criteria relevant to the target learners and Byrd (2001) gives priority to the fit between the textbook and the curriculum, students and teachers.

Tomlinson & Masuhara (2004: 7) proposed the following questions for evaluating criteria:

a) Is each question an evaluation question?
b) Does each question only ask one question?
c) Is each question answerable?
d) Is each question free of dogma?
e) Is each question reliable in the sense that other evaluators would interpret it in the same way?

Very few of the lists of criteria proposed in the literature satisfy these conditions, and most of them are not generalisable or transferable. For example:

a) 'Are there any materials for testing?' (Cunningsworth 1984) is an analysis question in the same checklist as evaluation questions such as 'Are the learning activities in the course material likely to appeal to the learners. . .?'
b) 'Is it attractive? Given the average age of your students, would they enjoy using it?' (Grant 1987: 122) combines two questions in one criterion.
c) 'Does the writer use current everyday language, and sentence structures that follow normal word order?' (Daoud & Celce-Murcia 1979: 304) contains two questions and both are unanswerable without a data analysis of both a corpus of current language and the complete script of the materials. 'To what extent is the level of abstractness appropriate?' (Skierso 1991: 446) is another example of a criterion which is too broad and vague to be answerable.
d) 'Are the various stages in a teaching unit (what you would probably call presentation, practice and production) adequately developed?' (Mariani 1983: 29) is dogmatic in insisting on the use of a Presentation Practice Production (PPP) approach.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

e) 'Is it foolproof (i.e. sufficiently methodical to guide the inexperienced teacher through a lesson)?' (Dougill 1987: 32) is unreliable in that it can be interpreted in different ways by different evaluators.

Mukundan & Ahour (2010) review 48 evaluation checklists from 1970 to 2008 and criticise many of them for being too demanding of time and expertise to be useful to teachers, too vague to be answerable, too context bound to be generalisable, too confusing to be useable and too lacking in validity to be useful. They conclude that a framework for generating clear, concise and flexible criteria would be more useful than detailed and inflexible checklists and also that more attention should be given to retrospective evaluation than to predictive evaluation, to help teachers to evaluate the effect of the materials they are using and make modifications. This point is also stressed by Tomlinson (2003b) and by Ellis (2011). Mukundan & Ahour (2010) also advocate a composite framework for evaluation consisting of multiple components and including computer analysis of the script of the materials (focusing, for example, on the vocabulary load or on recycling). Mukundan (2006c) describes the use of such a composite framework to evaluate ELT textbooks in Malaysia, which combines the use of checklists, reflective journals and concordance software.

Tomlinson (2003b) proposes a process for generating principled criteria instead of an unrealistic set of criteria for all contexts. He stresses that evaluators need to develop their own principled criteria which take into consideration the context of the evaluation and their own beliefs. He claims that evaluation criteria should be developed before materials are produced, and used to make decisions about the approach, procedures and activities to be adopted as well as to monitor their development and subsequent use.

Tomlinson differentiates between universal and local criteria, the former being those that can be used to evaluate materials for any learner anywhere. To generate these criteria he advises evaluators to brainstorm a list of principled beliefs that they hold about how languages are most effectively acquired and then convert these beliefs into criteria for evaluating materials, such as 'Are the materials likely to achieve affective engagement?' (Tomlinson 2003b: 28). He defines local criteria as those specific to the context in which the materials are going to be used, arguing that they are best generated from a profile. He also recommends a procedure for generating such criteria (pp. 27–33), which was used in Tomlinson et al. (2001) and in Masuhara et al. (2008) for evaluating coursebooks and on a number of materials development projects led by Leeds Metropolitan University in, for example, China, Ethiopia and Singapore.

Tomlinson (2003b: 16) recognises that evaluation is inevitably subjective, that it 'focuses on the users of the materials' and attempts to measure the potential or actual effects of the materials on their users. In contrast, analysis focuses on the materials and aims to identify what they contain, what they ask learners to do and what they say they are trying to achieve, aiming to provide an objective account of the materials, though the selection of questions is inevitably subjective and there is often a hidden agenda which it is hoped the revealed data will support. Littlejohn (2011: 181) makes a similar distinction when he says that analysis is concerned with materials 'as they are' and 'with the content and ways of working that they propose'. He suggests first carrying out an analysis of materials to find out how suitable they are for the context of use, followed by an evaluation to predict the likely effects of the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

materials on their users. Byrd (2001) makes a rather different distinction between evaluation and analysis when she talks about evaluation for selection and analysis for implementation. The literature, though, often confuses materials analysis with materials evaluation and uses the terms interchangeably. For example, Mariani (1983: 28–29) includes in a section on 'Evaluate your coursebook' such analysis questions as 'Are there any teacher's notes?', and Cunningsworth (1984: 74–79) includes both analysis and evaluation questions in his 'Checklist of Evaluation Criteria'.

In the last ten years a number of other writers have proposed frameworks for materials evaluation instead of checklists. McGrath (2002: 31) distinguishes between 'general criteria (i.e. the essential features of any good teaching-learning material)' and 'specific (or context related) criteria' and, in relation to choosing a coursebook, proposes a procedure which includes materials analysis, first-glance evaluation, user feedback, evaluation using situation specific checklists and, finally, selection. McDonough & Shaw (2003: 61) suggest that the evaluators first conduct an external evaluation 'that offers a brief overview from the outside' and then carry out 'a closer and more detailed internal evaluation'. They stress that the four main considerations when deciding on the suitability of materials are usability, generalisability, adaptability and flexibility. Riazi (2003) provides a critical survey of textbook evaluation schemes from 1975 onwards, in which he points out the transience of many of the criteria, which he says were based on pedagogic approaches fashionable at the time. In his conclusion he supports Cunningsworth (1995) in insisting on the importance of collecting data about the context of learning and proposes a procedure which includes a survey of the teaching/learning situation, a neutral analysis, a belief-driven evaluation and a selection. Other writers have offered principled advice on developing evaluation criteria, including Wallace (1998), who suggests twelve 'criterion areas' for materials evaluation; Rubdy (2003), who proposes and gives examples of a dynamic model of evaluation in which the three categories of psychological validity, pedagogical validity and process and content validity interact; Tomlinson & Masuhara (2004), with their evaluation procedure for inexperienced teachers and McCullagh (2010), who sets out the procedure she used to evaluate materials for medical practitioners.

3.2 Reporting evaluations

The focus of much of the literature on materials evaluation is on the principles and procedures of conducting evaluations. There are some publications, however, which report on the effectiveness of materials. Many journals publish regular predictive reviews of recent materials, such as *ELT Journal*, *Practical English Teaching*, *Modern English Teacher*, *English Teaching Professional*, *Folio*, *The Language Teacher*, *TESOL Journal* and *RELC Journal*. Some of them also include post-use reviews of materials. For example, *Modern English Teacher* includes a section entitled 'A Book I've Used', which consists of reviews by practitioners of their use of a recently published textbook. Most of the reviews are of specific textbooks or courses but *ELT Journal*, for example, also publishes survey reviews of a number of current textbooks of the same sub-genre. For example, Tomlinson et al. (2001) is a review of eight currently popular UK coursebooks for adults in which four reviewers from different cultural backgrounds independently subject each

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

course to a rigorous evaluation using the same 133 criteria. A similar review was published by Masuhara et al. (2008) in which they subjected eight coursebooks for adults to a rigorous criterion-referenced review. Interestingly, the two reviews came to similar conclusions. They both welcomed the attempts to personalise and humanise the coursebooks and both were critical of the expensive and unwanted increase in the number of components of coursebooks, the neglect of literature as a source of potentially engaging texts, the lack of intelligent content at lower levels, the neglect of extensive reading and listening, and 'the scarcity of real tasks which have an intended outcome other than just the practice of language forms' (Masuhara et al. 2008: 310). Other survey reviews which have appeared in *ELT Journal* recently include Tribble (2009) on resources for teaching academic writing, McDonough (2010) on materials for English for specific purposes, and Wilson (2010) on materials for IELTS preparation.

Many reports on micro-evaluations of materials are written for sponsors of projects or for publishers and are, understandably, confidential. Some reports of evaluations of materials in action are dotted throughout the literature but are rarely collected in one volume or issue. This is a point made by Ellis (2011: 234), who adds that such micro-evaluations are 'often seen as too localised and too small scale, and so theoretically uninteresting'. In Tomlinson (2008a) there are reports of macro-evaluations of current materials for young learners, for self-access learning, for EAP and for General English, as well as of nine evaluations of materials currently used in different parts of the world. There are also reports of micro-evaluations of materials in action in Mukundan (2006a), Harwood (2010a) and Tomlinson & Masuhara (2010).

Very little has been published on the on-going process of evaluating materials in production. However, Donovan (1998) has written on the process of piloting commercial coursebooks prior to publication. He discusses the issues involved in making decisions about what is piloted, who pilots it and how, and illustrates these processes with numerous examples taken from actual pilots of Cambridge University Press coursebooks. He also discusses the benefits of piloting and what can go wrong. In his conclusion he advocates the continuing use of piloting as a very effective way of obtaining feedback on the effectiveness of materials in development, but does concede that the increasing expense and decreasing time available might result in publishers making less use of piloting. Thirteen years later, Amrani (2011) reports that publishers no longer use piloting as their main means of obtaining feedback on their materials in development. They now use more cost-effective and time-saving methods, such as reviews from experienced teachers and from academics, feedback from focus groups, questionnaires, expert panels, editorial visits and classroom observations, and competitor analysis. Amrani provides examples of some of these in action and also discusses the benefits and problems of evaluating materials in development. In conclusion, she speculates on the future of publisher evaluation of materials and predicts that 'Increasingly post-publication review will inform future materials development' (Amrani 2011: 295). Commendable and impressive as Donovan and Amrani's accounts of evaluating materials in development are, there is no escaping the fact that the main concerns of publishers relate to the extent to which their draft materials appeal to their intended users in terms of appearance, content and approach. We cannot expect piloting or other means of evaluating materials in development to be able to provide reliable evidence of the effectiveness of the materials in relation to language acquisition. This would require the expertise, time and funding which only a consortium of universities could obtain. Nevertheless, such evaluations are undertaken by

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

M.A. and Ph.D. students throughout the world, but are rarely reported in the literature. One exception is Ellis (2011), who reports on three micro-evaluations of the effectiveness of actual task materials undertaken by M.A. students at the University of Auckland. Another exception is Barnard (2007), who reports a Ph.D. study of the effectiveness of materials using a comprehension approach for the teaching of Bahasa Indonesia to beginners at the National University of Singapore.

4. Materials adaptation

Considering how teachers adapt materials systematically or intuitively every day, there is surprisingly little help for them in the literature. One of the major early books on materials development, Madsen & Bowen (1978), did, however, focus on adaptation. It made the important point that good teachers are always adapting the materials they are using to the context in which they are using them in order to achieve the optimal congruence between materials, methodology, learners, objectives, the target language and the teacher's personality and teaching style. In order to achieve this congruence Madsen & Bowen propose ways of personalising, individualising, localising and modernising materials. Other early publications which provided help to teachers when adapting materials include Candlin & Breen (1980), who criticise published communicative materials and suggest ways of adapting them so as to offer more opportunities for communication, Cunningsworth (1984), who focuses on how to change materials so that they get the learners to do what the teacher wants them to do and Grant (1987), who suggests and illustrates ways of making materials more communicative. Experts who have given advice about adaptation in the nineties include Willis (1996), on ways of changing classroom management and sequencing to maximise the value of task-based materials, Nunan (1999), on procedures for making materials more interactive and White (1998), on ways of increasing student participation when using listening materials.

McDonough & Shaw (2003) devote a chapter to adaptation. After considering the many reasons for adapting materials, they focus on the principles and procedures of adaptation and give advice on adding, deleting, modifying, simplifying and reordering. McGrath (2002) also devotes a chapter to discussing the objectives, principles and procedures of adaptation. He proposes 'four evaluative processes' (p. 59) when basing a lesson on a coursebook and goes on to discuss the issues and procedures involved in each process. Teachers may select the material that will be used unchanged, reject either completely or partially sections of the material, add extensions or further exploitation of the existing materials and replace components of the materials. McGrath sets a series of useful tasks for the readers to check their understanding of his suggested procedures and their ability to use them. Some of these tasks involve the reader adapting coursebook materials; others involve them in evaluating adaptations suggested by experts. One problem with the tasks is that they are not situated in a specific learning context, even though one of the main objectives of adaptation is to make the materials of more value to the students using them. McDonough et al. (2012) solve this problem by getting the reader to make use of materials they are familiar with and to adapt them to make them more suitable for their own teaching situation. Islam & Mares (2003) solve the congruence problem by situating their three example scenarios in three different

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

contexts which they are familiar with. They borrow objectives and categories from previously published lists but include such objectives as adding real choice, catering for all learner styles, providing for learner autonomy, developing high-level cognitive skills, and making the input both more accessible and more engaging.

A different approach to adaptation is taken by Saraceni (2003), who advocates providing the learners with an important role in adapting the materials they are using. In order to involve learners in the process, she proposes that materials should actually be written with learner adaptation in mind, aiming to be learner-centred, flexible, open-ended, relevant, universal and authentic, and giving choices to learners. She also stresses that offering provocative topics and aesthetic experience can facilitate learner adaptation. She criticises published materials for being, for example, trivial, stereotypical and un-motivating, and provides an example of materials designed so that they can be adapted by the learners using them (as does Wajnryb 1996). A similar line is taken by Jolly & Bolitho (2011), who propose a dynamic approach to materials writing and adaptation which involves teachers as materials writers trialling their materials with their classes and then modifying them to take account of student feedback and suggestions.

Tomlinson & Masuhara (2004: 11) aim 'to help teachers to reflect upon their own practice and identify principles and systematic procedures for materials adaptation'. They discuss the principles and procedures of materials development at a very practical level, providing suggestions for optimising the teaching context so as to make it adaptation-friendly and setting the readers five tasks involving them in the adaptation of materials for students they are actually teaching. They also stress the need for a criterion-referenced evaluation of materials before making decisions about adaptation.

5. Materials production

5.1 How writers write

Reports of how writers actually write materials reveal that they rely heavily on retrieval from repertoire, cloning successful publications and spontaneous 'inspiration'.

Johnson (2003) says he searched the literature in vain for reports of the actual procedures involved in writing materials. He missed accounts that have appeared, such as those by Byrd (1995) and Hidalgo, Hall & Jacobs (1995), as well as Prowse's (1998) report of how a number of well-known authors actually write their material. Hidalgo et al. (1995) consists of reports by materials writers in South-East Asia of how they wrote materials. Although some of them mention influence by principles of language acquisition (see 5.2), many report replicating previous materials, adapting activity types which had worked for them before and relying upon creative inspiration. The writers in Prowse (1998) report similar approaches and stress the importance of thinking as you write, of how 'Ideas come to you at any time' during collaboration (p. 130), of thinking about the materials whilst doing something else, of being prepared to write many drafts and of being inspired. Some of the writers refer to prior planning but none to developing a principled framework or criteria before starting to write.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Johnson (2003) focused on expertise in task design. He studied the literature on task-based teaching but found nothing on the procedures involved in actually writing a task, so he set up an experiment in which eight expert materials writers and eight novices were asked to 'design an activity involving the function of describing people' (p. 4). He asked each writer to think aloud as they designed the task. Their 'concurrent verbalisations' were recorded and then analysed. What they revealed was that the experts wrote their materials in very different ways from the novices. The experts, for example, envisaged possibilities in concrete detail and were prepared to abandon tasks they had spent time developing. They designed in opportunistic ways, instantiated as they wrote, showed learner/context sensitivity and used repertoire a lot. Interestingly, there was no explicit reference by the experts to theory-driven principles. This is true also of Prowse (2011), in which he repeats his report of how writers write from Prowse (1998) and adds the reflections of a number of writers of recently published coursebooks, which also focus on the creative, inspirational aspect of materials writing ('coursebook writing is a creative rather than a mechanical process' (p. 173)) and on making use of prior experience of teaching and writing. None of them refer to making use of principled frameworks or criteria. My own preference is for an approach to materials writing in which the ongoing evaluation of the developing materials is driven by a set of agreed principles, both universal principles applicable to any learning context and local criteria specific to the target learning context(s).

5.2 Principled development of materials

Despite the typical reliance on repertoire and inspiration reported in the preceding section, some writers do describe establishing principles prior to writing.

Flores (1995: 58–59), for example, lists five assumptions and principles which drove the writing of a textbook in the Philippines, and Penaflorida (1995: 172–179) reports her use of six principles of materials design specified by Nunan (1988). Hall (1995: 8) insists that the crucial question we need to ask is 'How do we think people learn languages?' and goes on to discuss the principles which he thinks should 'underpin everything we do in planning and writing our materials' (ibid.). Tomlinson (1998b: 5–22; 2011b) proposes fifteen principles for materials development which derive from second language acquisition (SLA) research and from his experience, and a number of other writers outline principled approaches to developing ELT materials in Tomlinson (1998a, 2011a). For example, Bell & Gower (2011) discuss the need for authors to make compromises to meet the practical needs of teachers and learners and match the realities of publishing materials. They also articulate eleven principles which guide their writing. Edge & Wharton (1998: 299–300) talk about the 'coursebook as ELT theory' and as a 'genre whose goal is a dialogue about principle via suggestions about practice', and they stress the need to design coursebooks for flexible use so as to capitalise on 'teachers' capacity for creativity'. Maley (1998, 2011) suggests ways of 'providing greater flexibility in decisions about content, order, pace and procedures' (1998: 280) and Jolly & Bolitho (2011) advocate a principled, practical and dynamic framework for materials development. Teachers' books accompanying coursebooks also often express a rationale for their materials. For example, the introduction to *English Access Teacher's Resource 1* (Chandrasegeran, Venkataraman &

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Poh-Knight 2010: 3) says that the pedagogic framework 'begins with the receptive skills to tap students' prior knowledge and to trigger connections with their world view. The teacher then supports and provides scaffolding for the students to put their productive skills to use, working slowly in groups towards independent work'.

A detailed review of the literature on advice and principles for materials developers is provided by McGrath (2002: 152–161), from Methold (1972), who stressed the importance of recycling and of localisation, to Tomlinson (1998b) and his focus on learning principles. In his review McGrath focuses, in particular, on the theme- or topic-based approach, the text-based approach and the storyline (Nunan 1991).

Tan (2002) is concerned with the role that corpus-based approaches can and should play in language teaching and contains chapters from around the world which discuss the contribution that corpora have made in, for example, the conversation class, and the teaching of vocabulary, fixed expressions, writing and collocation. O'Keefe, McCarthy & Carter (2007) consider in detail how corpora can be used to inform and generate classroom activities. They focus on such language features as chunks, idioms, lexis, grammar, discourse and pragmatics, listenership and response, relational language, and language and creativity. McCarten & McCarthy (2010) are interested in ways in which coursebooks make use of corpora and describe and give examples of an approach to 'bridging the gap between corpus and course book' (p. 11) with specific reference to teaching conversation strategies. Gilmore (2009) and Farr, Chambers & O'Riordan (2010) also suggest ways of using corpora as language resources and Willis (2011) demonstrates ways in which teachers and students can develop corpora of their own. Tomlinson (2010c), however, points out some of the limitations of corpora and suggests ways of supplementing the information gained from them by making use of author, teacher and learner research involving following up insights gained from analysis of texts with searches for further textual evidence.

A publication which gives considerable attention to principles and procedures of materials development is Tomlinson (2003a). It contains, for example, chapters on a writing a coursebook (Mares 2003), principled frameworks for materials development (Tomlinson 2003c), creative approaches to writing materials (Maley 2003) and ways of humanising the coursebook (i.e. making it of more personal relevance and value to the human beings using it) (Tomlinson 2003d).

Another publication concerned with principles of materials development is Harwood (2010a). In his introduction, Harwood (2010b) discusses in detail the issues involved in matching materials with the TESOL Curriculum and in the content analysis of materials. He also provides an overview of recent accounts by writers of 'the design process' (p. 13). He focuses on Johnson (2003) but also refers to Samuda's (2005) report of the 'complex, highly recursive and often messy process' (p. 243) of task design and to Richard's (2006) account of how recent literature altered his approach to developing listening materials. Harwood agrees with Richards that language materials cannot only be shaped by research but need to suit the contexts in which they are used. Also in Harwood (2010a) there are principle-driven chapters by Ellis (2010) on L2 research and language-teaching materials, by Reinders & White (2010) on the theory and practice of technology in materials development and task design, by Tomlinson (2010a) on principles of effective materials development and by Benesch (2010) on critical praxis as materials development. These chapters in particular add a new dimension

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to the literature by focusing on how theory and research can both inform and be informed by materials development.

Tomlinson & Masuhara (2010), in reporting recent research, consider the application of many theoretical principles of language acquisition to the practice of materials development; a number of chapters report research results which could have important implications. Ghosn (2010) reports the research results of a project in Lebanon which revealed a superior effect on comprehension and vocabulary development for a group of young beginning learners who followed a story-based course, compared to an equivalent group who followed a conventional communicative course. Fenton-Smith (2010) describes the beneficial effects on Japanese university students' engagement and motivation from carrying out creative and critical output activities after extensive reading. Troncoso (2010) reports on the effectiveness of text-driven materials for the teaching of Spanish. Al-Busaidi & Tindle (2010) show the effectiveness of writing materials following experiential approaches in Oman, Mishan (2010) reveals the positive results of following a problem-solving approach at the University of Limerick and McCullagh (2010) highlights the effectiveness of published materials which follow an experiential approach in helping overseas doctors to communicate in English in the UK and Park (2010) shows how process drama materials worked in a Korean middle-school classroom. These chapters are significant in that they provide evidence of the beneficial effects of experiential approaches to materials development and, in particular, of approaches in which the learners are first given a meaning-focused experience of language in use and are then asked to focus more analytically on a particular feature of this use.

Tomlinson (2011a) is the second edition of Tomlinson (1998a) and contains an updated version of the introductory chapter, which relates commonly agreed principles of SLA to the development of language-learning materials. It also contains updated versions of most of the original chapters, many now more concerned with principles than they were previously. Hooper Hansen (2011) explores the principles behind the materials produced and inspired by Lozanov, Maley (2011) investigates the principles behind ideas for materials development which empower teachers, Masuhara (2011) considers principles informed by an analysis of the materials needs and wants of teachers and Tomlinson (2011c) examines the principles behind materials which involve the learners in making use of visual imaging. In addition, it contains a number of new chapters, including one by Reppen (2011), who provides a critical overview of recent attempts to apply principles to corpora-informed classroom materials, and chapters by Motteram (2011) and by Kervin & Derewianka (2011) on making use of new technologies in the delivery and use of principled and effective materials. All these chapters increase our awareness of ways in which theoretical principles can be applied to the practicalities of materials development, but unfortunately they do not provide much empirical evidence in support of their claims.

Tomlinson & Masuhara (2012) explores the connection between applied linguistics theory and materials development. Each chapter focuses on a particular aspect of applied linguistics and evaluates the match between current theory and current materials development practice. The authors of each chapter also suggest and provide examples of ways of achieving a closer match.

Other publications with something valuable to say about principled materials development include Byrd (1995), Fenner & Newby (2000), Richards (2001), Tomlinson & Masuhara (2004),

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mishan (2005), Mukundan (2006a), Mishan & Chambers (2010) and McDonough, Shaw & Masuhara (2012). Tomlinson (2008a) provides critical reviews of ELT materials currently being used around the world and most of its chapters make reference to the principles and procedures of materials development. It also contains an introductory chapter on 'Language acquisition and language-learning materials' (Tomlinson 2008b), which proposes ways of applying commonly agreed theories of language acquisition to materials development. The principles proposed include:

- the language experience needs to be contextualised and comprehensible
- the learner needs to be motivated, relaxed, positive and engaged
- the language and discourse features available for potential acquisition need to be salient, meaningful and frequently encountered
- the learner needs to achieve deep and multi-dimensional processing of the language

(Tomlinson 2008b: 4)

5.3 Practical guidance to writers

There are very few publications offering practical guidance to materials writers on how to develop effective materials. However, Byrd (1995) provides advice to materials writers, as does Nunan (1988, 1989). Johnson (2003) gives his informed opinion on the expertise needed to be a good task designer and Spiro (2006) provides advice on how to become an L2 story-writer. Tomlinson (2003b, 2003c) proposes a flexible text-driven framework for developing materials and puts forward ways of ensuring that materials are humanistic, and Tomlinson & Masuhara (2004) provide practical advice on developing materials, writing instructions, using illustrations and layout and design. Coyle, Hood & Marsh (2010) give detailed advice on how to develop materials for content and language integrated learning and Van Avermaet & Gysen (2006) and Duran & Ramaut (2006) give advice on writing tasks for young learners. *Folio* has been publishing articles providing information, advice and stimulus to materials writers twice a year since 1993.

6. Materials exploitation

Not many articles or books have been written on how to make the most effective use of materials. However, Dat (2003) reports a case study of attempts to localise published ELT materials in Vietnam, Lin & Brown (1994) provide guidelines for the production and use of in-house self-access materials and Tomlinson (2003d) proposes classroom procedures to help teachers to humanise their coursebooks.

There seems to be very little published on what teachers and learners actually do with materials in the classroom. All over the world I have seen many unexpected ways of using a textbook but not many publications reporting what I found to be a classroom reality of teachers doing it their own way. There is some literature reporting how teachers use their textbooks as resources rather than as scripts. For example, Richards & Mahoney (1996) use questionnaires and observation to find out how teachers in Hong Kong make resourceful

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

use of their textbooks, Katz (1996) found that the actual use of materials in four teachers' classrooms depended on the different teachers' pedagogical needs and goals, Gray (2000) reports how teachers censor or adapt aspects of cultural content in ELT reading materials and Lee & Bathmaker (2007) reveal how teachers using textbooks with vocational students in Singapore secondary schools adapt the materials in accordance with local institutional and classroom requirements. There have also been a number of studies of teacher attitudes towards their coursebooks which suggest that how they use their coursebook depends both on their experience and their view of the coursebook's value in their teaching context. For example, Tsui's (2003) research on the knowledge base of teachers indicates that while less experienced teachers tend to rely more heavily on their textbook, more experienced teachers are usually more selective in their use of published materials and make use of a richer variety of material resources. This phenomenon is often reported anecdotally so it is useful to actually have some evidence to support, for example, more emphasis on textbook adaptation in the initial training of teachers. Pelly & Allison (2000) investigated 58 Singaporean primary school teachers' views of assessment influences on their teaching practices and found that 79% reported that their teaching was determined 'to a large/very large extent' by tests, and the four teachers they interviewed said they taught only the parts of the textbook expected to come up in the examinations. This again supports what is often reported anecdotally and provides evidence to support in-service training on making maximal use of textbooks. And Gray's (2010) report of his interviews with 22 teachers in Barcelona revealed that some teachers omitted materials which they felt perpetuated cultural stereotypes because of the danger that their learners would believe they endorsed those stereotypes, whereas others said such materials could generate lively discussions. Zacharias (2005), however, reports how teachers in Indonesian tertiary institutions tend to revere international coursebooks and to use them as scripts for their lessons, and Gray (2010: 7) reports how beginning teachers in Barcelona 'do not have the confidence to challenge the authority of the coursebook'. All of these research projects can inform both the development of materials and teacher training in the classroom use of materials.

McGrath (2002) suggests procedures for in-use and post-use evaluation of materials to find out more about what teachers actually do with their materials and Masuhara (2011) suggests a record of use as a means of uncovering data on teachers' classroom use of materials. It would certainly inform the materials development process if we knew more about what teachers actually do with the materials they are given to use.

7. Issues in materials development

7.1 The value of textbooks

For years there has been debate about whether or not the textbook is the best medium for delivering language-learning materials. The debate started in the eighties with Allwright (1981) putting forward arguments against ways in which textbooks deliver materials and O'Neil (1982) mounting a rigorous defence. Since then there have been numerous contributors to the debate, including Prabhu (1989), Littlejohn (1992), Hutchinson & Torres

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(1994), Wajnryb (1996), Flack (1999), Thornbury & Meddings (2001), Gray (2002), Mishan (2005), Dat (2006) and Mukundan (2009b). Regardless of the views of experts who criticise the use of textbooks, most language teachers seem to continue to use them. For example, a British Council survey (2008) revealed that 65% of the teachers they polled always or frequently used a coursebook and only 6% never did. A similar survey at conferences in Malaysia, the United Kingdom and Vietnam (Tomlinson 2010b) showed that 92% of the respondents used a coursebook regularly (mainly because they were required to) but that 78% of them were negative about the books that were available to them.

Proponents of the coursebook argue that it is a cost-effective way of providing the learner with security, system, progress and revision, whilst at the same time saving precious time and offering teachers the resources they need to base their lessons on. It also helps administrators to achieve course credibility, timetable lessons and standardise teaching. Opponents of coursebooks argue that they can disempower both teacher and learners, cannot cater for the needs and wants of their actual users, are used mainly to impose control and order (e.g. 'OK, class, turn to page 46 of your textbook' – Mukundan 2009b: 99), and provide only an illusion of system and progress. Many also argue that 'a coursebook is inevitably superficial and reductionist in its coverage of language points and in its provision of language experience. . .it imposes uniformity of syllabus and approach, and it removes initiative and power from teachers' (Tomlinson 2001a: 67). It has also been argued that textbooks are invested with so much authority that it is difficult for teachers or students to challenge or adapt them (Luke, de Castell & Luke 1989; Dendrinos 1992), though Apple (1992), Hutchinson & Torres (1994) and Canagarajah (2005) have demonstrated that such challenges do take place. Another argument against textbooks is that textbooks are 'designed primarily to satisfy administrators and teachers but in doing so often ignore the needs and wants of learners' (Tomlinson 2010b). For detailed discussion of the arguments for and against textbooks, see Mishan (2005).

My own view is that we need textbooks to save time and money and many teachers want a coursebook which provides everything they need in one source. A textbook can do all that its proponents say it does, but unfortunately many global coursebooks are not considered to be sufficiently engaging or relevant for their actual users. In attempting to cater for all students at a particular age and level, global coursebooks often end up not meeting the needs and wants of any. Based on my experience of talking to teachers and to learners, and of observing teachers using materials in over thirty countries, I would like to see more localised textbooks and more global textbooks which are designed to be flexible and to offer teachers and students opportunities for localisation, personalisation and choice. In addition, publishers could produce web-based global 'coursebooks' which offer opportunities for choice, modification and replacement and which facilitate 'an ongoing process where materials are refined and even changed throughout the life of a product' (Amrani 2011: 297).

7.2 The need for published materials

Over the years many institutions and teachers have replaced published materials with home-made materials in order to achieve greater relevance and engagement. For example, Al-Busiadi & Tindle (2010) describe a project at Sultan Qaboos University in Oman on the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

teaching of writing skills, Jones & Schmitt (2010: 225) report on 'the development and piloting of discipline-specific vocabulary materials on a CD-ROM software program' at the University of Nottingham, Hewings (2010) reports on a scheme for teaching academic writing at the University of Birmingham, Mason (2010) discusses the effects of delivering a British Culture course at a Tunisian university with teacher-developed paper, video and internet materials, Trabelsi (2010) analyses the results of developing authentic in-house materials for business students at a Tunisian university and Troncoso (2010) comments on the effectiveness of teacher-developed materials for developing intercultural competence for learners of Spanish. Many teachers have also replaced published materials without requiring the teacher to find or write materials. For example, Tomlinson (2003d) describes how a teacher in Jakarta made each group of students responsible in one term for bringing her a reading passage on which she then based a reading lesson, and in the next term made each group responsible for actually teaching a reading lesson. He also mentions a class which each week made a video of their own dramatised version of an extract from literature, and a class in Vanuatu who spent every lesson for a term writing their own novels. Jensen & Hermer (1998) describe other such student-initiated activities, Verhelst (2006) reports task-based activities in Belgium primary schools in which the learners made things out of clay or responded emotionally to stories and poems, Park (2010) recounts how she replaced published materials with a process drama approach in a South Korean secondary school and Mishan (2010) describes how she used a problem-based approach. All of these publications are significant in that they support a move away from reliance on textbooks, a move which, in my view, needs to be supported by both initial and in-service teacher training.

The Dogme ELT movement has been especially determined to liberate teachers from their dependence on materials, and has developed into a methodology aiming to return English language teaching to its roots by using approaches which are learner-centred and materials-light. In Meddings & Thornbury (2009) the authors set out the core principles of Dogme, discuss its beliefs and practices and explore its origins. The methodology recommended is conversation-driven rather than materials-driven and focuses on the language which emerges rather than on a pre-determined language syllabus. As with text-driven approaches, the curriculum is articulated retrospectively and it is important, in my view, to keep checking this curriculum to make sure there are no significant omissions.

My position is that most teachers and students welcome published materials and can gain from them. However, if a teacher has confidence, principled creativity and the respect of their learners, then a textbook-free course can actually be more facilitative in providing the personalised, relevant and engaging experience of language in use and opportunities for observing how the language is used and for meaningful communication, which many textbook authors find it difficult to provide.

7.3 Pedagogic approaches

Over the last forty years, there have been many changes in the methodologies coursebooks claim to be using, but very little change in the pedagogy they actually use. The blurbs on the back are constantly changing. In the sixties and early seventies they stressed they were

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

teaching the language directly, without the use of translation or explanation: in the seventies they boasted that they were following a communicative approach which featured either the learning of functions or notions, or both. Subsequently, they have claimed to be following natural approaches based on topics, themes or tasks and many coursebooks nowadays stress that their syllabus is based on the 'can do' statements of the Common European Framework, for example Redston & Cunningham (2005). The reality, though, is that for the last forty years most coursebooks have been and are still using PPP approaches, with a focus on discrete forms and frequent use of such low-level practice activities as listen and repeat, dialogue repetition, matching and filling in the blanks. A number of writers have criticised this continuing use of approaches for which there is no theoretical or research-based justification. For example, Willis & Willis (2007) have criticised the PPP approach and Long (1991) and Ellis (2001) have raised doubts about the value of focus on discrete forms. Recently many writers have proposed more experiential approaches to using language-learning materials. For example, Bolitho (2003), Bolitho & Tomlinson (2005), Bolitho et al. (2003) and Tomlinson (1994, 2007b) have proposed a language awareness approach, in which learners first experience a text holistically and then analyse it with a view to making discoveries for themselves about language use. Tomlinson (2003c) has advocated a text-driven approach in which learners first respond to a text personally before exploiting it for creative and analytical activities and Prabhu (1987), Ellis (1998, 2003, 2011), Van den Branden (2006), Willis (1996) and Willis & Willis (2007) have advocated task-driven approaches in which the learners' target is task completion and the teacher's objective is language development. Masuhara (2006) and Tomlinson (2001b) have suggested multi-dimensional approaches to materials development in which the learners make use of sensory imagery, motor imagery, inner speech, emotion and thought to respond to texts and carry out tasks. What all these approaches have in common is a move away from teaching points driving the material and a belief in the importance of experiencing language in use (e.g. Ellis 2008), a change which was the focus of all the papers delivered at a MATSDA Conference on Innovation in Materials Development at Queens University, Belfast in January 2011.

There have, of course, been pedagogical innovations in published materials, especially in the supplementary materials published in the 1970s and 1980s and in recently published series of resource books for teachers. However, most of the core materials I know of which have successfully followed innovative pedagogical approaches have been on projects. Some have used Total Physical Response and discovery approaches for young beginners (such as the PKG Project in Indonesia (Tomlinson 1995)); others have been driven by texts (Tomlinson 1995, 2003c), tasks (Prabhu 1987) or CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) (Eurydice 2006). The most popular approach at the moment seems to be task-based, in which the learners are set tasks with non-linguistic outcomes (e.g. arrangements for a trip, an agenda for a meeting, the solution to a problem). Many books are available outlining the theory and procedures (e.g. Ellis 2003; Nunan 2004; Willis & Willis 2007), and some which give advice relevant to materials development (e.g. Bygate, Skehan & Swain 2001; Samuda & Bygate 2008). There are few, however, that report task-based materials development projects or which give examples of classroom materials. One book that does both is Van den Branden (2006), which contains chapters on developing task materials for beginners (Duran & Ramaut 2006), for primary and secondary education (Van Gorp & Bogaert 2006) and for

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

science education and vocational training (Bogaert et al. 2006). CLIL is popular on projects nowadays; in this, learners focus on learning content knowledge and skills (e.g. maths, playing a musical instrument, agricultural processes), whilst at the same time gaining experience of using English. Again, there are many publications focusing on the principles and procedures, but few on materials development, though an exception is Coyle et al. (2010), which includes a chapter on 'Evaluating and creating materials and tasks for CLIL classrooms'.

My own preference is the text-driven approach, in which an engaging written or spoken text drives a unit of materials in which readiness activities activate the learners' minds in relation to the text, initial response activities stimulate engagement whilst experiencing the text, intake response activities encourage articulation of personal responses, input response activities invite exploration of features of the text and development activities encourage learner production (Tomlinson 2003c).

7.4 Authenticity of texts and tasks

It has been argued that explicit teaching of language through contrived examples and texts helps the learners by focusing their processing energies on the target feature, and this is what most coursebooks typically do. However, many SLA researchers argue that this over-protects learners and does not prepare them for the reality of language use outside the classroom. Such researchers as Little et al. (1994), Bacon & Finneman (1990), Kuo (1993), McGarry (1995), Wong, Kwok & Choi (1995), Nuttall (1996), Mishan (2005), Gilmore (2007a, 2007b) and Rilling & Dantas-Whitney (2009) argue that authentic materials can provide meaningful exposure to language as it is actually used, motivate learners and help them develop a range of communicative competencies and enhance positive attitudes towards the learning of a language. Mishan (2005) gives a detailed account of the debate about authenticity and provides a rationale for using authentic materials, as does Trabelsi (2010), who argues for providing university students with materials which are authentic because they 'are tailored to the learners' profile and are suitable to the stakeholders'. . .expectations and demands' (p. 116). A number of researchers have compared data from corpora of authentic language use with data from coursebooks and have criticised the lack of authenticity of the latter. For example, Gilmore (2004) compares textbook and authentic interactions and Lam (2010) reports the high frequency of the discourse particle 'well' in the Hong Kong corpus of Spoken English compared to its infrequency in the coursebooks used there. However, other researchers, such as Widdowson (1984, 2000), Yano, Long & Ross (1994), Day & Bamford (1998), Ellis (1999) and Day (2003) claim that authentic materials can pose too many problems for learners: they put forward arguments for contriving materials that will simplify and facilitate learning. Widdowson (1984: 218), for example, believes that 'pedagogic presentation of language. . .necessarily involves methodological contrivance which isolates features from their natural surroundings', Ellis (1999: 68) argues for 'enriched input' which has been flooded with examples of the target structure for use in a meaning-focused activity, and Day (2003) attacks what he calls the cult of authenticity, saying there is no empirical evidence that authenticity facilitates language acquisition, and citing evidence that learners find authentic texts more difficult than simplified or elaborated texts. Prodromou (1992) and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Trabelsi (2010) have also raised the issue of authenticity in relation to the learners' culture. What might be authentic for one location (or for one learner) might not be authentic for another. It is not the text or the task which is authentic but the learner's interaction with it. Widdowson (1978) distinguished between the genuineness of a text and the authenticity of its use, Breen (1985: 61) focused on 'the authenticity of the learner's own interpretation [and] the actual social situation of the classroom' and Van Lier (1996: 128) stressed that authenticity 'is basically a personal process of engagement'.

For me, an authentic text is one which is produced in order to communicate rather than to teach, and an authentic task is one which involves the learners in communication in order to achieve an outcome, rather than practice the language. The text does not have to be produced by a native speaker and it might be a version of an original which has been simplified to facilitate communication. The task does not have to be a real-life task, but can be a classroom task which involves the use of real life skills in order to achieve not just communication but a non-linguistic outcome (e.g. one member of a group getting the others to draw a replica of a drawing she has been shown). Given these definitions, I think that every text that learners encounter should be authentic and that most tasks should be authentic too – otherwise the learners are not being prepared for the reality of language use.

7.5 Acceptability

Most publishers are understandably anxious to avoid giving offence and often supply their authors with lists of taboo topics, as well as guidelines on how to avoid sexism and racism. A number of authors have objected to what they see as sometimes excessive caution (e.g. Wajnryb 1996; Tomlinson 2001a) and have complained about the unengaging blandness of commercially published materials. Tomlinson (1995), in particular, has contrasted this with materials published on national projects and especially with the Namibian coursebook *On Target*, in which such provocative topics as marital violence and drug abuse are included, with the permission of the Ministry of Education, in response to a nationwide survey in which students requested such topics.

Banegas (2011) describes a two-part syllabus in use at a secondary school in Argentina. Syllabus 1 follows a mainstream coursebook while Syllabus 2 is a negotiated syllabus driven by teacher-suggested topics such as gay marriage and child abuse and student-suggested topics such as divorce and single parenting. To resource this deliberately provocative syllabus, the teachers have produced a sourcebook of authentic reading and listening texts from which to develop activities. Gray (2010) examines publishers' documents which prohibit their authors from using controversial topics such as politics, alcohol, religion and sex and also reports interviews in which publishers discuss their need to regulate materials to match the sensitivities of their markets. Gray comments on how the permitted topics portray a successful, materialistic and aspirational EFL world. Waijnryb (1996: 291) complains that this world is too 'safe, clean, harmonious, benevolent, undisturbed'. Tomlinson (2001a: 68), whilst understanding the cautious stance of the publishers, comments on how affect is undoubtedly an important factor in learning and says 'it is arguable that provocative texts which stimulate an affective response are more likely to facilitate learning than neutral texts

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which do not'. This is still my position: I have run many courses in which I have helped materials developers make use of controversial topics and texts that would be acceptable in their cultures and would have the potential for stimulating affective engagement.

7.6 Humanising materials

A number of recent publications have stressed the need for the humanisation of language-learning materials (e.g. Arnold 1999; Arnold & Brown 1999; Maley 2003, 2008, 2011; Rinvolucri 2003; Tomlinson 2003d, 2008b; Masuhara 2006, 2007; Tomlinson & Avila 2007a, 2007b; Masuhara et al. 2008; Mukandan 2009b and Hooper Hansen 2011), and Mario Rinvolucri has started a web journal publishing articles proposing ways of humanising language teaching (Humanising Language Teaching: www.hltmag.co.uk).

Most of these publications refer to learning theories and stress the need to help learners to personalise, localise and make meaningful their experience of the target language, as well as the need for materials to be affectively engaging and cater for all learning style preferences. Arnold & Brown (1999), for example, refer to researchers who advocate whole-brain learning and quote Gross (1992:139), who claims that 'We can accelerate and enrich our learning, by engaging the senses, emotions, imagination'. Canagarajah (1999) gives examples of the re-writing of textbook comprehension questions so as to elicit localised and personalised responses. Tomlinson (2003d) agrees with Berman (1999:2), who says, 'We learn best when we see things as part of a recognised pattern, when our imaginations are aroused, when we make natural associations between one idea and another, and when the information appeals to our senses'. Tomlinson goes on to advocate a humanistic coursebook which engages affect through personalised activities and which provides imaging, inner voice, kinaesthetic and process activities. When criticising the excessive control exerted by coursebooks, Mukundan (2009b: 96) says that the classroom should be like a jungle 'where chance and challenge and spontaneity and creativity and risk work in complementary fashion with planned activity'. Hooper Hansen (2011: 407) advocates helping the learner to achieve 'a state in which the mind is optimally relaxed and fully expanded' and suggests, for example, using paintings as texts. Masuhara (2006) and Tomlinson (2001b, 2003d) advocate and illustrate multi-dimensional approaches to language learning in which learners are encouraged to make use of sensory imagery, motor imagery, inner speech, associations, connections and emotions in order to personalise their language-learning experience.

Many of the publications referred to above criticise commercially published coursebooks for being insufficiently humanistic. Arnold & Brown (1999: 5), for example, believe that we need to add 'the affective domain' to 'the effective language teaching going on in the classroom' in order to make language learning more humanistic, and Tomlinson (2003:6) says that 'most coursebooks make little attempt to achieve affective engagement. . .and they present learners with bland texts and activities in which the learners remain neutral without their emotions being engaged'. Maley (2011) points out that the norm for coursebooks is to pre-determine the content, the order in which is it presented, the rate of progression and the procedures for using the content. He suggests using process options such as projects, community language-learning, drama, extensive reading and creative writing to give learners

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

an opportunity to determine content and language use for themselves. Masuhara et al. (2008: 310) are critical of coursebooks for not making enough use of 'engaging and extensive reading and listening texts', of the developmental opportunities offered by extensive writing, of 'the resources of the mind by stimulating multi-dimensional mental responses which are at the same time sensory, cognitive and affective', of extended projects and of opportunities to stimulate the imagination of learners.

My position is very clear. Without affective and cognitive engagement there is little possibility of deep processing (Craik & Lockhart 1972) and therefore little hope of enduring acquisition. Deep processing comes from personal involvement as an individual human being, and the coursebooks most likely to achieve more than coverage of teaching points are those that take a humanistic approach to language learning and help the learners to localise, to personalise and to achieve confidence and self-esteem.

7.7 Ideology in materials

For a long time critical theorists and socio-cultural theorists have deprecated the role of English language teaching in a globalisation process which they see as promoting western, capitalist, materialistic values. Ferguson (2003) uses the term 'Angloglobalisation' to identify what he sees as a positive connection between the British Empire, English and globalisation but Phillipson (1992), Pennycook (1994, 1998), Gray (2002) and Block (2006) have been much more critical of these links, and Whitehead (2011: 357) discusses ways in which materials can help to 'develop counter-hegemonic discourses' by encouraging critical engagement with issues relating to globalisation. Gray (2010: 16–17) points out how English has become 'a form of linguistic capital, capable of bringing a profit of distinction to those speakers with the ability to access it (or more accurately, its socially legitimated varieties), and as an increasingly commodified dimension of labour-power'. Gray focuses on how the global coursebook is an artefact, a commodity which promotes socio-economic norms through its texts, activities, values and, especially, its illustrations. He analyses four popular British coursebooks and concludes that they all celebrate personal and professional success, individualism, pleasure, mobility, egalitarianism and materialism. He also examines publishers' guidelines and interviews publishers before concluding that a standardised product is being 'delivered through the standardized methodology embodied in the coursebook into the global marketplace – in which all are assumed to want and need exactly the same thing' (p. 138). This is seen mainly as a result of the publishers' taboo on inappropriate topics and their insistence on discrete-item approaches in which linguistic content is 'made deliverable for teachers in manageable portions and finally made testable by examinations' (p. 137). Not all students and teachers would accept these criticisms of neo-colonialism: see, for example, Bisong (1995) for the perspective of Nigerian users.

Others have written about the development of the coursebook as a commodity to be consumed. Tickoo (1995: 39) views textbook-writing in a multilingual and multicultural society as satisfying different sets of criteria. 'Some of them arise from such a society's need to teach the values it wants to foster. Some arise in the desire to make education a handmaiden of economic progress and social reconstruction'. Toh (2001) reports how the content of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Singapore coursebooks reflects conformity to Western socio-cultural norms. Singapore Wala (2003) views the coursebook as a communicative act, 'a dynamic artefact that contributes to and creates meaning together with other participants in the context of language teaching' (p. 59). She analyses coursebooks used in Singapore and concludes that 'a coursebook is not just a collection of linguistic items – it is a reflection of a particular world-view based on the selection of resources' (p. 69).

Holliday (2005) argues that education has become increasingly commodified and that students have become recast as learners and consumers, Bolitho (2008) claims that textbooks have acquired iconic status as symbols and Mukundan (2009b) talks about the 'declared agenda' of the classroom, in which the teacher is orchestrated by the textbook writer to create a 'zoo-like environment, where learners behave like caged animals, performing planned tricks for the animal trainer. . .' (p. 96). See also Adaskou, Britten & Fahsi (1990), Alptekin (1993), Zhang (1997), Cortazzi & Jin (1999), Gray (2000) and Tomlinson (2005) for discussion of issues relating to culture and materials development.

In my opinion it is inevitable that coursebooks communicate a view of teaching and learning, a view of the target language and the culture(s) they represent and the worldview of their producer. This is potentially dangerous as the coursebook is revered in many classrooms as the authority and there is a risk of its users uncritically accepting its views. However, my experience throughout the world is that teachers and learners are more critical than they are given credit for and often resist the commodity they are being asked to consume. However, to protect the intended consumers it is important that teachers' and language courses focus on developing constructive criticality as one of their objectives.

7.8 The roles of new technologies in language-learning materials

In recent years there have been radical developments in the use of new technologies to deliver language-learning materials. In general these have been welcomed but a number of materials developers have pointed out the dangers of excessive reliance on electronic delivery of materials. For example, Mukundan (2008b: 109) has warned against the danger of educationalists thinking that 'multimedia can drive pedagogically sound methodology' and gives the example of Malaysia where, in his opinion, teaching courseware 'directs teaching in a prescriptive manner'. Reinders & White (2010:68) make the obvious but very important point that whether Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) materials facilitate learning depends on 'how the technology is implemented'. Maley (2011: 390) points out how IT can be used as a resource 'for the freeing of teachers and learners alike from the constraints of the coursebook' and for providing 'rapid and flexible access to unlimited information resources'. However, he also points out that change is so rapid that the resources are bound to be ephemeral, that there is a danger of 'total capitulation to technology' (p. 392) and, like Wolf (2008), believes that the 'multi-tasking, rapidly switching, superficial processing of information might. . .impair more reflective modes of thinking' (p. 392). Lewis (2009) describes and demonstrates how technology can be made use of in the ELT classroom and suggests, for example, ways of using cloud computing and mobile technology.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Many journals (e.g. *ELT Journal*) now have regular features reviewing new electronic materials and ICT applications and numerous experts have written about the potential impact of electronic materials on language learning. For example, Chapelle (1998, 2001) and Chapelle & Lui (2007) have described the effects of CALL materials on their users, Eastment (1999), Derewianka (2003a, 2003b), Murray (2003), Blake (2008), Reinders & White (2010), Kervin & Derewianka (2011) and Motteram (2011) have given accounts of the development and use of electronic materials and Ferradas Moi (2003) has written about the development of materials which make use of hyperfiction. There are also a number of journals, such as *Language Learning & Technology*, which publish articles on electronic delivery of language-learning materials.

When thinking or writing about electronic materials it helps to distinguish between CALL materials (i.e. ELT materials available from websites, computer software, courseware and on-line courses), web sources of language experience (e.g. Google, YouTube, Facebook) and ICT applications which can be made use of both to deliver materials and to facilitate interaction (e.g. mobile phones). It is worth keeping these distinctions in mind when considering the potential benefits of electronic materials put forward below:

- facilitating reading by making hidden information available, by providing on-the-spot help, by supporting comprehension with graphics, video and sound, and facilitating writing through modelling the genre, demonstrating the process, facilitating brainstorming and research, helping to draft and providing the potential for conferencing, editing and revision (Derewianka 2003a)
- organisational advantages such as easy access, convenient storage and retrieval, easy sharing and recycling and cost efficiency; pedagogical advantages such as authenticity, interaction and situated learning; learner advantages such as instant feedback, choice of route and sequence, monitoring of progress, control and empowerment (Reinders & White 2010)
- localised adaptation of materials; free source of a variety of authentic texts; out-of-class opportunities for spoken interaction between learners; development of digital literacy through comparing and evaluating sources of similar information; choice of routes and activities when using teacher blog materials (Motteram 2011)
- collaborative problem solving activities inside and outside the classroom; interaction in simulated environments such as Second Life; modelling and feedback for pronunciation practice; resources for intensive and extensive listening (and viewing) at the learner's convenience; opportunities for integrated learning environments (Kervin & Derewianka 2011).

I welcome the use of new technologies in language learning, especially for the opportunities this can provide for teachers and learners of flexibility and choice, and for the window on the real world they open up to learners in their classrooms and their homes. I see the mobile phone, in particular, as offering great potential for learners (especially in South and South-East Asia where many teenagers have access to mobiles but not to schools). However, I am wary of the misuse of new technologies and have seen examples of schools wasting money on electronic delivery when they do not have any books, of institutions depending on electronic

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

delivery but not having the resources to ensure reliability, and institutions providing so much electronic delivery that they neglect face-to-face interaction.

8. Materials development projects

Much of the innovation in materials development has taken place on projects sponsored by ministries or institutions dissatisfied with what is available to them from commercial publishers. Only a few of these projects have been written up in the literature, but some of the more innovative include:

- the CBSE-ELT Project in India in which the College of St Mark and St John (Plymouth, UK) assisted the Central Board of Secondary Education (CBSE) in helping teachers to develop communicative and task-based textbooks.
- a secondary school coursebook in Namibia written by thirty teachers in six days, which made use of nationwide surveys of student and teacher needs and wants, contained a number of normally taboo topics (e.g. drug abuse), and was text-driven (Tomlinson 1995).
- a secondary school textbook project in Bulgaria in which two textbooks were developed by small teams of teachers and one of them (which focused on helping students to explain Bulgarian culture to overseas visitors) chosen for publication (Tomlinson 1995).
- an eight-year secondary school coursebook series in Romania written by a team of fourteen teachers (Popovici & Bolitho 2003).
- an institution-specific course developed by a large team of teachers at Bilkent University, Ankara (Lyons 2003).
- primary and secondary courses developed by large teams of teachers in Romania, Russia, Belarus and Uzbekistan (Bolitho 2008).
- an institution-specific project in which a small group of teachers produced materials for Sultan Qaboos University, Muscat to help EAP students develop writing skills through an innovative experiential approach which combined text-driven, discovery and process approaches (Al-Busaidi & Tindle 2010).
- a project in which humanistic materials were developed to stimulate 'written textual identities' (Whitehead 2011: 346) as part of the Peacekeeping English Project in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

9. Research in materials development

In a colloquium paper Richards (2005) stressed that all materials reflect the writers' theories of language, language use and language acquisition. He admitted that very few materials producers are also academic theorists and researchers and that there is very little research into the design and effects of materials, going on to suggest ways of connecting research and materials development. In addition, in a plenary paper, Chapelle (2008) pointed out how surprisingly little research has been published on materials evaluation, which can also be said of research on the development and use of materials. If you look at the main literature on materials development reported on above you will find scholarship and theory but not very

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

much empirical investigation. If you look at major books on language acquisition and on classroom research (e.g. Hinkel 2005; Ellis 2008) you will find a lot of empirical investigation of the factors which facilitate language acquisition but very little reference to the role that materials play in the process. The reasons for this seem fairly obvious. Empirical investigation of the effects of materials on language acquisition requires longitudinal research involving considerable investments of time and money. It also requires a careful control of variables, which would be quite easy in controlled experiments investigating immediate phenomena such as repair but very difficult to achieve in classroom research investigating enduring effects on language acquisition and development. How, for example, can you claim that it was a particular textbook which was responsible for a measured long-term outcome and not the quality of the teaching, the rapport between teacher and class or the exposure to the target language gained by the students away from the textbook? Such research is possible but very demanding and could best be achieved by long-term collaboration between publishers and universities. Publishers do, of course, conduct research into the effects of their materials on their users but, for good reasons, such research is usually confidential and rarely published.

Nevertheless, there is some published research on the effects of materials on their users, especially on the effects of extensive reading materials on learners of English. For example, Day & Bamford (1998), Elley (1991) and Krashen (2004) report research findings which demonstrate the positive power of free, voluntary reading in facilitating language acquisition. Maley (2008) provides a review of the literature and research on extensive reading and lists websites which report current research projects on extensive reading. Fenton-Smith (2010) also provides a review of the research on extensive reading and focuses in particular on the debate about the desirability or otherwise of designing output activities to follow the extensive reading of a book. Possibly because of the need to justify the extra expenditure, there is also quite a large literature on the effects of CALL materials on their users (e.g. Chapelle 1998, 2001; Chapelle & Lui 2007). In addition, a number of books on materials development do include reference to research. For example, Harwood (2010a) contains numerous chapters relating research-driven theory to materials development. Mishan (2005) reviews the research literature on SLA and concludes that, for example, authentic texts 'provide the best source of rich and varied input for language learners', 'impact on affective factors essential to learning, such as motivation, empathy and emotional involvement' and stimulate 'whole-brain processing' which can result in more durable learning (Mishan 2005: 41–42). Mukundan (2003, 2006a, 2006b, 2008a, 2009a) includes papers from MICELT materials development conferences in Malaysia that report research. Many of these papers are significant in that they relate to similar studies conducted elsewhere, they report local research which can be generalised and replicated in other contexts and/or their results have general implications for materials development. For example, Chandran & Abdullah (2003) report on a study of gender bias in Malaysian English Language textbooks, Mukundan & Hussin (2006) on their use of Wordsmith 3.0 to evaluate materials, Le & Ha (2008) on a study of foreignness in EFL global textbooks, and Menon (2009) on a corpus analysis of textbooks. McGrath (2002) contains a chapter which reviews the literature on the effects of materials on their users and a short section in the final chapter on the research base for writing and evaluating materials. Renandya (2003) includes research papers on local projects which have universal applications, for example on textbook evaluation in Indonesia (Jazadi 2003), the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

use of textbooks in Malaysia (Chandran 2003), and localising ELT materials in Vietnam (Dat 2003). Tomlinson (1998a, 2003a, 2008a, 2011a) focuses mainly on ideas for innovation in materials development but does also include reference to research which could have significant implications for materials development. For example, Tomlinson (1998b, 2011b) reports on major research findings in SLA and proposes ways of connecting them to materials development and use, and (2011c) on research into L1 and L2 visual imaging, suggesting ways of applying the findings to developing activities for L2 learning. Donovan (1998) writes one of the few published accounts of a publisher's trialling of coursebooks and discusses the lessons to be learned, Ellis (1998) reports the literature on research studies which evaluate language-learning materials and applies the findings to suggestions for conducting materials evaluations, Ellis (2011) reports research experiments on the effects of task-based materials in action and discusses their implications, and Masuhara (2011) reports and evaluates what little literature there is on research into what teachers want from coursebooks (this is another topic of enquiry that is investigated by publishers and reported confidentially). In one such report Tomlinson found that teachers in twelve countries around the world specified their main want as interesting texts and their main need as not having to spend a lot of time preparing lessons. In Tomlinson (2003a) there are reports on research into the use of electronic materials (Derewianka 2003), hyperfiction (Ferradas Moi 2003), materials for beginners (Cook 2003), the realisation of primary school coursebook tasks in the classroom (Ghosn 2003), and the development of textbooks (Lyons 2003; Popovici & Bolitho 2003; Singapore Wala 2003). All these chapters make suggestions for applying theory to practice. In Tomlinson (2008a) there is a chapter on language acquisition and language-learning materials (Tomlinson 2008b) and numerous chapters reporting systematic evaluations of materials in different regions of the world. In Tomlinson (2007a) there are reports on research relating materials development to the neurolinguistic processes involved in early reading (Masuhara 2007), to the inner voice and visual imaging (Tomlinson & Avila 2007a), to influences on learners' written expression (Ghosn 2007) and to the value of comprehension in the early stages of the acquisition of Bahasa Indonesia (Barnard 2007). Van den Branden's (2006) book on task-based learning contains a number of papers evaluating research on the effects of such materials on their users in Belgium. All the chapters singled out above are significant in that they report pioneering studies which could be replicated in other contexts, and could influence a move towards more experiential approaches to materials development and more empirical approaches to its study.

So there is already quite an extensive literature on research and materials development but regrettably little of it provides empirical evidence of the effects of materials on their users. However, there are a number of Ph.D.s which do report empirical investigations of the effects of materials. Some of these studies have also been reported in books and journals, such as Barnard (2007) on comprehension-based materials for beginners of Bahasa Indonesia, Dat (2008) on materials designed to remedy reticence in Vietnam, Shintani's (2011) comparative study of the effects of input-based and production-based instruction on vocabulary acquisition and Gilmore (forthcoming) on the use of authentic materials. In addition Tomlinson & Masuhara (2010) report on twenty-two materials development research projects in fourteen countries. These reports focus on research on the value of extensive reading, in-house materials designed for university students, locally developed materials for

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

language learners and different types of materials. Interestingly, none of the projects reported was conducting research on the effects of global coursebooks, though many were reporting on projects to find replacements for them. Another new book which does focus on the application of applied linguistics research and theory to materials development is Tomlinson & Masuhara (2012), which reports recent research on different areas of applied linguistics, for each one investigating the match between research and materials and proposing ways of achieving effective applications.

In her plenary paper referred to above, Chapelle (2008) argued that we need to take materials evaluation forward into a more research-oriented framework, which will enable us to make claims about the effects of materials on the basis of evidence from research. I very much agree with Chapelle and am optimistic that the increase in the number of Ph.D.s on materials development and the efforts of such organisations as MATSDA will help the field move in this direction.

10. Conclusion

10.1 The current situation

In the last forty years materials development has progressed dramatically, both as an academic field and as a practical undertaking. We are now much more aware of the principles and procedures of materials development that are most likely to facilitate language acquisition and development and are much better at actually developing effective materials. Teachers also seem to be more constructively critical of their coursebooks and to be more willing, confident and able to localise and personalise their coursebooks for their learners. This is especially so in regions where teachers have been trained as materials developers, either on teacher development courses or on national or institutional materials development projects. As Canniveng & Martinez (2003), Lyons (2003), Popovici & Bolitho (2003), Tomlinson (2003d) and Bolitho (2008) have told us, such courses and projects are ideal for stimulating teachers to think about how best to facilitate language acquisition and development, to gain self-esteem and confidence and to develop personally and professionally in ways which help them to help others.

10.2 Gaps in the literature

Very little of the existing literature on materials development tells us much about the actual effect of different types of materials on language acquisition and development, nor about how to encourage teachers and learners to try new types of materials (although see Tomlinson 2005), about ways in which commercial publishers can achieve face validity whilst introducing principled innovative approaches or about approaches which help learners to develop their own learning materials. These are gaps which I would hope to see filled in the near future.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

10.3 The future of materials development

What I think will happen in the future is that materials will increasingly be delivered electronically through computers and smartphones, that commercially produced materials will continue to provide users with the materials they expect and that more and more institutions and countries will decide that the only way to develop locally appropriate materials is to do it themselves. What I hope is that commercial publishers will respond to the challenge from local publications and develop more flexible courses designed to be localised, personalised and energised by teachers and learners. What I know is that teachers will continue to develop positively as a result of their involvement in materials development, whether as course participants, members of project teams or adapters of materials in their classrooms.

References

Adaskou, K. D., D. Britten & B. Fahsi (1990). Design decisions on the cultural content of a secondary English course for Morocco. *ELT Journal* 44.1, 3–10.

Al-Busaidi, S. & K. Tindle (2010). Evaluating the impact of in-house materials on language learning. In B. Tomlinson & H. Masuhara (eds.), 137–149.

Allwright, R. L. (1981). What do we want teaching materials for? *ELT Journal* 36.1, 5–18.

Alptekin, C. (1993). Target language culture in EFL materials. *ELT Journal* 47.2, 136–143.

Amrani, F. (2011). The process of evaluation: A publisher's view. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 267–295.

Apple, M. (1992). The text and cultural politics. *Educational Researcher* 21, 4–11.

Arnold, J. (ed.) (1999). *Affect in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arnold, J. & H. D. Brown (1999). A map of the terrain. In J. Arnold (ed.), 1–24.

Bacon, S. M. & M. D. Finneman (1990). A study of the attitudes, motives and strategies of university foreign language students and their disposition to authentic oral and written input. *The Modern Language Journal* 74.4, 459–473.

Banegas, D. L. (2011). Teaching more than English in secondary education. *ELT Journal* 65.1, 80–82.

Barnard, E. S. (2007). The value of comprehension in the early stages of the acquisition and development of Bahasa Indonesia by non-native speakers. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 187–204.

Bell, J. & R. Gower (2011). Writing course materials for the world: A great compromise. In B. Tomlinson (ed.) (2011a), 135–150.

Benesch, S. (2010). Critical praxis as materials development: Responding to military recruitment on a US campus. In N. Harwood (ed.), 109–128.

Berman, M. (1999). The teacher and the wounded healer. *IATEFL Issues* 152, 2–5.

Bisong, J. (1995). Language choice and cultural imperialism: A Nigerian perspective. *ELT Journal* 49.2, 122–132.

Blake, R. (2008). *Brave new digital classroom: Technology and foreign language learning*. Washington, DC: Georgetown Press.

Block, D. (2006). *Multicultural identities in a global city*. London: Palgrave.

Bogaert, N., K. Van Gorp, K. Bultynck, A. Lanssens & V. Depauw (2006). Task-based language teaching in science education and vocational training. In K Van den Branden (ed.), 106–128.

Bolitho, R. (2003). Materials for language awareness. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 422–425.

Bolitho, R. (2008). Materials used in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 213–222.

Bolitho, R. & B. Tomlinson (2005). *Discover English*. Oxford: Macmillan.

Bolitho, R., R. Carter, R. Hughes, R. Ivanic, H. Masuhara & B. Tomlinson (2003). Ten questions about language awareness. *ELT Journal* 57.2, 251–259.

Breen, M. (1985). Authenticity in the language classroom. *Applied Linguistics* 6.1, 60–70.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Breen, M. & C. Candlin (1987). Which materials? A consumer's and designer's guide. In L. E. Sheldon (ed.), *ELT textbooks and materials: Problems in evaluation and development. ELT Documents 126*. London: Modern English Publications and the British Council.
British Council (2008). Teaching English: Course books. London.
Brown, J. B. (1997). Textbook evaluation form. *The Language Teacher* 21.10, 15–21.
Bygate, M., P. Skehan & M. Swain, (eds.) (2001). *Researching pedagogic tasks*. Harlow, UK: Pearson.
Byrd, P. (1995). *Materials writers guide*. Rowley MA: Newbury House.
Byrd, P. (2001). Textbooks: Evaluation for selection and analysis for implementation. In M. Celce-Murcia (ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. (3rd edn). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle, 415–427.
Canagarajah, S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Canagarajah, S. (2005). Introduction. In S. Canagarajah (ed.), *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, xiii–xxx.
Candlin, C. N. & M. Breen (1980). Evaluating and designing language teaching materials. *Practical papers in English Language education*. Vol. 2. Lancaster: Institute for English Language Education, University of Lancaster.
Canniveng, C. & M. Martinez (2003). Materials development and teacher training. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 479–489.
Chandran, S. (2003). Where are the ELT textbooks? In W. A. Renandya (ed.), 161–169.
Chandran, S. K. & M. H. Abdullah (2003). Gender bias in Malaysian English textbooks. In J. Mukundan (ed.), 91–101.
Chandrasegaran, A., N. Venkataraman & L. Poh-Knight (2010). *English access teacher's resource 1*. Singapore: EPB Pan Pacific.
Chapelle, C. A. (1998). Multimedia CALL: Lessons to be learned from research on instructed SLA. *Language Learning & Technology* 2.1, 22–34.
Chapelle, C. A. (2001). *Computer applications in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Chapelle, C. A. (2008). The spread of computer-assisted language learning. Plenary paper at the Association Canadienne de Linguistique Appliqué/Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics, Vancouver, British Columbia, 4–6 June.
Chapelle, C. A. & H. M. Lui (2007). Theory and research: Investigation of 'authentic' CALL tasks. In J. Egbert & E. Hanson-Smith (eds.), *CALL environments* (2nd edn). Alexandria, VA: TESOL Publications, 111–130.
Cook, V. (2003). Materials for adult beginners from an L2 user perspective. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 275–290.
Cortazzi, M. & L. Jin (1999). Cultural mirrors: materials and methods in the EFL classroom. In E. Hinkel (ed.), *Culture in second language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 196–219.
Coyle, D., P. Hood & D. Marsh (2010). *Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Craik, F. & R. Lockhart (1972). Levels of processing: a framework for memory research. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 11, 671–684.
Cunningsworth, A. (1984). *Evaluating and selecting EFL teaching material*. London: Heinemann.
Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your coursebook*. Oxford: Heinemann.
Daoud, A. M. & M. Celce-Murcia (1979). Selecting and evaluating a textbook. In M. Celce-Murcia & L. McIntosh (eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. New York: Newbury House, 302–307.
Dat, B. (2003). Localising ELT materials in Vietnam: a case study. In W. A. Renandya (ed.), 170–191.
Dat, B. (2006). Breaking stereotypes in coursebooks. In J. Mukundan (ed.), 70–83.
Dat, B. (2008). ELT materials used in Southeast Asia. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 263–281.
Davison, W. (1976). Factors in evaluating and selecting texts for the foreign language classroom. *English Language Teaching* 30.4, 310–314.
Day, R. (2003). Authenticity in the design and development of materials. In W. A. Renandya (ed.), 1–11.
Day, R. & J. Bamford (1998). *Extensive reading in the second language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Dendrinos, R. (1992). *The EFL textbook and ideology*. Athens: Grivas Publications.
Derewianka, B. (2003a). Developing electronic materials for language teaching. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 199–220.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Derewianka, B. (2003b). Designing an on-line reference grammar for primary English teachers. In W. A. Renandya (ed.), *Methodology and materials design in language teaching*. Singapore: SEAMEO, 44–51.
Donovan, P. (1998). Piloting – a publisher's view. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 149–189.
Dougill, J. (1987). Not so obvious. In L. E. Sheldon (ed.), 29–36.
Dubin, F. & E. Olshtain (1986). *Course design*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Duran, G. & G. Ramaut (2006). Tasks for absolute beginners and beyond: Developing and sequencing tasks at basic proficiency levels. In K. Van den Branden (ed.), 47–75.
Eastment, D. (1999). *The internet and ELT*. Oxford: Summertown Publishing.
Edge, J. & S. Wharton (1998). Autonomy and development: Living in the materials world. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 295–310.
Elley, W. (1991). Acquiring literacy in a second language: The effect of book-based programmes. *Language Learning* 41, 375–411.
Ellis, R. (1998). The evaluation of communicative tasks. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 217–238.
Ellis, R. (1999). Input based approaches to teaching grammar: A review of classroom oriented research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 19, 64–80.
Ellis, R. (2001). Introduction: investigating form-focused instruction. *Language Learning* 51. Supplement 1, 1–46.
Ellis, R. (ed.) (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd edn). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Ellis, R. (2010). Second language acquisition research and language teaching materials. In N. Harwood (ed.), 33–57.
Ellis, R. (2011). Macro- and micro-evaluations of task-based teaching. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 21–35.
Eurydice (2006). *Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) at school in Europe*. Brussels: Eurydice.
Farr, F., A. Chambers & S. O'Riordan (2010). Corpora for materials development in language teacher education: Underlying principles and useful data. In F. Mishan & A. Chambers (eds.), 33–62.
Fenner, A. & D. Newby (2000). *Approaches to materials design in European textbooks: Implementing principles of authenticity, learner autonomy, cultural awareness*. Graz: European Centre for Modern Languages.
Fenton-Smith, B. (2010). A debate on the desired effects of output activities for extensive reading. In B. Tomlinson & H. Masuhara (eds), 50–61.
Ferguson, N. (2003) *Empire*. London: Penguin.
Ferradas Moi, C. (2003). Hyperfiction: Explorations in texture. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 221–233.
Flack, R. (1999). A problem shared. . .coursebook deficiency disorder: Coursebook bore. *Modern English Teacher* 81.1, 60–61.
Flores, M. M. (1995). Developing materials for tertiary level expository writing. In A. C. Hidalgo, D. Hall & G. M. Jacobs (eds.), 57–66.
Gearing, K. (1999). Helping less-experienced teachers of English to evaluate teachers' guides. *ELT Journal* 53.2, 122–127.
Ghosn, I. (2003).Talking like texts and talking about texts: How some primary school coursebook tasks are realized in the classroom. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 291–305.
Ghosn, I. (2007). Output like input: Influence of children's literature on young L2 learners' written expression. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 171–186.
Ghosn, I. (2010). Five year outcomes from children's literature-based programmes vs. programmes using a skills-based ESL course – The Matthew and Peter effects at work. In B. Tomlinson & H. Masuhara (eds.), 21–36.
Gilmore, A. (2004). A comparison of textbook and authentic interactions. *ELT Journal* 58.4, 363–374.
Gilmore, A. (2007a). Authentic materials and authenticity in foreign language learning. *Language Teaching* 40, 97–118.
Gilmore, A. (2007b). *Getting real in the language classroom: Developing Japanese students' communicative competence with authentic materials*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Nottingham.
Gilmore, A. (2009). Using online corpora to develop students' writing skills. *ELT Journal* 63.4, 363–372.
Gilmore, A. (forthcoming). 'I prefer not text': Developing Japanese learners' communicative competence with authentic materials. *Language Learning*.
Grant, N. (1987). *Making the most of your textbook*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
Graves, K. (1996). *Teachers as course developers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Gray, J. (2000). The ELT coursebook as cultural artefact: How teachers censor and adapt. *ELT Journal* 54.3, 274–283.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Gray, F. (2002). The global coursebook in English language teaching. In D. Block & D. Cameron (eds.), *Globalization and language teaching*. London: Routledge, 151–166.
Gray, J. (2010). *The construction of English: Culture, consumerism and promotion in the ELT coursebook*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Gross, R. (1992). Lifelong learning in the learning society of the twenty first century. In C. Collins & J. Mangieri (eds.), *Teaching thinking: An agenda for the twenty first century*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Hall, D. (1995). Materials production: Theory and practice. In A. C. Hidalgo, D. Hall & G. M. Jacobs (eds.), 8–24.
Harmer, J. (1991). *The practice of English language teaching*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
Harmer, J. (1998). *How to teach English*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
Harwood, N. (ed.) (2010a). *Materials in ELT: Theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Harwood, N. (2010b). Issues in materials development and design. In N. Harwood (ed.), 3–32.
Hemsley, M. (1997). The evaluation of teachers' guides – design and application. *ELTED* 3.1, 72–83.
Hewings, M. (2010). Materials for university essay writing. In N. Harwood, (ed.), 251–278.
Hidalgo, A. C., D. Hall & G. M. Jacobs (eds.) (1995). *Getting started: Materials writers on materials writing*. Singapore: SEAMEO Language Centre.
Hinkel, E. (ed.) (2005). *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Holliday, A. (2005). *The struggle to teach English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hooper Hansen, G. (2011). Lozanov and the teaching text. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 403–413.
Hutchinson, T. & E. Torres (1994). The textbook as agent of change. *ELT Journal* 48.4, 315–328.
Islam, C. & C. Mares (2003). Adapting classroom materials. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 86–100.
Jazadi, I. (2003). Mandated English teaching materials and their implications for teaching and learning: The case of Indonesia. In W. A. Renandya (ed.), 142–160.
Jensen, M. & A. Hermer (2006). Learning by playing: Learning foreign languages through the senses. In M. Byram & M. Fleming (eds.), *Language learning in intercultural perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 178–192.
Johnson, K. (2003). *Designing language teaching tasks.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Jolly, D. & R. Bolitho (2011). A framework for materials writing. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 107–134.
Jones, M. & N. Schmitt (2010). Developing materials for discipline-specific vocabulary and phrases in academic seminars. In N. Harwood (ed.), 225–248.
Katz, A. (1996). Teaching style: A way to understand instruction in language classrooms. In K. Bailey & D. Nunan (eds.), *Voices from the language classroom*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 57–87.
Kervin, L. & B. Derewianka (2011). New technologies to support language learning. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 328–351.
Krashen, S. (2004). *The power of reading: Insights from the research*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
Kuo, C. H. (1993). Problematic issues in ESP materials development. *English for Specific Purposes* 12, 171–181.
Lam, P. W. Y. (2010). Discourse particles in corpus data and textbooks: The case of *well*. *Applied Linguistics* 31.2, 260–281.
Lewis, G. (2009). *Bringing technology into the classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Le, T. B. & P. L. Ha (2009). Examining the foreignness of EFL global textbooks: Issues and proposals from the Vietnamese classroom. In J. Mukundan (ed.), 196–212.
Lee, R. & A. Bathmaker (2007). The use of English textbooks for teaching English to 'vocational' students in Singapore secondary schools: A survey of teachers' beliefs. *RELC Journal* 38.3, 350–374.
Lin, L. Y. & R. Brown (1994). Guidelines for the production of in-house self-access materials. *ELT Journal* 48.2, 150–156.
Little, B. L., S. Devitt & D. Singleton (1989). *Learning foreign languages from authentic texts*. Dublin: Authentik Language Learning Resources Ltd.
Littlejohn, A. (1992). *Why are ELT Materials the way they are?* Ph.D. thesis. Lancaster University.
Littlejohn, A. (2011). The analysis of language teaching materials: Inside the Trojan horse. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 179–211.
Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg & C. Kramsch (eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Luke, C., S. de Castell & A. Luke (1989). Beyond criticism: The authority of the school textbook. In S. de Castell, A. Luke & C. Luke (eds.), *Language, authority and criticism: Readings on the school textbook*. London: Falmer Press, 245–260.
Lyons, P. (2003). A practical experience of institutional textbook writing: Product/process implications for materials development. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 490–504.
Madsen, K. S. & J. D. Bowen (1978). *Adaptation in language teaching*. Boston, MA: Newbury House.
Maley, A. (1998). Squaring the circle – reconciling materials as constraint with materials as empowerment. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 279–294.
Maley, A. (2003). Creative approaches to writing materials. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 183–198.
Maley, A. (2008). Extensive reading: Maid in waiting. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), *English language learning materials: A critical review*. London: Continuum, 133–156.
Maley, A. (2011). Squaring the circle – reconciling materials as constraint with materials as empowerment. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 379–402.
Mares, C. (2003). Writing a coursebook. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 130–140.
Mariani, L. (1983). Evaluating and supplementing coursebooks. In S. Holden (ed.), *Second selections from Modern English Teacher*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
Mason, J. (2010). The effects of different types of materials on the intercultural competence of Tunisian university students. In B. Tomlinson & H. Masuhara (eds.), 67–82.
Masuhara, H. (2006). The multi-dimensional awareness approach to content teaching. In J. Mukundan (ed.), *Focus on ELT materials*. Petaling Jaya: Pearson/Longman, 1–11.
Masuhara, H. (2007). The role of proto-reading activities in the acquisition and development of reading skills. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 15–31.
Masuhara, H. (2011). What do teachers really want from coursebooks? In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 236–266.
Masuhara, H., M. Haan, Y. Yi & B. Tomlinson (2008). Adult EFL courses. *ELT Journal* 62.3, 294–312.
Matthews, A. (1985). Choosing the best available textbook. In A. Matthews, M. Spratt & L. Dangerfield (eds.), *At the chalkface*. London: Edward Arnold, 202–206.
McCarten, J. & M. McCarthy (2010). Bridging the gap between corpus and course book: The case of conversation strategies. In F. Mishan & A. Chambers (eds.), 11–32.
McCullugh, M. (2010). An initial evaluation of a set of published materials for medical English. In B. Tomlinson & H. Masuhara (eds.), 381–393.
McDonough, J. (2010). English for specific purposes: A survey review of current materials. *ELT Journal* 64.4, 467–477.
McDonough, J. & C. Shaw (1993, 2003). *Materials and methods in ELT: A teacher's guide*. London: Blackwell.
McDonough, J., C. Shaw & H. Masuhara (2012). *Materials and methods in ELT: A teacher's guide* (3rd edn). London: Blackwell.
McGarry, D. (1995). *Learner autonomy 4: The role of authentic texts*. Dublin: Authentik Language Learning Resources Ltd.
McGrath, I. (2002). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Meddings, L. & S. Thornbury (2009). *Teaching unplugged: Dogme in English language teaching*. Peaslake: Delta.
Menon, S. (2009). Corpus analysis of prescribed Science and English language textbooks: Potentials for language teaching and EST materials design. In J. Mukundan (ed.), 213–231.
Methold, K. (1972). The practical aspects of instructional materials preparation. *RELC Journal* 3.1, 88–97.
Mishan, F. (2005). *Designing authenticity into language learning materials*. Bristol: Intellect.
Mishan, F. (2010). Withstanding washback: Thinking outside the box in materials development. In B. Tomlinson & H. Masuhara (eds.), 353–369.
Mishan, F. & A. Chambers, (eds.) (2010). Perspectives on language learning materials development. Bern: Peter Lang.
Moskowitz, G. (1978). *Caring and sharing in the foreign language class*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
Motteram, G. (2011). Coursebooks and multi-media supplements. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 303–327.
Mukundan, J. (ed.) (2003). *Readings on ELT material*. Sedang: Universiti Putra Malaysia Press.
Mukundan, J. (ed.) (2006a). *Focus on ELT materials*. Petaling Jaya: Pearson Malaysia.
Mukundan, J. (ed.) (2006b). *Readings on ELT materials II*. Petaling Jaya: Pearson Malaysia.
Mukundan, J. (2006c). Are there new ways of evaluating ELT coursebooks? In J. Mukundan (ed.) (2006b), 170–180.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mukundan, J. (ed.) (2008a). *Readings on ELT materials III*. Petaling Jaya: Pearson Malaysia.
Mukundan, J. (2008b) Multimedia materials in developing countries: The Malaysia experience. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 100–109.
Mukundan, J. (ed.) (2009a). *Readings on ELT materials III*. Petaling Jaya: Pearson Malaysia.
Mukundan, J. (2009b). Are there really good reasons as to why textbooks should exist? In J. Mukundan (ed.), 92–100.
Mukundan, J. & A. A. Hussin (2006). Exploration of Wordsmith 3.0 as a textbook writer's guide and as an evaluation instrument. In J. Mukundan (ed.) (2006a), 12–24.
Mukundan, J. & T. Ahour (2010) A review of textbook evaluation checklists across four decades (1970–2008). In B. Tomlinson & H. Masuhara (eds.), 336–352.
Murray, D. E. (2003). Materials for new technologies: Learning from research and practice. In W. A. Renandya (ed.), 30–43.
Nunan, D. (1988). Principles for designing language teaching materials. *Guidelines* 10, 1–24.
Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers*. Prentice Hall.
Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.
Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Nuttall, C. (1996). *Teaching reading skills in a foreign language*. Oxford: Heinemann.
O'Keefe, A., M. McCarthy & R. Carter (2007). *From corpus to classroom: Language use and language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
O'Neil, R. O. (1982). Why use textbooks? *ELT Journal* 36.2, 104–111.
Oxford, R. L. (2002). Sources of variation in language learning. In R. B. Kaplan (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics* (3rd edn). New York: Oxford University Press, 245–252.
Park, H. (2010). Process drama in the Korean EFL secondary classroom: A case study of Korean middle school classrooms. In B. Tomlinson & H. Masuhara (eds.), 155–171.
Pelly, C. P. & D. Allison (2000). Investigating the views of teachers on assessment of English language learning in the Singapore education system. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics* 5, 81–106.
Penaflorida, A. H. (1995). The process of materials development: A personal experience. In A. C. Hidalgo, D. Hall & G. M. Jacobs (eds.), 172–186.
Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. New York: Longman.
Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Popovici, R. & Bolitho, R. (2003). Personal and professional development through writing: The Romanian textbook project. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 505–517.
Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Prabhu, N. S. (1989). Materials as support: Materials as constraint. *Guidelines* 11, 66–74.
Prodromou, L. (1992). What culture? Which culture? *ELT Journal* 46.1, 39–50.
Prowse, P. (1998). How writers write: Testimony from authors. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 130–145.
Prowse, P. (2011). How writers write: Testimony from authors. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 151–173.
Redston, C. & G. Cunningham (2005). *face2face Pre-intermediate*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Reinders, H. & C. White (2010). The theory and practice of technology in materials development and task design. In N. Harwood (ed.), 58–80.
Renandya, W. A. (ed.) (2003). *Methodology and materials design in language teaching: Current perceptions and practises and their implications*. Singapore: RELC.
Reppen, R. (2011). Using corpora in the language classroom. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 35–50.
Riazi, A. M. (2003). What do textbook evaluation schemes tell us? A study of the textbook evaluation schemes of three decades. In W. A. Renandya (ed.), 52–68.
Richards, J. C. (1978). *Understanding second and foreign language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
Richards, J. (2001). *Curriculum development in language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Richards, J. (2005). Materials development and research – making the connection. Paper presented at a colloquium on materials development and research, TESOL Convention, San Antonio, March 2005.
Richards, J. (2006). Materials development and research – making the connection. *RELC Journal* 37.1, 5–26.
Richards, J. C. & D. Mahoney (1996). Teachers and textbooks: A survey of beliefs and practice. *Perspectives* 8.1, 40–63.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Rilling, S. & M. Dantas-Whitney (eds.) (2009). *Authenticity in the language classroom and beyond: Adult learners*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
Rinvolucri, M. (2003). *Humanising your coursebook*. Peaslake: Delta Publishing.
Rivers, W. M. (1981). *Teaching foreign-language skills*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
Roberts, J. T. (1996). Demystifying materials evaluation. *System* 24.3, 375–389.
Rubdy, R. (2003). Selection of materials. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 37–57.
Samuda, V. (2005). Expertise in pedagogic task design. In K. Johnson (ed.), *Expertise in second language learning and teaching*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 230–254.
Samuda, V. & M. Bygate (2008). *Tasks in second language learning*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Saraceni, C. (2003). Adapting courses: A critical view. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 72–85.
Sheldon, L. E. (ed.) (1987). *ELT textbooks and materials: Problems in evaluation and development. ELT documents* 126. London: Modern English Publications and the British Council.
Sheldon, L. E. (1988). Evaluating ELT textbooks and materials. *ELT Journal* 42.4, 237–246.
Shintani, N. (2011). A comparative study of the effects of input based and production based instruction on vocabulary acquisition by young EFL learners. *Language Teaching Research* 15.2, 137–158.
Singapore Wala, D. A. (2003). A coursebook is what it is because of what it has to do: An editor's perspective. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 58–71.
Skierso, A. (1991). Textbook selection and evaluation. In M. Celce-Murcia (ed.), 432–453.
Spiro, J. (2006). Becoming a second language story writer. In J. Mukundan (ed.), 47–60.
Swales, J. M. (1980). ESP: The textbook problem. *The ESP Journal* 1.1, 11–23.
Tan, M. (ed.) (2002). *Corpus studies in language education*. Bangkok: IELE Press.
Thornbury, S. & L. Meddings (2001). Coursebooks: The roaring in the chimney. *Modern English Teacher* 10.3, 11–13.
Tickoo, M. L. (1995). Materials for a state-level system: A retrospective record. In A. C. Hidalgo, D. Hall & G. M. Jacobs (eds.), 31–45.
Toh, G. (2001). Primary school English textbooks in Singapore across the decades: An examination of cultural content of the Oxford series, PRP and PETS. In J. Tan, S. Gopinathan & H. W. Kam (eds.), *Challenges facing the Singapore education system today*. Singapore: Prentice Hall, 140–157.
Tomlinson, B. (1994). Pragmatic awareness activities. *Language Awareness* 3.3 & 4, 119–129.
Tomlinson, B. (1995). Work in progress: Textbook projects. *Folio* 2.2, 26–31.
Tomlinson, B. (ed.) (1998a). *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Tomlinson, B. (1998b). Introduction. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 1–24.
Tomlinson, B. (2001a). Materials development. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (eds.), *The Cambridge guide to TESOL*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 66–71.
Tomlinson, B. (2001b). Connecting the mind: A multi-dimensional approach to teaching language through literature. *The English Teacher* 4.2, 104–115.
Tomlinson, B. (ed.) (2003a). *Developing materials for language teaching*. London: Continuum.
Tomlinson, B. (2003b). Materials evaluation. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 15–36.
Tomlinson, B. (2003c). Developing principled frameworks for materials development. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 107–129.
Tomlinson, B. (2003d). Humanizing the coursebook. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 162–173.
Tomlinson, B. (2005). English as a foreign language: Matching procedures to the context of learning. In E. Hinkel (ed.), 137–154.
Tomlinson, B. (ed.) (2007a). *Language acquisition and development: Studies of first and other language learners*. London: Continuum.
Tomlinson, B. (2007b). Teachers' responses to form-focused discovery approaches. In S. Fotos & H. Nassaji (eds.), *Form focused instruction and teacher education: Studies in honour of Rod Ellis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 179–194.
Tomlinson, B. (ed.) (2008a). *English language teaching materials: A critical review*. London: Continuum.
Tomlinson, B. (2008b). Language acquisition and language learning materials. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 3–14.
Tomlinson, B. (2010a). Principles and procedures of materials development. In N. Harwood (ed.), 81–108.
Tomlinson, B. (2010b). What do teachers think about EFL coursebooks? *Modern English Teacher* 19.4, 5–9.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Tomlinson, B. (2010c). Helping learners to fill the gaps in their learning. In F. Mishan & A. Chambers (eds.), 87–108.
Tomlinson, B. (ed.) (2011a). *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd edn). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Tomlinson, B. (2011b). Principled procedures in materials development. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 1–31.
Tomlinson, B. (2011c). Seeing what they mean: Helping L2 readers to visualise. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 357–378.
Tomlinson, B., B. Dat, H. Masuhara & R. Rubdy (2001). ELT courses for adults. *ELT Journal* 55.1, 80–101.
Tomlinson, B. & H. Masuhara (2004). *Developing language course materials*. Singapore: RELC Portfolio Series.
Tomlinson, B. & J. Avila (2007a). Seeing and saying for yourself: the roles of audio-visual mental aids in language learning and use. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 61–81.
Tomlinson, B. & J. Avila (2007b). Applications of the research into the roles of audio-visual mental aids for language teaching pedagogy. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 82–89.
Tomlinson, B. & H. Masuhara (eds.) (2010). *Research for materials development in language learning: Evidence for best practice*. London: Continuum.
Tomlinson, B. & H. Masuhara (eds.) (2012). *Applied linguistics and materials development*. London: Continuum.
Trabelsi, S. (2010). Developing and trialling authentic materials for business English students at a Tunisian university. In B. Tomlinson & H. Masuhara (eds.), 103–120.
Tribble, C. (2009). Writing academic English – a survey review of current published resources. *ELT Journal* 63.4, 400–417.
Troncoso, C. R. (2010). The effects of language materials on the development of intercultural competence. In B. Tomlinson & H. Masuhara (eds.), 83–102.
Tsui, A. (2003). *Understanding expertise in teaching: Case studies of ESL teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Tucker, C. A. (1975). Evaluating beginning textbooks. *English Teaching Forum* 13, 335–361.
Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Van Avermaet, P. & S. Gysen (2006). From needs to tasks: Language learning needs in a task-based approach. In K. Van den Branden (ed.), 17–46.
Van den Branden, K. (2006). *Task-based language education: From theory to practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Van Gorp, K. & N. Bogaert (2006). Developing language tasks for primary and secondary education. In K. Van den Branden (ed.), 76–105.
Van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
Verhelst, M. (2006) A box full of feelings: Promoting infants' second language acquisition all day long. In K. Van den Branden (ed.), 197–216.
Wallace, M. J. (1998). *Action research for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Wajnryb, R. (1996). Death, taxes and jeopardy: Systematic omissions in EFL texts, or life was never meant to be an adjacency pair. *9th Educational Conference, Sydney.*
White, G. (1998). *Listening*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Whitehead, D. (2011). English language teaching in fragile states: Justifying action, promoting success and combating hegemony. In H. Coleman (ed.), *Dreams and realities: Developing countries and the English language*. London: British Council, 333–369.
Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Widdowson, H. G. (1984). Authentic versus purposeful activities. Address to *Joint Council of Languages Association Conference*, n.p.
Widdowson, H. G. (2000). On the limitations of linguistics applied. *Applied Linguistics* 21.1, 3–25.
Williams, D. (1983). Developing criteria for textbooks evaluation. *ELT Journal* 37.3, 251–255.
Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Harlow, UK: Longman Pearson.
Willis, J. (2011). Concordances in the classroom without a computer: Assembling and exploiting concordances of common words. In B. Tomlinson (ed.), 51–77.
Willis, D. & J. Willis (2007). *Doing task-based teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Wilson, J. (2010). Recent IELTS materials. *ELT Journal* 64.2, 219–232.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Wong, V., P. Kwok & N. Choi (1995). The use of authentic materials at tertiary level. *ELT Journal* 49.4, 318–322.
Wolf, M. (2008). *Proust and the squid*. London: Icon Books.
Yano, Y., M. H. Long & S. Ross (1994). The effects of simplified and elaborated texts on foreign language comprehension. *Language Learning* 44.2, 189–212.
Zacharias, N. (2005). Teachers' beliefs about internationally-published materials: A survey of tertiary English teachers in Indonesia. *RELC Journal* 36.1, 23–37.
Zhang, W. (1997). A strong cultural component in EFL materials. *Folio* 4.1, 38–41.

BRIAN TOMLINSON is Visiting Professor at Leeds Metropolitan University and Academic Director of TEFL International. He has worked in Japan, Indonesia, Nigeria, Oman, Singapore, the UK, Vanuatu and Zambia and has given presentations in sixty countries. He is President of MATSDA (the Materials Development Association) and has published on materials development and other research interests such as language through literature, language awareness and the roles of visual imaging and inner speech in language learning. His books include *Materials development in language teaching* (Cambridge University Press, 2011, second edition), *Developing materials for language teaching* (Continuum, 2003), and *Research for materials development in language learning* (with Hitomi Masuhara; Continuum, 2010).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528 Published online by Cambridge University Press