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Abstract

The research presented in this dissertation explores the interaction between English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers and the classroom materials they develop. It aims to illuminate the potential value of this creative process for teachers’ development of critically reflective practice (CRP). For many EFL teachers, materials are an essential part of their pedagogy. Despite the widespread availability of publications for this compulsory subject in Dutch secondary education, many teachers choose to supplement the coursebook with their own materials. A premise of this research is that the materials teachers develop embody their personal theories of action regarding EFL teaching and learning. These theories, consisting of espoused principles and principles-in-use, are conceptualised as the teachers’ pedagogic principles. Critical reflection may help teachers uncover their espoused and tacit principles with the aim to align them, and improve their teaching practice. The central question is: In what ways does classroom materials development offer teachers of English a tool for CRP?

The research questions are addressed through a qualitative, exploratory, embedded multiple-case study approach. Four Dutch EFL teachers are considered as individual cases. The components of each case are analysed to present an encompassing view of the materials development process: reflective logs (creation), the materials themselves (product), and lesson observations (use) are supplemented with pre- and post-lesson interviews to complete data collection. Data are analysed through deductive and inductive within-case analysis and cross-case synthesis. Findings suggest that teachers’ pedagogic principles are multifarious, informed by practical and pragmatic considerations, and revealed at several points and in a variety of ways during the materials development process. Yet it is only when teachers engage in dialogue about them that increased awareness of these principles ensues. CRP may thus be stimulated by a critical friend, and the materials development process can provide an impetus for discussion and dialogue.
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1. Introduction

This research centres on teachers of English in Dutch secondary schools, and the theories these teachers hold on the role and function of classroom materials in their teaching practice. Chapter 1 discusses the context and scope of the research, focussing on relevant terminology and conceptualisations in relation to other research in the field, and on the professional context of the research participants. It continues with a discussion of recent developments which inform the research and the questions it aims to address. The chapter ends with an overview of the aims and objectives of the research, the research questions, and the chapters in this dissertation.

1.1 Context and Scope of the Research

1.1.1 Teaching English as a Foreign Language

It has been assumed for some time that there is a difference between second language acquisition (SLA) and instructed foreign language learning (Gass and Selinker, 2001; Ortega, 2009). Although it could be argued that the objective of both is to acquire another language, and recent publications by Ellis and Shintani (2014) and Tomlinson (2017) draw findings in both research areas together, SLA is considered to refer to a natural process that occurs when one moves to a foreign country and is immersed in a new language environment, whereas instructed language learning usually takes place in a classroom setting, which is, by definition, more contrived.

The terminology used in the literature on instructed foreign language learning can be confusing: the language which is not one's native language is referred to as a second language, a foreign language, or an other language (e.g. Evans and Esch, 2013; Alghbban et al., 2015; Canagarajah, 2016). The participants in this research will be referred to as EFL (English as a Foreign Language) teachers: they teach English to pupils who are enrolled in the Dutch secondary education system, most of whom speak Dutch as their mother tongue. Their pedagogy, in which English could be said ‘to be simultaneously the medium and the object of instruction’ (Freeman et al., 2015: 131), aims at facilitating instructed language learning in a native-language environment.

EFL teaching and learning has been a subject of research for decades (Kleinsasser, 2013). Emerging trends in EFL pedagogy and research documented in recent literature include shifts from

- pre-packaged methods to situated pedagogies;
- controlled classrooms and experimental settings to everyday contexts and ecologies;
- knowledge or skills to identities, beliefs, and ideologies;
- generalised and global to specific and local (Canagarajah, 2016: 30-31).

Originating in the 1970s, a major approach in EFL pedagogy today is Communicative Language Teaching (Howatt, 1984; Nunan, 1993; Kwakernaak, 2011a). What the many methods associated with this approach appear to have in common, is that they centralise communicative
competence (Hymes, 1966) as opposed to grammatical accuracy; there is a focus on meaning rather than a focus on form (Long, 1991; Doughty and Williams, 1998; Belchamber, 2010; Ellis, 2016). In addition, they often involve collaborative learning, and focus on language tasks based on 'real world communication, authentic materials, and realistic settings' (Belchamber, 2010: 61). Whether and how this general pedagogic approach is reflected in the participants’ teaching practice and their materials will be addressed in this dissertation.

In Communicative Language Teaching, communication in the target language is a key principle. This places demands on EFL teachers who, like the participants in this research, are non-native speakers of English (Freeman et al., 2015). Non-native speakers may lack the confidence required for ‘classroom activities which demand unpredictable language use and ... rapid and intuitive assessment of accuracy and appropriacy’ (Richards, 2001: 211). In the context of this research, Dutch teachers who teach English to Dutch pupils have the benefit of a shared native language, and can draw from their own experiences of EFL learning. These experiences may enable them to recognise and respond to learners’ difficulties more readily, both in their materials and in the classroom (ibid.; Canagarajah, 2016).

1.1.2 The Role and Function of Classroom Materials

As reflected in introductory guides to foreign language teaching (e.g. Harmer, 2007; Ur, 2012; Staatsen and Heebing, 2015), and in the emerging body of research concerned with the development, use, and evaluation of classroom materials, materials are regarded more than ever as a key component in EFL pedagogy (Tomlinson and Masuhara, 2010). Drawing from McGrath (2013), classroom materials, or materials, will be used in this research to refer to pedagogic aids or facilitators in the EFL classroom; they range from commercially produced coursebooks and other reference and practice materials, like dictionaries and supplementary skills books, to authentic texts and recordings, and from teacher-generated hand-outs, worksheets and assignments to digital software and hardware. The word coursebook is used to mean the commercially published textbook, which may be accompanied by a workbook with exercises.

EFL materials can be said to mediate between the course content, the teacher and the pupils. They offer much of the language input and practice received by pupils (Richards, 2001). Those based on a Communicative Language Teaching approach will often contain language tasks aimed at supporting their development of communicative competence (Hymes, 1966; Porcaro, 2011). Materials have also been characterised as organisers of lesson content, with the coursebook in particular serving as ‘the de facto curriculum’ in many EFL classrooms (Guerrettaz and Johnston, 2013: 5).

---

1 Ellipsis points and square brackets are used in this dissertation to indicate omissions in, and modifications to, citations.
1.1.3 Materials Development

The definition of materials development adopted in this dissertation is the ‘practical undertaking involving the production, evaluation, adaptation and exploitation of materials intended to facilitate language acquisition and development’ (Tomlinson, 2016: 2).

**By Teachers**

It has been argued that every teacher is a materials developer because no coursebook meets every learner’s needs; thus, teachers may choose to re-design, i.e. delete, reduce, supplement, and modify, parts (Tomlinson, 2003; Samuda, 2005). A typical motive for EFL teachers to develop materials is to personalise and contextualise them so that they ‘reflect local content, issues, and concerns’ (Richards, 2001: 261). Indeed, in recent surveys amongst secondary teachers conducted by the Dutch Institute for Curriculum Development (SLO, 2012; SLO, 2016), participants expressed a need to develop support materials for different ability groups, and materials relating to current topics and their pupils’ life experiences. An additional motive for the participants is their own development (ibid.). It would seem from the literature characterising materials development as a practical, effective professional development strategy, that it can strengthen teachers’ commitment to the curriculum, and their sense of ownership and agency (Shawer, 2010; Priestly et al., 2012; McGrath, 2013; Cviko et al., 2014; Erss et al., 2016).

Tomlinson and Masuhara (2010) conclude that, so far, little research has focussed on teachers’ roles, wants and expectations in the materials development process. Because it is more manageable to focus on accessible, quantifiable effects of attainment, the main body of research constitutes principles and procedures of materials evaluation, and seems to centre on the impact on the learner (ibid.). Although continuing professional development has been identified as one of its benefits, as discussed above, the concrete effects of the creation of classroom materials on the teacher have remained largely under-researched, particularly in the Netherlands. To address this gap, this research will explore the complete materials development process, including the materials as product and their
use in the classroom, as it investigates its potential to ‘stimulate reflection and informed action in teachers’ (McGrath, 2013: xiv).

As a Tool for Reflective Practice

One way in which professional development and learning can be supported is through the development of critically reflective practice (CRP) (Schön, 1983; Mezirow, 1990; Tarrant, 2013). Based on artefacts and observable actions, which in this research will involve the teachers’ own materials, CRP has been found to help teachers gain an increased awareness of their theories of action (Argyris and Schön, 1974; Schön, 1983). These theories are assumed to consist of their espoused theories, those which people believe to guide their behaviour and which they are able to communicate, and their theories-in-use, those actually governing behaviour (Argyris and Schön, 1974). Specifically, CRP may enhance teachers’ awareness of potential disparities between their espoused theories and their theories-in-use (Leavy et al., 2007). This could help them align those theories and improve their practice (Savaya and Gardner, 2012).

In short, this research will explore the relationship between materials development and professional growth through the development of CRP. A premise which underpins it is that teacher-generated materials are an embodiment of the teacher’s theories of action regarding EFL teaching and learning. Following Breen et al. (2001), to distinguish between teachers’ ‘deeply held and largely context-independent’ (472) beliefs on the one hand, and their pedagogic principles, which are more context-bound and reflexive, on the other, the participants’ theories of action will be conceptualised as their pedagogic principles. This distinction will be further discussed in Chapter 2.

1.1.4 The Participants’ Professional Context

In the Dutch secondary education system, English is a compulsory subject at the three main levels distinguished: VWO (pre-university education), HAVO (higher secondary education), and VMBO (pre-vocational education). See Appendix 1 for a graphic overview. Most mainstream secondary schools provide education to pupils at one or two of these levels. The EFL teachers participating in this research teach English to pupils in the first or second year (circled in Appendix 1). This inclusion criterion ensures that the general teaching context, in which many published classroom materials are available, is the same for the participants. In these two years, English is one of the modern foreign languages taught to the pupils, who range between 12 and 15 years of age.

1.2 Recent Developments in the Netherlands

In Dutch secondary schools, the coursebook is ‘an almost ubiquitous feature of language classrooms’ (Guerrettaz and Johnston, 2013: 781): figure 1.1 below shows that 70-80% of the teachers participating in a survey on the role of materials over the past years indicate that it is their main or only resource
While teachers and managers have predicted for years that the ratio will change, teachers still depend more on coursebook-related materials than not-coursebook-related materials (ibid.). Kuiper (2015) has suggested that this may be due to the lack of guidance provided by national objectives; coursebook writers have already made pedagogic decisions based on those objectives on behalf of the teacher. Recently, however, the national objectives for the lower secondary forms have been translated into concrete ‘can do’ statements for reading, listening, conversation, speaking, and writing skills at all levels of the Common European Framework of Reference for languages (Council of Europe, 2011; SLO, 2015c).

![Figure 1.1. Types of materials used by Dutch secondary school teachers, SLO (2016, translated)](image)

Disadvantages of relying on the coursebook are that teachers might feel pressured to cover its contents, experience less professional autonomy, and struggle to move beyond it because the selected texts, audio-visual materials and exercises are logically connected (Kuiper, 2015; SLO Context VO, 2015; Erss et al., 2016). EFL teachers specifically have many resources to choose from: a recent online query resulted in a list of 44 titles, including textbooks, workbooks, and multimedia packs (Wikiwijsleermiddelenplein, 2016). This extensive list may mean there is no initial need for Dutch teachers of English to develop their own materials.

Recent Dutch research on modern foreign language pedagogy has focussed on English as a medium of instruction, multilingualism, personalised learning, the increased use of information and communication technology, and the development of the Common European Framework of
Reference (SLO, 2015a; SLO, 2015b). Describing foreign language proficiency at six levels, this European Framework has also informed Dutch research on the design and use of classroom materials (Kwakernaak, 2011b; Kwakernaak, 2014). The participants in this study are likely to work with coursebooks which make reference to these six levels.

The participants’ perceived sense of curricular autonomy may have been affected by educational reforms, which include those of the lower secondary forms in 1993 and 2006 (Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, Ministerie van OCW, 2006), and by more recent developments which typify an age of increased teacher accountability (Erss et al., 2016), such as Registerleraar.nl, a national public register of teachers and their qualifications. At the same time, in recent years, appeals have been made for fewer classroom hours for teachers and more time to develop the curriculum with their colleagues. Proposals to this effect have been put forward in newspapers and manifestos by, amongst others, Members of Parliament, national platforms, and the Dutch Board of Secondary Education (Van Dijk, 2014; De Vries, 2015; Platform Onderwijs2032, 2015; VO-Raad, 2016).

Amidst these developments in education, research and politics, most Dutch secondary school teachers engage in materials development by choice. They are not forced to do so by a lack of printed materials, as Tin (2003) points out is the case in other teaching contexts. They are not told to do so by the local or national government. Teams of teachers have been known to be required by school management bodies to develop their own materials since the law on free coursebooks came into effect, stipulating that pupils’ coursebooks are paid for by their schools (Dutch House of Lords, Eerste Kamer der Staten-Generaal, 2008). However, the teachers who participate in this research do so voluntarily, and create materials as an addition to the coursebook for their own, small-scale use.

1.3 Aims and Objectives of the Research

1.3.1 Aims

The research outlined in this dissertation is aimed at exploring the interaction between secondary school EFL teachers and the materials they develop, and at gaining insight into the potential value of this creative process for teachers’ developing critically reflective practice.

1.3.2 Objectives

In order to achieve the aforementioned aims, the researcher will

- examine ways in which teachers’ own materials reflect their espoused and tacit principles regarding the role and function of classroom materials in EFL teaching and learning;
- explore the creative process and the use of the materials in practice in order to develop an understanding of the content of these principles;
- investigate whether critical reflection on their own materials helps teachers uncover their pedagogic principles.

1.3.3 Intended Research Outcomes

Once the aims and objectives have been achieved, it is anticipated that the findings of this research will contribute to knowledge in four main areas:

1. It will illuminate Dutch EFL teachers' perspectives on, and motives for, materials development, and focus on qualitative principles regarding EFL pedagogy, thereby complementing recent quantitative surveys (SLO, 2012; SLO, 2016).

2. It will address a perceived gap in empirical research, particularly in the Netherlands, by focussing on the impact materials have on the teacher (Tomlinson and Masuhara, 2010).

3. Its findings can be used to illustrate the theoretical proposition that theories of action govern behaviour (Argyris and Schön, 1974). The under-researched connection between teachers' theories of action, or pedagogic principles, materials development, and CRP is central.

4. Its methodology should encourage participants to confront their explicit and implicit thinking by engaging in CRP, which may benefit their development as professionals if and when it becomes a 'catalyst for change' at both the individual and institutional level (Tarrant, 2013: 44). While it is beyond the scope of the research to investigate long-term effects on professional learning, the outcomes are expected to provide insights into the potential role of CRP in aligning personal theories and creating materials consistent with those theories.

1.4 Research Questions

The main research question this study aims to address is:

**In what ways does classroom materials development offer teachers of English as a foreign language a tool for critically reflective practice?**

The following sets of questions will inform the theoretical underpinnings and methodology of the research:

1. What are the teachers' espoused pedagogic principles regarding the role and function of classroom materials in EFL teaching and learning?

2. In what ways are the teachers' espoused pedagogic principles reflected in their materials?

3. In what ways are the teachers guided by their espoused pedagogic principles during the use of their materials in class?

4. What are the teachers' tacit pedagogic principles regarding the role and function of classroom materials in EFL teaching and learning, as reflected in their materials?
5. In what ways are the teachers guided by their tacit pedagogic principles during the use of their materials in class?

6. At which point(s) in the materials development process, and in what ways, are (the differences and similarities between) the teachers' espoused principles and their tacit principles revealed?

7. Which part of the materials development process do the teachers consider to be most informative in revealing their pedagogic principles?

1.5 Overview
This chapter has introduced the context and scope of the research and the professional context of its participants. It has been used to discuss relevant recent developments in the Netherlands, identify the research aims and objectives, and present an overview of the research questions. In Chapter 2, the theoretical framework of the research will be presented. Chapter 3 will be used to discuss the research methodology and design, including the data collection and analysis procedures, and ethical considerations taken into account during the field research. The data collection and analysis processes will be critically reflected on in Chapter 4. In Chapter 5, the data will be presented and discussed. Chapter 6 will contain a critical discussion of the data in relation to the seven research questions presented above. The main research question, the contributions of the research to the body of knowledge, limitations and scope of the research, and suggestions based on its findings will be addressed in Chapter 7.
2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Introduction
This chapter consists of a critical analysis of studies in three areas relevant to the research and the questions it addresses: the development of critically reflective practice (CRP), teachers’ theories of action, and materials development. These are the three strands that will be drawn together to explore the question whether the development of their own materials can offer teachers a tool for CRP by heightening their awareness of their personal theories of action in practice. The metaphor which will be used throughout this chapter to connect the components of the theoretical framework is that of the teacher as a craftsperson (see figure 2.1). The next section of the chapter introduces this metaphor. In sections 3, 4 and 5, it will be used to illustrate the three theoretical strands referred to above as they are critically explored. The potential of the metaphor as well as its limitations will be examined in more depth throughout. As in Sennett’s (2008) philosophical exploration, the notion of craftsmanship will be used for both male and female reference.

2.2 The Teacher as a Craftsperson
Defined by Sennett (2008) as being engaged in creation, as acting out ‘the desire to do a job well for its own sake’ (9), craftsmanship can be observed in carpenters, lab technicians, and musical conductors alike. In this research, it is the creation of classroom materials which is seen as a form of craftsmanship. It involves the teacher’s engagement, anticipation and imagination, and results in a unique object in the shape of the newly created materials. In order to arrive at such an object, the teacher as a craftsperson goes through a process characterised by complexity and messiness, which will be elaborated later in this chapter. Throughout this process, there is a ‘constant interplay between
tacit knowledge and self-conscious awareness, the tacit knowledge serving as an anchor, the explicit awareness serving as critique and corrective’ (ibid.: 50).

This interplay between knowing on the one hand, and consciously doing on the other, is mirrored in the relationship between the craftsman’s head and his or her hands. This relationship has appealed to the imagination of scholars and philosophers for centuries. It can be traced back to the early Greek philosopher Anaxagoras, who believed that using his hands had enabled man to develop his cognitive capacities (Burnet, 1920; O’Rourke, 2011). Interest in this relationship was also exhibited in Pagan Rome, through ‘its belief that the work of one’s hands can reveal much about the soul’ (Sennett, 2008: 55). Following this analogy, classroom materials as objects crafted by a teacher today may reveal the teacher’s underlying ideas about what the role and function of materials are or should be. For example, in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom, authentic English materials could be seen to reflect the communicative proposition that language learning is facilitated through spoken and written input in the target language.

Taking this analogy further, the materials development process itself, which has been defined as a craft (Maley, 1995) and as a ‘form of operationalized tacit knowledge’ (Tomlinson and Masuhara, 2010: 4), could serve to uncover the teacher-as-developer’s tacit knowledge. By reflecting on the development process, teachers may ask themselves what knowledge and which ideas about EFL teaching and learning inform their pedagogic decisions. By using their materials as input for reflection, they may contemplate what the impact of that knowledge and those ideas are on their educational practice. In order to explore this potential, what is needed is a connection from the practical craft of materials development (doing) to the theoretical principles underpinning it (knowing). This dissertation will be used to illuminate the question whether CRP, examined in more detail in section 2.3, could make that connection.

2.3 The Development of Critically Reflective Practice

This section of the chapter provides a critical discussion of the concept of CRP, its purpose and potential, in relation to the aims and objectives of the research. To arrive at a thorough understanding of CRP, the underlying notions of reflection and critical reflection will be examined first.

2.3.1 Reflection

As pointed out in much literature on reflection, it is a concept that has received a lot of attention yet is often poorly or even contradictorily defined (Stenhouse, 1975; Schön, 1983; Ixer, 1999; Fendler, 2003; Kinsella, 2007; Black and Plowright, 2010). Reflection as it is understood in this research refers to conscious, deliberate, or ‘careful thought about a particular subject’ (Collins Cobuild, 2001). In the case of teacher reflection, the subject will relate to the teacher’s professional practice and may therefore be pedagogic in nature.
Careful thought about their professional practice may lead teachers to develop an awareness of their tacit knowledge (Polanyi, 1967). This is the kind of knowledge which was portrayed above as the anchor that serves craftspersons as they are engaged in their work, and which can be described as 'so self-evident and habitual that it seems just natural' (Sennett, 2008: 183). Originally defined as conceptions of teacher learning by Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999), this self-evident knowledge can consist of knowledge-for-practice, knowledge-in-practice, and knowledge-of-practice: the first conception is associated with formal knowledge and theory, the second with practical knowledge and teaching competence, and the third with local, contextualised knowledge, of the sort ‘generated when teachers treat their own classrooms and schools as sites for intentional investigation …, interrogation and interpretation’ (250).

Criticisms about both theoretical and practical aspects of teacher reflection have particularly been aimed at ‘the degree to which reflective practices serve to reinforce existing beliefs rather than challenge assumptions’ (Fendler, 2003: 16). This can be considered problematic when the point of reflection is to move beyond what is known, towards informed and enhanced professional practice. In an attempt to overcome this circularity, the notion of criticality as an additional quality of teacher reflection will be explored next.

2.3.2 Critical Reflection

The conceptualisation of reflection central to this research is future-directed, anticipatory reflection (Van Manen, 1995), also referred to as reflection-for-action (Schön, 1992). It is the type of reflection that is aimed at learning from past actions in order to positively affect future actions (Eraut, 1995). Eraut has argued that reflection-for-action is grounded in Kolb’s (1984) experiential learning cycle, and in Dewey’s (1933) definition of reflection as a cognitive process which ‘emancipates us from merely impulsive and merely routine activity’ and ‘enables us to direct our activities with foresight’ (17). In this research, such activities would involve the development of one’s own materials and trying them out in the classroom.

Impulsive and routine teaching practice could be regarded as the opposite of a practice which is critically reflective (Schön, 1983; Schön, 1987; Akbari et al., 2010; Farrell, 2015a). CRP involves ‘not only achieving an end such as student learning but carefully considering how best to achieve that end and the legitimacy or importance of that end’ (Nickel, 2013: 68). Numerous theoretical models have incorporated this critical level of reflection for learning and change (Van Manen, 1977; Hatton and Smith, 1995; Jay and Johnson, 2002; Thompson and Thompson, 2008; Akbari et al., 2010; Black and Plowright, 2010; Thompson and Pascal, 2012; Thorsen and DeVore, 2013). The authors of these models argue that it is only when tacit knowledge, for example EFL teachers’ pedagogic thoughts and principles about how a foreign language should be taught and learnt, become part of a deliberate thought process, that personal assumptions may be questioned, challenged, and changed.
2.3.3 Critically Reflective Practice: How and Why

Relevant to this research, and research questions 4 and 5 in particular, is the question how consciousness and control of a teacher’s implicit professional knowledge regarding EFL teaching and learning might be gained. Reflection, as a form of metacognition, requires verbalisation and symbolisation (Schön, 1987). Methods for reflection that have been proposed range from keeping journals, creating teaching portfolios, talking to colleagues, and undertaking action research projects (Akbari et al., 2010; Abednia et al., 2013; Nickel, 2013; Farrell, 2016). Verbalisation, or using language as a mediating tool, appears to be characteristic of all these reflective methods. Often, however, craftspersons have a hard time putting into words what they do and why (Sennett, 2008). Sennett raises the question whether language can mirror the more abstract reasons, motives, and principles inside the craftsperson’s head.

In order to overcome this limitation, Sennett (ibid.) and authors concerned with teacher reflection and professionalism have pointed to the use of imagery, such as metaphors and similes, to provide a window on teachers’ perceptions of their professional realities (Pajares, 1992; Andriessen, 2010; Alghbban et al., 2015; Maxwell, 2015). Metaphor, which can be defined as ‘seeing, experiencing, or talking about something in terms of something else’ (Ritchie, 2013: 8; Lakoff and Johnson, 2003; Semino, 2008), is a linguistic device often used by teachers to describe their profession, principles, and practice (Lin et al., 2012; Maxwell, 2015). It has been found to offer insights into teachers’ understanding of complex concepts such as teaching and learning (Miller, 1987; Wan et al., 2011). In the study by Wan et al., for example, EFL teachers’ and students’ metaphors were used to negotiate conflicts between their respective beliefs and expectations for practice. Metaphors for the teacher, such as an encyclopaedia and a bridge, sparked reflections and discussions on the role of EFL teachers as cultural transmitters. Metaphor can also be a means for craftspersons to voice why and how they do what they do, to explicate the tacit knowledge on which they rely (Sennett, 2008). By drawing out the participants’ theories about EFL classroom materials and by analysing their metaphors, the methodology employed in this research will be aimed at doing just that.

The value of CRP for professional development and learning has been widely acknowledged (Schön, 1983; Day, 1993; Harland and Kinder, 1997; Marsick and Watkins, 2001; Guskey, 2002, Loughran, 2002; Shulman and Shulman, 2004; Tarrant, 2013). In EFL teaching specifically, the capacity to engage in critical reflection is also considered essential in professional development and learning (Ur, 1992; Wyatt, 2010; Saylag, 2012; Farrell, 2016). Still, it has been acknowledged that we ‘do not know how reflection leads to change’ (Day, 1993: 90) and what role CRP might play in bringing about professional growth (Mena Marcos and Tillema, 2006; Akbari et al., 2010). It seems that empirical studies on teacher reflection and action have focussed more on teachers’ beliefs and reflections than on professional performance in practice (Mena Marcos and Tillema, 2006). To
illuminate the relationship between the two, the second theoretical part of this chapter will be used to investigate when critical reflection becomes a practice, engrained in a teacher’s daily routines.

2.4 EFL Teachers’ Theories of Action

Grounded in the work of Argyris and Schön (1974), a premise underpinning this research and its questions is that human behaviour is guided by people’s theories of action. As discussed in Chapter 1, these theories are assumed to consist of *espoused theories*, those that people believe to guide their behaviour, and are able to communicate, and their *theories-in-use*, those which actually govern behaviour (ibid.). In this part of the chapter, the two types of theories as well as the possible contents of those held by EFL teachers will be critically discussed.

2.4.1 Espoused Theories and Theories-in-Use

It would seem from the literature consulted for this research that few definitions of theories of action exist, and that concrete theories of professional teacher action have rarely been the subject of empirical research. They will be conceptualised in this research as EFL teachers’ mental maps regarding how to act in situations (Smith, 2001). In the case of teachers-as-materials-developers, these mental maps involve the planning, implementation, and review of pedagogic actions surrounding the materials the teachers create and use. In their original work, Argyris and Schön (1974) acknowledge that theories of action are not straightforward and are likely to depend on numerous assumptions ‘about self, others, … and the connections among action, consequence, and situation’ (7). It is anticipated that the research participants’ personal sets of espoused theories about the role of materials in their classrooms, which will be the focus of research question 1, can be used to illustrate the proposition that theories of action guide behaviour.

Interest in teacher cognition and its potential impact on professional practice and development has increased since the 1970s (Garcia and Lewis, 2014; Burns et al., 2015). This might be due to the suggestion that teacher perceptions and beliefs are seen as ‘the most significant predictors of change’ in pedagogic practice (Opfer and Pedder, 2011: 389; Li, 2013; Ur, 2013; Zheng, 2013). However, the field of study has suffered from ‘definitional problems, poor conceptualisations, and differing understanding’ (Pajares, 1992: 307). Many different labels are used to refer to what appear to be similar concepts: e.g. personal or professional theories and governing values (Argyris and Schön, 1974), professional knowledge and cognition (Wette, 2010), practical knowledge (Gholami and Husu, 2010) or knowledge in practice (Cochran-Smith and Lytle, 1999; Osmond and O’Connor, 2004), beliefs (Leavy et al., 2007; Li, 2013; Zheng, 2013), and those Pajares (1992) refers to as beliefs which ‘travel in disguise’ (309) as attitudes, judgements, perceptions, conceptions, principles, and perspectives. This lack of consistent terminology seems to have hampered comparisons among findings (Kubanyiova and Feryok, 2015).
The ‘continually multiplying and overlapping terminology’ (ibid: 439) may also be indicative of the problematic nature of teachers’ theories-in-use as a topic of research. One of the issues which have been identified is that such tacit theories can often not be articulated (Polanyi, 1967; Osmond and O’Connor, 2004; Sennett, 2008). Therefore, it is the teachers’ practice that will be investigated in this research to provide insight into their underlying theories of action. Research questions 2 to 5 have been formulated to this effect. A practical focus on the teachers’ materials and their use of them in the classroom may also facilitate the exploration of the extent to which materials development reveals these theories. This will help address research questions 6 and 7. The data collection and analysis techniques, which will be triangulated to ‘enable overlapping or linking of the data to develop a full account of … plans, actions, and reflections’ (Mena Marcos and Tillema, 2006: 125), will be further discussed in Chapter 3.

2.4.2 Theories of Action and CRP

Reflection has been found to increase professionals’ awareness and understanding of their theories of action (Leavy et al., 2007; Wyatt, 2010; Savaya and Gardner, 2012; Farrell, 2016). The relevance of this awareness lies in the argument that ‘the more aware a teacher is of her values and priorities, the greater her understanding of why certain things make sense to her and the greater her ability to understand and resolve the dilemmas she will confront’ (Graves, 1996b: 2). Critical reflection has been found to help teachers interrogate the origins and ‘social, political, and psychological dimensions’ (Zimmerman, 2009: 50) of educational theories and practices, and connect them to their own experiences (Brookfield, 1995; Thompson and Pascal, 2012). This, in turn, can facilitate their engagement in professional dialogues (Zimmerman, 2009; Dutch Education Council, Onderwijsraad, 2013).

On a more critical note, teachers’ awareness of their theories of action could be restricted to incongruities between their espoused theories and theories-in-use (Leavy et al., 2007). This awareness might lead to a perceived negative sense of cognitive dissonance (Warin et al., 2006). Addressing this dissonance by trying to align one’s theories is no guarantee for teacher development and improved teaching practice, as Garcia and Lewis (2014) have pointed out. However, it can create ‘a dynamic for reflection and dialogue’ (Li, 2013: 178). Critical reflection could offer possibilities for teachers to try to align their theories by modifying their theoretical assumptions, on the one hand, and by devising ‘workable alternative [models] of practice’ (Savaya and Gardner, 2012: 152), on the other (Farrell, 2016). In the case of EFL materials development, teachers could create new learning experiences by purposively applying their personal theories and trying out alternative practices involving their own materials.
2.4.3 Pedagogic Principles

A premise underpinning the research is that teachers' theories of action consist of their assumptions and principles in relation to specific content regarding the teaching and learning of English as a foreign language, and that these theories are implied in and must be inferred from a specific context (Pajares, 1992; Osmond and O'Connor, 2004; Burns et al., 2015). Therefore, following Breen et al. (2001), a distinction is made between teachers' static, underlying beliefs on the one hand, and their pedagogic principles, which are more context-bound, reflexive and responsive, on the other. The term pedagogic principles will be used to conceptualise the participants' professional theories of action about EFL pedagogy.

This conceptualisation addresses a point of critique on Schön's (1983; 1987) theoretical work on reflection, namely that 'the situatedness of practitioner experience' (Usher et al., 1997: 168) is sometimes neglected. The research adopts an interactionist perspective of EFL teachers' pedagogic principles, meaning that the principles will be examined 'as they relate to the ... participating teachers' classroom practices' (Li, 2013: 177). This approach fits in with a current trend in language teacher cognition research, which recognises that language teachers' professional practices are embedded in workplaces, educational systems, and national and international language policies (Kubanyiova and Feryok, 2015). Although the sources of teachers' principles, such as their personal educational experiences and their reflections-on-action (Opfer and Pedder, 2011; Ur, 2013), are beyond the scope of this research, the participants' principles will be regarded as the 'values and priorities that are products of [their] experience as well as the prevailing wisdom around [them]' (Graves, 1996b: 2). Questions concerning the possible contents of these pedagogic principles will be more thoroughly explored next.

2.4.4 Contents

As discussed in Chapter 1, current approaches and developments in foreign language pedagogy include Communicative Language Teaching, collaborative learning, and the use of language tasks. Existing findings on the content of the theories of action, or pedagogic principles, held by EFL teachers reflect these developments. Studies published in recent years have focussed on Chinese teachers' theories about English as a global language (Pan and Block, 2011), Omani teachers' beliefs regarding student autonomy (Borg and Al-Busaidi, 2012), how Canadian and Turkish teachers incorporate what they know about second language acquisition (SLA) research in their pedagogies (Nassaji, 2012), how Colombian teachers' theories about Communicative Language Teaching impact on their instructional and assessment practices (Kim, 2014), and on Chinese teachers' beliefs about task-based pedagogy (Zheng and Borg, 2014). The purpose of this research is to add to this body of knowledge by exploring Dutch secondary school teachers' principles regarding the role and function
of classroom materials in EFL teaching and learning, and how these principles affect their decisions, judgements, and actions in practice (Zheng, 2013).

The relationship between principles and practice is generally considered complex, and is explored in the studies listed above through the use of teachers’ self-reports, observations, surveys, peer evaluation forms, interviews, and teachers’ materials such as tests. The relevance of investigating pedagogic principles lies in the suggestion that they are a major source of impact on pedagogic decisions (Ur, 2013). In addition, they inform ‘teachers’ expectations about the feasibility of introducing innovations in their classrooms’ (Humphries and Burns, 2015: 1). Notwithstanding their wish to adhere to Communicative Language Teaching as a pedagogic approach, time constraints, exams and traditional assessments may prevent language teachers from implementing communicative principles in practice (Kim, 2014; Humphries and Burns, 2015).

2.5 Materials Development

This final theoretical strand focusses on the teacher as a developer of his or her own classroom materials, and serves to conceptualise materials development as a context for research. Positioned in a body of literature originating in the 1970s, this research considers materials development to be a form of teacher action that involves making decisions and executing judgements, and a practical act worthy of theoretical inquiry (Richards, 2001; Tomlinson, 2012; McGrath, 2013). It is regarded as the ‘ultimate applied linguistics challenge’ (Timmis, 2014: 260), and a means for EFL teachers to ‘articulate and develop their own theories of language learning’ (Tomlinson, 2003: 499). This section begins with a discussion of the three stages which materials development could be said to involve: creation, product and use. It includes a juxtaposition of theoretical perspectives and EFL teachers’ own characterisations of the materials development process. The next part elaborates on the potential motives of teachers to engage in materials development. The last two parts are dedicated to the merits and mechanisms of materials development as a professional development activity, and to the notion of materials development as an endeavour underpinned by principles.

2.5.1 Creation, Product, Use

Materials development will refer in this research to a cyclical process that encompasses three stages: the creation or design of classroom materials, the materials themselves as product, and the application of these materials in practice as use. Based on the practical experience of using their materials in the classroom, teachers could decide to further adapt and refine them and re-engage in this practice. This research, however, involves one cycle. Although both design and creation could be understood to refer to uniquely new materials only, they can also involve the re-design (Samuda, 2005), i.e. the reduction, supplementation, and modification, of existing materials, and will be used to refer to the first stage of the materials development process throughout this research for variation. Research
question 1 will focus on this first stage. Research questions 2 and 4 will focus on the second stage, as they involve the materials themselves. Directed at the classroom situation, research questions 3 and 5 will focus on the third stage.

This conceptualisation of EFL classroom materials development as creation – product – use appears to be supported by theoretical accounts of materials development for language learning. Such accounts have consisted, on the one hand, of frameworks for writing complete courses (Graves, 1996a; Jolly and Bolitho, 2011), and, on the other hand, of principles for smaller units of materials for one or two lessons (Tomlinson, 2003; Howard and Major, 2005). Although Graves points out that the components of materials development frameworks are ‘not necessarily sequential’ (1996a: 12), the fact that they are generally listed and discussed sequentially would at least suggest that developers start out with some form of needs assessment, then determine goals and objectives, then conceptualise content, then select and develop materials and activities, and lastly evaluate how the materials have worked in practice.

Practical accounts of materials development, like those by Hadfield (2014a) and Timmis (2014), have provided insights into the development process as complex, ambiguous, and messy. As such, it bears a resemblance to the craftsperson’s creative process detailed by Sennett (2008). Materials developers themselves have emphasised the role of creativity and intuition, often based on prior experiences, in their work (Kuzborska, 2011; Prowse, 2011). The ‘somewhat mysterious and haphazard way ideas suddenly arrive’ (Hadfield, 2014a: 322) makes the process iterative and dynamic rather than linear (Graves, 1996b; Johnson, 2003; Verstegen et al., 2006). This interplay of creativity and intuition in materials development as a form of craftsmanship may explain why it can be difficult for teachers to explain what they do, how, and why. Attempting to address this issue, this research will explore methods for eliciting the participants’ principles behind their materials. Addressing a perceived lack of developers’ practical accounts (Tomlinson and Masuhara, 2010), it will illuminate teachers’ experiences of, and perspectives on, materials development.

2.5.2 Motives and Purpose
As discussed in Chapter 1, many EFL teachers develop materials regardless of the widespread availability of national and international publications for English as a secondary school subject. This raises the question why, based on which motives, or for what purpose, teachers create their own materials. One motive expressed in recent Dutch surveys amongst secondary school teachers is the lack of support materials for different ability groups, and materials relating to current topics (Dutch Institute for Curriculum Development, SLO, 2012; SLO, 2016). In the context of EFL learning and teaching, it would seem that published coursebooks, especially when designed for a global market, cannot take into account, let alone fully cater for, individual teachers’ and learners’ needs. In addition,
it has been argued that language textbooks are partly outdated by the time they are published, especially with respect to cultural references (Motteram, 2011).

Another, more general reason for teachers to develop their own materials is to personalise and contextualise them in order to suit their situated methodologies (Richards, 2001; Ur, 2013; SLO, 2016). Materials purposively made or adapted for the learner are often expected to enhance learner motivation (Shawer et al., 2008; Shawer et al., 2009; Bahous et al., 2011). To increase students’ motivation to learn English as a foreign language, student involvement and decision-making have been promoted in relation to lesson content, to tasks and procedures for completing tasks, and to criteria, assessment rubrics and learning objectives (Lesikin, 2001; Bahous et al., 2008; Bimmel et al., 2008; De Vos et al., 2013). The participants in this research, too, may have purposively created their materials to motivate their pupils. Their materials could reflect any of the above motivational strategies in practice, thus potentially revealing the teachers’ personal theories about motivation in EFL learning.

Lastly, Dutch secondary school teachers have indicated that they are motivated to create their own materials for the purpose of professional development (SLO, 2012). As a tool for continuing professional development, materials development could be a way for them to experiment, update their subject knowledge, adopt a pupil-centred approach, and collaborate with other teachers (De Vries et al., 2014). It may allow them to engage in a development activity which is concrete and practical, inquiry-based, and directly related to their professional practice, qualities which have been found to make such activities effective for teacher learning (Tin, 2003; Van Veen et al., 2010; Opfer and Pedder, 2011).

2.5.3 As a Continuing Professional Development Activity

Materials development has been found to impact positively on EFL teachers’ professional development and learning in terms of subject knowledge, practical pedagogical knowledge, and curricular content knowledge, and to result in increased job satisfaction, autonomy, confidence, collegiality and creativity (Shawer, 2010; Wyatt, 2011; Zeegers, 2012; McGrath, 2013; Tomlinson, 2014). In addition, Masuhara (2006: 42-43) argues, the benefits of materials development for EFL teachers include an enhanced awareness of learners, themselves, and learning contexts, and enhanced capabilities for critical application and development of learning theories and teaching methods.

What it is that brings about these positive changes, however, is less clear. To address this matter, this research explores what aspects of materials development, including the participants’ materials as artefacts (Tarrant, 2013), potentially make it a useful strategy for professional development and learning. It does so by investigating materials development as a professional practice which both reveals and can offer insight into teachers’ pedagogic principles, made explicit
through reflection. Research questions 6 and 7 have been formulated with this aim in mind. These questions are grounded in the idea that, as the practical context of the research, materials development can offer EFL teachers ‘opportunities to clarify their understanding of theory’ (Graves, 1996b: 6) as they apply theory in practice, and that engaging in materials development can, in turn, lead teachers to revisit their personal theories. The significance of materials development as a form of CRP is thus to enhance professional awareness and understanding. Returning to the connection between one’s hands and one’s head earlier in the chapter, it may help teachers as craftspersons quite literally ‘[come] to grips with an issue’ (Sennett, 2008: 151).

2.5.4 As a Principled Endeavour

Underpinned by the notion, discussed in the previous main section of this chapter, that people’s behaviour and decisions are guided by their espoused and tacit theories of action, the research is based on the idea that materials development is informed by the developer’s pedagogic principles. In the materials development literature, these principles are generally based on SLA research findings (Richards, 2006; Tomlinson, 2008, 2013; Guilloteaux, 2013). The assumption underpinning this seems to be the shared objective, discussed in Chapter 1, of instructed language learning and SLA, which is the acquisition of the foreign language. Lists of such principles have been used in developers’ practical accounts of the materials writing process (Hadfield, 2014a; Timmis, 2014), and have also been presented as guidelines for aspiring developers (Howard and Major, 2005). Table 2.1 on the following two pages summarises the 32 pedagogic principles proposed by Nation (1993), Tomlinson (2003), and Ellis (2005).

The outcome of theory triangulation (Denscombe, 2010), table 2.1 is an adapted version of the extensive overview of these 32 principles presented by Hadfield (2014b). For readability and manageability purposes, the principles originally put forward (Nation, 1993; Tomlinson, 2003; Ellis, 2005) have been conflated to result in a collection of 15. Furthermore, the first column has been added in order to provide descriptors which capture the essence of these 15 focal points. Only the first two, focus on second language (L2) input and output, are based on prerequisites for language learning generally agreed upon in the SLA literature and proposed by all three sources. The overview will be applied in practice in this research; as will be further discussed in Chapter 3, it will be used as an initial coding scheme to analyse the participants’ pedagogic principles as elicited through a number of data collection techniques. The use and value of these fifteen principles as preliminary codes will be critically reflected on in Chapter 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus on (repeated) L2 input</th>
<th>Focus on L2 output &amp; interaction</th>
<th>Focus on meaning</th>
<th>Focus on form</th>
<th>Focus on generalisable and frequently occurring features of the L2</th>
<th>Focus on usefulness</th>
<th>Focus on formulaic expressions and rules</th>
<th>Focus on implicit and explicit knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Successful instructed language learning requires extensive L2 input.</td>
<td>7. Successful instructed language learning also requires opportunities for output.</td>
<td>2. Instruction needs to ensure that learners focus predominantly on meaning.</td>
<td>3. Instruction needs to ensure that learners also focus on form.</td>
<td>3. The language focus of a course needs to be on the generalisable features of the language.</td>
<td>1. Instruction needs to ensure that learners develop both a rich repertoire of formulaic expressions and a rule-based competence.</td>
<td>1. Instruction needs to ensure that learners develop both a rich repertoire of formulaic expressions and a rule-based competence.</td>
<td>4. Instruction needs to be predominantly directed at developing implicit knowledge of the L2 while not neglecting explicit knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. A prerequisite for language acquisition is that the learners are exposed to a rich, meaningful and comprehensible input of language in use.</td>
<td>6. Learners need opportunities to use language to try to achieve communicative purposes.</td>
<td>5. Language learners can benefit from noticing salient features of the input and from discovering how they are used.</td>
<td>5. Language learners can benefit from noticing salient features of the input and from discovering how they are used.</td>
<td>4. A language course should provide activities aimed at increasing the fluency with which learners can use the language knowledge they already know, both receptively and productively.</td>
<td>2. A language course should progressively cover useful language items, skills, and strategies.</td>
<td>4. Instruction needs to be predominantly directed at developing implicit knowledge of the L2 while not neglecting explicit knowledge.</td>
<td>5. A language course should provide the best possible coverage of language in use through inclusion of items that occur frequently in the language, so that learners get the best return for their learning effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on affective engagement</td>
<td>2. In order for the learners to maximise their exposure to language in use, they need to be engaged both affectively and cognitively in the language experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on the learners' readiness &amp; logical sequencing</td>
<td>3. Language learners who achieve positive affect are much likely to achieve communicative competence than those who do not.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on the learners' readiness &amp; logical sequencing</td>
<td>11. As much as possible, the learners should be interested in and excited about learning the language, and they should come to value this learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on the learners' readiness &amp; logical sequencing</td>
<td>14. A course should be presented so that the learners have the most favourable attitude to the language, to users of the language, to the teacher's skill in teaching the language and to their chances of success in learning the language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on learner differences, learner needs and teaching conditions</td>
<td>5. Instruction needs to take into account the learner's &quot;built-in syllabus&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on learner differences, learner needs and teaching conditions</td>
<td>7. The teaching of language items should take account of the most favourable sequencing of language items and should take account of when the learners are ready to learn them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on learner differences, learner needs and teaching conditions</td>
<td>9. The items in a language course should be sequenced so that items which are learnt together have a positive effect on each other for learning and so that interference effects are avoided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on using prior knowledge, e.g. of the L1</td>
<td>4. L2 language learners can benefit from using those mental resources which they typically utilise when acquiring and using their L1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on using prior knowledge, e.g. of the L1</td>
<td>8. The course should help the learners make the most effective use of previous knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on deep processing</td>
<td>13. Learners should process the items to be learned as deeply and as thoughtfully as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on metacognition</td>
<td>6. A language course should train learners in how to learn a language and how to monitor and be aware of their learning, so that they can become effective and independent language learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on feedback</td>
<td>16. Learners should receive helpful feedback which will allow them to improve the quality of their language in use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*table 2.1. Principles behind EFL classroom materials development, adapted from Hadfield (2014b: 85-88)*
2.6 Conclusion

This chapter has been used to position the research within a range of relevant literature in three main areas: the development of CRP, teachers’ theories of action, or pedagogic principles, regarding EFL teaching and learning, and materials development. The metaphor of the teacher as a craftsman, who engages in materials development as a form of craftsmanship, has been used throughout this theoretical framework to draw these three strands together and position the teacher at the heart of the research. Underpinned by theoretical and empirical research, the discussion has centred around the case that materials development has the potential to ‘stimulate reflection and informed action in teachers’ (McGrath, 2013: xiv) by offering a practical context for critical reflection on teachers’ principles behind it. This addresses the perceived under-researched connection between the three main themes, illustrated in figure 2.2 below, as the research will

1. examine ways in which teachers’ espoused and tacit principles are reflected in the creation of materials, the materials as product, and their use in the classroom;
2. investigate whether critical reflection can help teachers uncover their pedagogic principles and develop an understanding of their contents; and
3. look at the general potential of materials development to offer a tool for CRP.

As discussed in this chapter, research questions 1 to 5 will focus on the first connection, research questions 6 and 7 on the second, and the main research question will be addressed by focussing on the third. The research methodology employed to do this will be outlined and critically discussed in Chapter 3.
3. Methodology and Design

3.1 Introduction
To develop an in-depth understanding of teachers’ pedagogic principles about the role and function of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom materials, and how these principles are embodied in their materials, this small-scale study incorporates participants’ words, imagery, and interactions rather than numbers as units of analysis, so it is qualitative in nature (Denscombe, 2010). It is based on the assumption that people have and interpret experiences in a ‘qualitative world’ (Eisner, 1993: 5-6). The first part of this chapter positions the research within a broader qualitative research tradition, and defines its epistemological and ontological foundations. The research approach and design, including its pitfalls, will be discussed in sections 3.3 and 3.4. Section 3.5 includes a critical reflection on the data collection methods. The data analysis methods are outlined in section 3.6. This will be followed by a discussion of the ethical issues to be considered during the research process.

3.2 Research Tradition and Background
The research is positioned in an interpretative and hermeneutic tradition which can be traced back to Gadamer (Pring, 2000; Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2009). Gadamer (1960) claimed that all human experiences and perceptions are interpretation. Within this tradition, researchers have worked towards increased understandings of social phenomena through the meanings people assign to them, exploring the phenomena from the participants’ perspectives (Bransen, 2001; Cohen et al., 2011). Aimed at representing rather than abstracting (ibid.) teachers’ pedagogic principles and their development of critically reflective practice (CRP), this research is subjectivist in nature. It is based on the epistemological assumption that ‘truth or value is relative to or dependent on the consciousness of the individual’ (Saint-Andre, n.d.). The ontological basis of this research is the view that there are multiple ways to perceive reality (Pring, 2000); the participating teachers are each assumed to interpret their experiences in their own way.

The desire to understand better the ways in which the participants perceive what happens in the classroom, how they think their pupils learn English, how it should be taught, and what role their materials play, provides the basis for the methodological decisions made in this research. In an attempt to foster interpretative understanding and capture the complexity of the interaction between the individual teacher’s principles and their practice, a case study approach will be adopted.

3.3 Case Study Approach
3.3.1 Rationale
Based on Yin’s (2014) definition of case study as an ‘empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary
phenomenon ... in depth and within its real-world context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context may not be clearly evident’ (16), several considerations motivate the choice for a case study approach. The contemporary phenomenon of teachers’ development of CRP through materials development exists in a real-world setting and will be investigated within that setting (Denscombe, 2010). The phenomenon will be investigated and portrayed in depth, with a focus on how-questions (Cohen et al., 2011; Yin, 2014). As discussed in Chapter 2, critical reflection on teachers’ pedagogic principles can be said to involve interrogating their ‘social, political, and psychological dimensions’ (Zimmerman, 2009: 50), which means there are potentially unclear boundaries between the phenomenon on the one hand, and its context on the other.

The case study approach will facilitate the use of multiple data sources to capture the complex interaction between a teacher’s principles and his or her practice in a holistic manner (Denscombe, 2010). Moreover, it will allow the research questions to be addressed from the perspective of the individual teacher, and will take into account the teacher’s professional background and context, which can have a critical impact on how classroom materials are developed and used (Harwood, 2016).

3.3.2 Definition of the Case
In this research, a case is a Dutch EFL teacher who:

- works at a mainstream secondary school in the Netherlands;
- is used to developing, on regular occasions, his or her own classroom materials, and
- currently uses these materials as an addition to the coursebook in the first or second year.

Each teacher will be considered as an individual case, with his or her own autobiography, teaching and learning experiences, motives to engage in materials development, assumptions, values, and beliefs (Farrell, 2016). Each case will be scrutinised from the perspective of the research questions, so it is the professional context of the participants which is relevant. This context is bounded by the education system and recent developments discussed in Chapter 1 (see also Appendix 1).

3.3.3 Pitfalls
Potential pitfalls of case study include determining the boundaries of a case, and gaining access and consent (Denscombe, 2010; De Lange et al., 2011). In this research, the case is bounded by a set of contextual and personal criteria on the basis of which participants will be selected (see section 3.3.2 above). The researcher’s own work setting, prior work experiences and network, as well as the fact that the research is small-scale in nature, are expected to increase the likelihood of finding participants and gaining access to their professional context. As ‘a method, approach, style, strategy or design’ (Tight, 2010: 331), case study has referred to general features (see Stake, 2000; Verschuren, 2003; George and Bennett, 2005; Yin, 2014), but does not denote any single set of guidelines for data collection and analysis. Some case studies in the field of materials development and EFL teachers’
professional growth, like those by Popovici and Bolitho (2003), Wyatt (2010), and Jolly and Bolitho (2011), lack specifications of their methods. This can impede judgement of credibility, replication, and interpretation of outcomes. The way in which the approach in this research is expected to facilitate the collection, organisation, analysis, and subsequent presentation of the data with regard to the cases will be discussed next.

3.3.4 How the Cases will Be Used
Considering the teachers as individual cases will provide the boundaries and focus necessary to keep data collection manageable. It is expected to facilitate the storage of data per case, enabling easier reference and retrieval. The cases will also be used to arrange the presentation of the findings in Chapter 5, resulting in an overview which centralises the teachers-as-craftspersons as opposed to the research questions. Data will be collected for each teacher in relation to research questions 1 to 5 to facilitate within-case analysis (Yin, 2014). They will also help address research questions 6 and 7, which are more general in nature and will be addressed by synthesising the findings and presenting them collectively. The multiple-case study approach, which is discussed in more detail in the following section, will allow for this kind of cross-case synthesis (ibid.). Going beyond the individual teachers’ principles, materials, and classrooms, this synthesis will ultimately help address the main research question.

3.4 Research Design: Multiple-Embedded Cases
This section discusses why multiple cases will be used, and how the collection of cases is expected to help address the research questions. It contains a graphic overview of each case connecting its components to the questions. The section concludes with reflections on transferability and credibility.

3.4.1 Multiple Cases
This research involves multiple cases to explore multiple perspectives on the phenomenon under investigation (Small, 2009). It is underpinned by the assumption, originally proposed by Campbell (1975), that multiple cases are worth more than ‘having double the amount of data on a single-case study’ (Cohen et al., 2011: 291). The participants each make their own pedagogic decisions and have their own story about materials development: why they engage in it, what they choose to create, and whether this works out for them in practice. The aim of the research is to gain a more thorough understanding of this interplay in different situations, and to accomplish a multidimensional representation of this exploration. In the words of Stake:
the official interest is in the collection of these cases or in the phenomenon exhibited in those cases. We seek to understand how this whole ... operates in different situations ... and we choose to study it through its cases (2006: vi).

Four cases will be used to explore the ways in which materials development offers EFL teachers a tool for CRP. This number is based on the expectation, informed by case study literature, that it will enable in-depth analyses of the data in response to the complexity of the research questions, and help ‘obtain information about the significance of various circumstances’ (Flyvbjerg, 2006: 230). Four cases can facilitate diversity of circumstances, including school type and levels, and personal differences such as age, gender, and years of teaching experience, without compromising the quality of this thorough exploration (Starks and Brown Trinidad, 2007; Yin, 2014). The concentration of effort on a few sites is expected to enhance researcher flexibility regarding the manageability of the field research (Denscombe, 2010; Cohen et al., 2011).

### 3.4.2 Units of Analysis

For each case, the research encompasses the three stages of materials development identified in Chapter 2: the creation of the materials, the materials themselves as product, and the use of the materials in class. As these are three separate units of analysis, the multiple-case study design is embedded. The embedded units will form the basis for the presentation of the data and the findings (Verschuren, 2003). Figure 3.1 depicts the four cases:

---

**Figure 3.1. Embedded multiple-case design, adapted from Yin (2014: 50)**
Focussing on one such primary unit, *figure 3.2* below represents the case. Intended not as a model to be validated but as a representation of the conceptual framework (Baxter and Jack, 2008), it illustrates the connections between the case components:

1. The primary unit, an EFL teacher who holds certain theories of action, or pedagogic principles, regarding the role and function of classroom materials in teaching and learning;
2. These principles consist of his or her espoused principles and principles-in-use;
3. Both kinds of principles affect the materials development process in which the teacher engages;
4. The development process entails creating the materials, the finished product, and the use of the materials in class;
5. The materials development process helps the teacher reflect critically on the two sets of pedagogic principles, and the differences and similarities between them.

---

**Figure 3.2. Components of each case**

3.4.3 Transferability

The cases in this research are not regarded as statistically representative of a wider population; hence, they are not treated as a sample, and no generalisations will be made from them (Stake, 2000; Yin, 2014). Increased understanding of the unique cases in relation to the research questions is the aim.

---

2 The white, double-sided arrows in *figure 3.2* indicate that materials development may in turn affect the teacher’s principles, as discussed in Chapter 2 (Graves, 1996b). The focus of this research, however, is the arrow pointing upwards, i.e. where the materials development process sheds light on the teacher’s existing pedagogic principles.
Nevertheless, cases can offer a natural basis for analytic generalisation, or transferability, because they are often ‘in harmony with the reader’s own experience’, and may therefore be easy to relate to (Cohen et al., 2011: 292; Stake, 2000; Yin, 2014). This exploratory research, too, is based on the assumption that case studies can ‘serve as prototypes for others’ replication and transformation’ (Schön, 1992: 136). Future research into teachers’ pedagogic principles, and the ways in which materials development as a form of CRP might help teachers uncover these, could be informed by its design, execution, and findings.

3.4.4 Credibility

Confirmation bias, which has been defined as the tendency to look for and present data which confirm preconceptions, as ‘seeing in the case only whatever is brought to it in the prior theory’ (Evers and Wu, 2007: 210), could threaten the credibility of this research. This type of bias has been identified as a potential pitfall of all qualitative research approaches, and even as a fundamentally human trait (Bacon, 1853; Popay et al., 1998; Flyvbjerg, 2006; Denscombe, 2010). One strategy which will be adopted to address this issue is to keep a record detailing the research procedures (Malterud, 2012; Yin, 2014). The critical discussions of data collection and analysis methods in this chapter and the next are aimed at enhancing the transparency of the research to this effect.

Additional strategies to enhance the credibility of the research entail involving multiple participants, extending the time spent at the research site, and triangulating data collection methods, types of data, and data analysis methods, as elaborated below (Baxter and Jack, 2008; Yin, 2014). Multiple sources of evidence will be provided for claims made in Chapters 5, 6, and 7. This will not guarantee a complete picture of the cases, nor does it ignore the possibility that triangulation may confound the coherence of the research outcomes (Stake, 2006; Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2009). However, using a combination of data collection methods has been found effective in raising awareness of EFL teachers’ principles and how these principles are applied in practice (Li and Walsh, 2011; Erkmen, 2012). The data collection methods will be triangulated as illustrated in figure 3.3:

![figure 3.3. Triangulation of data sources](image-url)
To further enhance the credibility of the findings, a journal will be kept during the field research to record impressions, dilemmas, and questions; it will be used as an instrument for researcher reflexivity and inform the critical reflections in Chapter 4 (Burgess et al., 2006). Critical friends will be engaged in peer consultation and discussion of the data analysis processes and their outcomes (Starks and Brown Trinidad, 2007). Lastly, preliminary findings will be compared with each participant’s own reflections on the research through member checks. Although member checks might undermine the coherence of the findings too, they have been identified as a means to involve the participants, build a reciprocal relationship with them, and add new perspectives (Freeman et al., 2007; Stutchbury and Fox, 2009; Trainor and Bouchard, 2013). This is why the teachers’ reactions and recommendations will be incorporated in this dissertation (Cohen et al., 2011).

3.5 Data Collection

3.5.1 Selection of Cases

The four cases will be selected on the basis of a non-probability purposive selection procedure (Cohen et al., 2011). Frequently associated with case study, this approach involves ‘hand-picking’ the participants on the basis of ‘their relevance to the topic of the investigation’ (Denscombe, 2010: 35). Based on the inclusion criteria listed in section 3.3.2, the participants will be selected from the researcher’s network of former colleagues and students, and contacted personally. This kind of close contact with research participants has been regarded a strength of qualitative inquiry and case study methodology specifically (Freeman et al., 2007; Baxter and Jack, 2008). A possible downside is that those contacted might feel pressured to take part (Collins et al., 2005). This is why the teachers will be asked whether they would consider participating, and assured that their participation is voluntary.

A pilot case study will be conducted to facilitate familiarisation with the steps involved in the execution of a rigorous research project, and the making of judgement calls as the collection and analysis of data progress (Burgess et al., 2006; Yin, 2014). It will be selected on the basis of the same non-probability purposive selection procedure.

3.5.2 Data Collection Methods

The data collection procedure will consist of five consecutive steps for each case (see the second column in table 3.1 below, which presents the methods and their relation to the research questions). Organised in a way that has traditionally been called condensed field work in multi-site case study (MacDonald and Walker, 1975; Stenhouse, 1983), these five stages will be executed within a month. This may stimulate recall in follow-up interviews and member checks, and will mean that findings can be reported back quickly to acknowledge the participants’ involvement and time investment.
To address research question(s) | data will be collected through
---|---
1: What are the teachers’ espoused pedagogic principles regarding the role and function of classroom materials in EFL teaching and learning? | 1. Semi-structured interview 1  
2. Reflective log
2: In what ways are the teachers’ espoused pedagogic principles reflected in their materials? | 3. Classroom materials
4: What are the teachers’ tacit pedagogic principles regarding the role and function of classroom materials in EFL teaching and learning, as reflected in their materials? | 4. Non-participant observation
3: In what ways are the teachers guided by their espoused pedagogic principles during the use of their materials in class? | 5. Semi-structured interview 2
5: In what ways are the teachers guided by their tacit pedagogic principles during the use of their materials in class? | 6. At which point(s) in the materials development process, and in what ways, are (the differences and similarities between) the teachers’ espoused principles and their tacit principles revealed?
7: Which part of the materials development process do the teachers consider to be most informative in revealing their pedagogic principles? | 7: Which part of the materials development process do the teachers consider to be most informative in revealing their pedagogic principles?

Table 3.1. Data collection methods related to research questions

1. Semi-Structured Interview 1

The first step in the data collection procedure will be an initial interview, held with each participant to gain insight into their espoused principles regarding classroom materials, to address research question 1. It will be conducted on the basis of the interview guide in Appendix 3, which consists of open-ended questions intended to uncover the teachers’ perspectives. The question sequence is based on the idea of moving from non-confrontational questions to more complex questions (Brinkmann and Kvale, 2015). The teachers will have been asked to bring their coursebook, which will be used as a prompt to make the conversation more concrete. The topics to be covered are:

- general teaching experience and experiences in the two lower forms at this school;
- role and function of the coursebook and other materials currently used;
- motives and causes behind the development of materials;
- role, function and unique features of the teacher’s own materials;
- general important features of classroom materials.

Interviews are considered an appropriate method to investigate people’s lived experiences of complex social phenomena (Pring, 2000; Starks and Brown Trinidad, 2007). This interview will be semi-structured in nature, which may require more improvisation and time for analysis than a structured interview (Wengraf, 2001), but will allow for topics and questions to arise as the conversation develops, and enable probing for more clarity on the experience (Denscombe, 2010).

3 Connected to the embedded units of analysis, methods 2, 3 and 4 will also retrospectively inform research question 6. Method 5 will also be used to address research question 1.
2. Reflective Log

The second step, also aimed at addressing research question 1, entails asking the participants to keep a reflective log as they create their classroom materials. Logs or journals have been found to help teachers foster greater awareness and understanding of their beliefs and habits (Abednia et al., 2013; Farrell, 2016), and can help 'paint vivid portraits of the complexity and dilemmas of [materials] writers’ (Harwood, 2016: 9). McGrath (2013) calls for more studies that focus on teachers’ decision-making regarding materials at the pre-lesson planning stage. As a form of 'simulated practice' (Carlsgren, 1999:52) involving experimentation, imagination, and intention, this stage can be considered just as much part of practice as the classroom activities that follow it (Eisner, 1993; Pang, 2016).

As a research method, keeping a reflective log is not without its limitations. If the objectives of the task are not clearly specified, this could lead to uncertainty on the part of the participants (Abednia et al., 2013). The participants may have negative experiences with, and attitudes towards, reflective writing (Fendler, 2003). To balance both limitations against the aim to gather sufficient data, the teachers will be requested to record the decisions they make and the motivations behind these decisions, while being offered a choice regarding how they do this (Knapp, 2012). They can keep a written log, like a diary entry or combination of entries, or make an audio or video recording of themselves. The logs are expected to contain reflections at various levels, ranging from factual descriptions of their decisions to deeper reflections on underlying principles.

3. Classroom Materials

The third data source constitutes the artefacts which are the materials themselves. This source will be used to address research questions 2 and 4, aimed at uncovering the ways in which the participants’ espoused and tacit pedagogic principles are reflected in their materials. As discussed in Chapter 1, these materials may, for instance, consist of a hand-out, worksheet, or collection of assignments, supplementing the coursebook. Asking the participants to share their materials is the least obtrusive collection method in this research, as the participants would naturally have created these materials as part of their lesson planning (Web Center for Social Research Methods, 2006).

A strength of using artefacts in case studies is that they are potentially ‘insightful into cultural features’ (Yin, 2014: 106). The intrinsic features of materials have been found to predict what happens in the language classroom: gap-filling exercises logically proved to elicit different responses from pupils than more open-ended assignments (Guerrettaz and Johnston, 2013). A teacher’s espoused wish to focus on metacognition could be reflected in the materials through questions about pupils’ language learning strategies, or tips and tricks for independent learning. A focus on (repeated) L2 input could be revealed through authentic English texts. However, ‘examining materials in isolation from their use in classrooms can only ever give us an inadequate understanding’ (ibid.: 791) of their
role and function. The ways in which the materials impact on classroom discourse will be explored in the fourth step of the procedure.

4. Classroom Observation

To address research questions 3 and 5, this step will consist of a direct, non-participant observation of a classroom situation in which the teachers use their own materials (Cohen et al., 2011). This method answers appeals for more classroom-based studies which focus on teachers’ perspectives on EFL materials (Guerrettaz and Johnston, 2013; McGrath, 2013). This kind of direct observation is aimed at understanding the ways in which their materials ‘function in the complex web of relationships that constitutes an actual classroom’ (Guerrettaz and Johnston, 2013: 783). It is anticipated, for example, that a teacher who believes in a focus on form will be guided by this principle during his or her instruction and will point out salient linguistic features in the materials. A teacher whose principle is a focus on using prior knowledge may explicitly compare such features to the first language (L1).

Direct, first-hand observations have been found to be revealing with regard to complex social events and real-life situations (Denscombe, 2010). At the same time, they can be considered intrusive; especially when, like in this research, the lesson will be recorded on video to facilitate analysis and recall. The ‘naturalness of the setting’ (ibid.: 203) will be retained as much as possible by choosing the position in the classroom from which the observation will be arranged carefully and in consultation with the teacher. The recording will be complemented with observation notes, which will be both descriptive and reflective in nature, and will be written down on the observation sheet found in Appendix 4.

5. Semi-Structured Interview 2

The final method is an interview with each participant to address questions 1, 6 and 7. The rationale behind it is based on the metaphor of the materials developer as a crafts person discussed in Chapter 2: ‘as in all craftwork, understanding of what one [is] doing [may appear] only slowly, after the fact’ (Sennett, 2008: 199). As in the first interview, one aim is to gain insight into the participant’s principles regarding EFL materials. This time, the focus is on a specific teaching experience, which has been found to help participants voice concrete principles as opposed to general conceptions of teaching and learning (Eley, 2006). The objective is to engage the participants in reflection-on-action and reflection-for-action (Schön, 1983). Reflection will be aimed at principles in theory, identified as espoused principles in the first interview and the teacher’s log, and principles in practice, as revealed in the materials and the classroom.

The input for this follow-up interview will therefore consist of the outcomes from preliminary analyses of the first interview, log, materials, and the observation video and notes. As in Breen et al.’s (2001) study, the strategy will be to reflect decisions back ‘as a stimulus for teacher commentary and
elucidation’ (477). The follow-up interview will be conducted within a week of the observed lesson to facilitate recall, and will be semi-structured in nature for the reasons outlined above. It will be based on the open-ended questions in Appendix 5. The topics to be covered are:

- general experience of the observed lesson;
- role and function of the coursebook and other materials in this lesson;
- role and function of the teacher’s own materials in this lesson;
- differences and similarities between espoused principles and observed practice.

3.5.3 Data Preparation

Verbatim transcripts will be made of the interview recordings and of the teachers’ logs, if the teachers recorded them as audio or video files, to enable subsequent analysis and interpretation. The utterances of the people involved will be preceded by their initials or by those of their self-selected pseudonyms. Facilitating a level of detail that suits the research objectives and questions, the transcripts will include the participants’ words and punctuation to reflect rising and falling intonation, and exclude such details as the length of pauses (Cameron et al., 2009).

3.6 Data Analysis

3.6.1 General Approach

Once collected and transcribed, the data will be analysed through constant comparison of observations in different data sources (Corbin and Strauss, 2008; Cohen et al., 2011; Fram, 2013). Common to interpretative analysis (Starks and Brown Trinidad, 2007), this approach will involve:

- reading of the data to enhance familiarisation with their contents;
- taking memos alongside the data to identify noticeable features;
- coding of the data;
- categorising the data into thematic units, and
- synthesising the categorised data into general findings.

It is anticipated to provide a means for the researcher to move from apparent ‘chaos’ (Malterud, 2012: 796) to themes and concepts. The steps will be taken for each case to constitute within-case analysis, followed by cross-case synthesis for the collection of cases (Yin, 2014).

Coding will help condense the data ‘into a more manageable form than the transcript’ (Cameron et al., 2009: 73), yet has been contested as a positivist approach to qualitative research (St. Pierre and Jackson, 2014). It entails decontextualising or at least ‘temporarily removing parts of the text from their original context’ (Malterud, 2012: 797). This problem will be addressed by providing descriptions of context and making explicit the considerations with regard to how data are presented. Another potential pitfall, which is the premature identification of codes and themes, will be avoided.
as much as possible by recording all relevant decisions made during the analysis process as a way to enhance researcher reflexivity (ibid.; Yin, 2014; Pallotti, 2016).

As indicated in section 3.4.4, multiple coding approaches will be used to reduce confirmation bias, achieve a rigorous analysis of the ‘soft’ data associated with case study (Denscombe, 2010: 63), and arrive at thorough insights into the interplay between the teachers’ principles and their materials. The deductive and inductive approaches will be outlined and related to the research questions in the following two sections.

3.6.2 Deductive Coding: Pedagogic Principles

First, a directed content analysis approach will entail coding the interview transcripts and the teachers’ logs to gain an in-depth view of their principles to address research question 1 (Potter and Levine-Donnerstein, 1999; Hsieh and Shannon, 2005). The preliminary codes which will be used for this purpose are informed by Hadfield’s (2014b) list of pedagogic principles underpinning materials developers’ decisions as discussed in Chapter 2, represented here in table 3.2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preliminary codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Focus on (repeated) L2 input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Focus on L2 output &amp; interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Focus on meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Focus on form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Focus on generalisable and frequently occurring features of the L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Focus on usefulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Focus on formulaic expressions and rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Focus on implicit and explicit knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Focus on affective engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Focus on the learners’ readiness &amp; logical sequencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Focus on learner differences, learner needs and teaching conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Focus on using prior knowledge, e.g. of the L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Focus on deep processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Focus on metacognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Focus on feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_table 3.2. Preliminary codes_

As discussed in Chapter 2, for the purposes of this research, principles from Hadfield’s original table were combined to prevent overlap. The focus on labels were added to cover the contents of the descriptions and facilitate ease of reference.

A directed content analysis approach acknowledges, and facilitates working with, existing theory and findings (Hsieh and Shannon, 2005). Starting with this kind of coding framework has been found helpful by those new to the use of a constant-comparison analysis method (Fram, 2013), and will enable the application of Hadfield’s principles in a new way, as deductive, theory-driven codes. However, although theory can provide focus and structure, ‘qualitative analysis emphasizes the
importance of remaining open to what is in the data’ (Roulston, 2014: 305). This is why directed coding will be supplemented with an emergent coding approach.

3.6.3 Inductive Coding: Metaphors

The conventional content analysis approach employed next will consist in coding the interview and log data again to gain a more thorough view of the participants’ pedagogic principles (Hsieh and Shannon, 2005). A strength of this approach is that it is grounded in the data and allows for ‘exemplars for each code and category [to be] identified from the data’ (ibid.: 1279). Inductive codes and themes arising from the data will be used to ensure coverage, accurate representation, and enhanced understanding (Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Baxter and Jack, 2008). The procedure will be inspired by a metaphor-led discourse analysis (MLDA) approach (Cameron and Deignan, 2006; Cameron et al., 2009). As discussed in Chapter 2, metaphors may offer insight into the EFL teacher-as-craftsperson’s principles; they can serve to unpack ‘what’s buried in the vault of tacit knowledge’ (Sennett, 2008: 184). It is anticipated that the participants’ metaphors for their materials and their practices reveal principles which are more tacit than the ones they espouse. Indeed, the analysis of the metaphors people use in discourse has been found useful as an empirical tool to uncover their perceptions (Lakoff and Johnson, 2003; Lin et al., 2012).

Difficulties in identifying phrases as metaphors may arise because metaphor can be regarded as a lexical and a textual phenomenon (Malterud, 2008). Moreover, phrases may be so conventionalised that they are easily overlooked as metaphors (Cameron et al., 2009). Following Cameron et al., the metaphor identification procedure outlined by the Pragglejaz Group (2007) will be used to avoid these pitfalls. This procedure encompasses the steps in figure 3.4:

a) For each lexical unit in the text, establish its meaning in context, that is, how it applies to an entity, relation, or attribute in the situation evoked by the text (...). Take into account what comes before and after the lexical unit.

b) For each lexical unit, determine if it has a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context. For our purposes, basic meanings tend to be
   - More concrete (...);
   - Related to bodily action;
   - More precise (as opposed to vague);
   - Historically older;
   Basic meanings are not necessarily the most frequent meanings of the lexical unit.

c) If the lexical unit has a more basic current–contemporary meaning in other contexts than the given context, decide whether the contextual meaning contrasts with the basic meaning but can be understood in comparison with it.

If yes, mark the lexical unit as metaphorical.

figure 3.4. Metaphor identification procedure (Pragglejaz Group, 2007: 3)
In this research, the MLDA approach will entail returning to the interview transcripts and the logs after the initial coding strategy. The metaphors each participant uses in them will be coded to identify any tacit pedagogic principles in the data not yet accounted for. A tree diagram of codes emerging from the interviews and the logs will then be used to code the materials developed by the teachers to address research questions 2 and 4, and the video recordings and the observation notes to address research questions 3 and 5. Cross-case synthesis of the four cases will consist of applying a final, selective coding strategy to the teachers’ logs, materials, and the observation data to address research question 6. The conventional content analysis approach outlined above will be applied to the transcripts of the follow-up interviews to address research question 7.

3.7 Ethical Considerations

The codes of practice which will be observed in this research are the guidelines for educational research by the British Educational Research Association (BERA, 2011) and the code of conduct for practice-oriented research by the Dutch Council of Higher Education (HBO-Raad, 2010). The research will comply with legal requirements relating to research involving children and the protection of data, as laid down in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), and British and Dutch law, respectively. The ethical grid proposed by Stutchbury and Fox (2009) will be consulted throughout the research process to interrogate situations as they arise, and the questions in it will inform the critical reflections in Chapter 4.

3.7.1 Voluntary Informed Consent

Voluntary informed consent from the potential participants will be sought in a letter which includes an outline of the research, an estimation of the time required, and information about the storage of data and dissemination of findings (BERA, 2011). The letter also addresses why their participation is necessary and what makes it voluntary, and offers the possibility to withdraw from the research for any or no reason, at any time during the data collection process (see Appendix 2). The participants will be asked whether they would prefer to communicate in Dutch or in English, and their preference will be observed. Because the research includes the audio and video recording of children during the classroom observation, the head teacher of each secondary school involved will be approached to establish whether standing parental consent applies. If the head is not authorised to act in loco parentis, a letter will be drawn up for the parents or guardians of the children taught by the participating teacher, asking them for passive, ‘or ‘opt-out”, consent (Felzmann, 2009: 105).

3.7.2 Confidentiality

Data and interpretations arising from the research will be treated confidentially. The confidential and secure storage of data will consist in the use of a password-protected external hard drive, and the use
of a locked cupboard accessible only to the researcher to save any hard copies. The participants will be asked in the first meeting whether they would like to be represented anonymously in the dissertation. They will be granted access to their personal data at all times during the data collection and analysis stages.

### 3.7.3 Reciprocity

Conducting research in an ethically acceptable manner is anticipated to appeal to the researcher’s personal judgement and professional norms (Stutchbury and Fox, 2009). Taking general ethical considerations a step further, Trainor and Bouchard (2013) challenge researchers to build their research around reciprocity as an ethical stance. The question that will be kept in mind throughout the field research is what value is in it for the teachers, and possibly for their schools or departments (Stutchbury and Fox, 2009). Whether the participants are ‘able to name specific benefits they received through the researcher’s more direct involvement’ (Zigo, 2001, p. 354) may be addressed as part of the member check, and will be critically discussed in Chapter 7.

### 3.8 Conclusion

This chapter has been used to present a detailed discussion of the research as a qualitative, exploratory inquiry in a real-world setting. The qualitative nature of the research is reflected in the close contact with the participants, as well as in the outcomes of the field research in the form of words rather than numbers. Its exploratory character is reflected in the open-ended research questions, and in the decision to conduct an in-depth inquiry with a small number of participants using a variety of sources, data collection methods, and analysis strategies. The choice for a case study approach to the research, in which the individual teacher is selected and treated as a case to facilitate the collection and within-case analysis of the data, reflects the subjectivist nature of the findings which are expected to emerge. At the same time, through a multiple-case study approach, it offers the possibility of a cross-case synthesis.

The aim of this inquiry is to offer insight into the lived experiences of four EFL teachers in Dutch secondary schools, not to generalise its findings. The elements of the research design, its execution, and its findings may feed into future research on teachers as materials developers, teachers’ pedagogic principles regarding EFL learning and teaching, and the development of CRP. To address limitations of and criticisms on the ‘one-off-ness’ of education research studies which are ‘difficult to replicate’ (Kelly and Yin, 2007: 133), the methods used in this embedded multiple-case study design have been thoroughly described and underpinned in this chapter. Chapter 4 will be used to present critical reflections on the processes of data collection and analysis.
4. Processes of Data Collection and Analysis

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents critical reflections on the research process. Researcher reflexivity has been defined as the ‘active acknowledgement’ that the researcher’s ‘actions and decisions will inevitably impact upon the meaning and context of the experience under investigation’ (Horsburgh, 2003: 308; Thompson and Pascal, 2012). It entails problematising the interpretation and representation of realities (Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2009). One way in which researcher reflexivity can be enhanced is by keeping a journal throughout the research process, to facilitate the identification of critical actions and decisions for further reflexive exploration (Burgess et al., 2006). The journal which was kept during this research functioned as an instrument to record critical moments, impressions, and preliminary interpretations of events during the data collection process, as well as critical questions and concerns which arose when the data were analysed and prepared for presentation. It was a major source of input for the reflections in this chapter.

While acknowledging that conducting research is rarely a neat, chronological undertaking but instead can be characterised as ‘messy business’ (ibid: vii), much like the craftsperson’s creative process, reflections will be presented chronologically. The sections in this chapter contain the dilemmas and decisions in relation to the selection and representation of the participants, data collection, data transcription and translation, and data analysis. It ends with a discussion of the outcomes of the data analysis process.

4.2 Selection and Representation of the Participants

As discussed in Chapter 3, the four participants were selected through the researcher’s network of colleagues. Four teacher educators who work at secondary placement schools in the region part of the time were asked to identify English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers at those schools who were known for creating their own materials and would be willing to participate. Originally, this purposive selection procedure was intended to entail contacting one teacher at a time (Yin, 2014). In reality, several teachers responded to the call to participate simultaneously, and agreements were made quickly to benefit from their enthusiasm and to condense the field research. The researcher observed that establishing contact via e-mail was very fast, and wondered whether the fact that potential participants were contacted indirectly, by senior colleagues at their schools, may have coerced them into participation (Researcher’s journal, 20/4 and 22/4). In the first meeting with each participant, it became clear that this had not been the case.

A decisive moment in the field research was right at the start, when the first interview with the participant selected as the pilot case was conducted. As discussed previously, the main motives
for doing a pilot in the first place had been to facilitate familiarisation with the steps involved in the execution of an intensive research project, and to provide training for adaptation, rigour, and the making of judgement calls. It soon became apparent, however, that familiarisation would occur as the collection and analysis of data progressed, and that each encounter with a participant would require new judgement calls. Giving rise to the dilemma was the strong impression that the pilot case would make an inherently valuable contribution to the findings (Researcher’s journal, 11/5). Based on this impression, the decision was made to regard this first case study as an integral part of the research.

One or several pilots might have been useful in ‘developing, testing, or refining the planned research questions and procedures’ (Yin, 2014: 240), as will become clear from the critical reflections in this chapter. At the same time, the semi-longitudinal nature of the research design, which entailed visiting each research site three times, facilitated the refinement of these procedures. The ways in which they were modified were noted in the researcher’s journal and, as the field research progressed, were incorporated and discussed more thoroughly in the dissertation itself. The decisions made along the way became an essential part of Chapters 4 and 6, and suggestions for future research based on the experiences in this small-scale, exploratory inquiry will be made in Chapter 7. The dilemma taught the researcher that a reflexive stance can be demonstrated by showing flexibility with regard to the execution and adaptation of the intended research design (Horsburgh, 2003).

All four participants indicated that they would like to be represented with their own names as opposed to pseudonyms, and they adhered to this decision when they were presented with the data as part of the member check. A dilemma arose for the researcher when contemplating that the teachers’ pedagogic principles and practices would also be discussed critically for a wider audience, and in light of prior research findings, in Chapters 6 and 7, and that some of their actions during the data collection processes would be scrutinised in this chapter without their having the opportunity to read and comment. In order to protect the individual teachers and secure the confidential nature of the data, it was decided to use pseudonyms in the dissertation.

4.3 Data Collection
4.3.1 General Reflections
Based on the traditional notion of condensed field work (MacDonald and Walker, 1975; Stenhouse, 1983), each school was visited three times within the course of one month, with the aim to report findings back to the participants relatively quickly. Although the actual member check, which will be discussed in more detail in section 4.6, occurred approximately one year later, preliminary interpretations of the interview and log data were shared with each participant one or two weeks after the classroom observation. The participants were kept informed of the general progression of the research via e-mail.
On the one hand, prior work experience as a secondary school EFL teacher facilitated cultural sensitivity to values and norms in the research environment (Stutchbury and Fox, 2009). When establishing contact with pupils and teachers in the schools, and especially during the classroom observations, the researcher felt almost like an insider, and more like a participant than a spectator (Mercer, 2007; Kemmis, 2012; Hanson, 2013; Nakata, 2015). On the other hand, she did remain an outsider, because it was not her own professional practice and immediate teaching context which were the focus of the research. She reminded herself to concentrate on the teachers’ interaction with their materials (Researcher’s journal, 28/5). Potentially sensitive issues regarding her position as a teacher educator and researcher will be discussed in relation to the data collection methods below.

Each section below will start with a brief reminder of the intended procedure, followed by a discussion of the issues and reflections in relation to the procedure and to the literature, and will conclude with a description of the actual procedure. This structure is intended to facilitate both replication of the consecutive stages and the interpretation of the data presented in Chapter 5.

4.3.2 Stage 1: Conducting the First Interview

As outlined in Chapter 3, the first step in the data collection procedure constituted an initial interview with each participant, which was semi-structured in nature and guided by the open-ended questions in Appendix 3. The aim of this interview was to gain insight into the participant’s espoused principles regarding classroom materials and thus address research question 1. In the preliminary meeting, aimed at clarifying the research procedures and signing the informed consent letter, the participant had been asked to bring the coursebook he or she used as a prompt for discussion during the interview.

Interviewing was experienced as a fascinating method. A side-effect of repeatedly playing back and transcribing the first interview, so that preliminary analyses could serve as input for the follow-up interview, was that the researcher became aware of some of the challenges early on. She came to notice herself (Elliott, 2013), especially when the participants asked for repetition or clarification. The preliminary analyses provided the opportunity for the researcher to adjust her speed, take time to finish speaking, and tolerate silence to let participants make and clarify their points in the follow-up interviews. She contemplated that a pilot case study would have been valuable in raising awareness and developing her interviewing skills early on.

Unexpected interviewee behaviours (Roulston et al., 2003) which occurred during the interviews were flattery and ‘statements indicative of social desirability response bias’ (Collins et al., 2005: 188-189). When asked to describe her past and current teaching experiences, one participant referred to the grammar lessons she had been taught by the researcher when she was still in University. She claimed to have copied the researcher’s pedagogic approach (Phoebe, Interview-1).
This teacher might have deemed it desirable to characterise grammar as essential in the EFL classroom because the researcher, in her perception, felt the same way. Behaviours such as these can be considered problematic because they might threaten the credibility of the answers given (Collins et al., 2005). However, the fact that Phoebe’s focus on grammar was made explicit repeatedly and confirmed in other data sources, as illustrated in Chapter 5, as well as in personal communication, seems to mitigate this effect (Researcher’s journal, 7/10).

The interview questions helped draw out the participants’ general teaching experiences and their experiences in the two lower forms at their schools, reflections on the role and function of the coursebook and other materials currently used, their motives and causes behind the development of materials, reflections on the role, function and unique features of their own materials, and general important features of classroom materials for each participant. The four interviews resulted in audio recordings of between 15 and 25 minutes. After the interview, the researcher and the participant agreed on a date and time for the classroom observation which would suit them both, and the participant was requested to keep a reflective log during the materials development process, which would take place in the one to two weeks between the first interview and the observation.

4.3.3 Stage 2: Collecting the Participants’ Reflective Logs

The second stage of the data collection procedure entailed gathering the reflective logs kept by the four participants as they developed their own classroom materials. As discussed in section 3.5.2, the aim of this method, too, was to gain insight into the participants’ espoused principles regarding classroom materials and thus address research question 1. The teachers were requested to record the decisions they made, and the motivations behind these decisions, as they created materials for the 50-minute lesson which would be observed by the researcher. They could record these decisions and motivations in a written log or make an audio or video recording of themselves.

An advantage of using printed materials which are “out there, ready to be gathered’, such as logs and materials, is that they do ‘not require time-consuming transcription before analysis’ (Mautner, 2008: 32). The researcher realised, however, that this does not mean printed materials are readily available, nor that their analysis is straightforward. Keeping a reflective log during the creation of their materials, for instance, was not something the teachers would naturally have done. As a data collection method, it would certainly have impacted on their workload. Indeed, finding the time to keep a log has been identified as one of the barriers to writing reflections for EFL teachers and student teachers (Abednia et al., 2013). However, none of the participants commented on this impact or decided to make an arguably less time-consuming audio or video recording of themselves.

The request to record the decisions they made as they created their materials, and to explain these decisions, seemed clear enough, as none of the participants asked for clarifications or examples. The permissive nature of this request did, however, result in four very different reflective logs. One of
them was hand-written, while three participants sent in a digital file (see Appendix 6 for sample logs from two participants). The logs varied in length from half a page to three pages, contained full sentences as well as key words and symbols, and were structured in various ways. These different approaches made their interpretation and analysis rather complicated, as the researcher reflected on in her own journal.

With regard to the contents of the teachers’ logs, she noted:

They are about practical considerations, amount of time + work, what they intend to do rather than how, much less why (Researcher’s journal, 22/7).

Although each log addressed the decisions made during the creation stage of the materials development process to some extent, this data collection method seemed to have drawn out rather superficial reflections as opposed to critical, deeper levels of reflection. The participants never made reference to their philosophies of practice, theoretical foundations, or any ‘broader socio-political as well as affective/moral issues that impact practice’ (Farrell, 2015a: 8) to explain and underpin their pedagogic decisions. Implications of this will be discussed further in Chapters 5, 6 and 7.

4.3.4 Stage 3: Collecting the Participants’ Classroom Materials

As discussed in Chapter 3, the third data source constituted the artefacts which were the materials themselves. This source was intended to address research questions 2 and 4, aimed at uncovering the ways in which the participants’ espoused and tacit pedagogic principles are reflected in their own materials. Several examples of how such principles could be reflected in their materials were offered in the previous chapter.

The participants themselves decided which type of materials they would create for the lesson that was to be observed. This resulted in a range of different types of materials, which will be discussed and illustrated in Chapter 5. This variety posed a difficulty for the researcher, as it complicated the analysis of this data set. The researcher struggled to find relevant literature on using printed and written materials as data and felt alone in her attempts to start interpreting and analysing them. When reading the logs and the teachers’ materials to enhance familiarisation with their contents, the researcher reflected on how giving the participants a sense of freedom and choice, reducing their time investment, guarding the non-interventionist approach of the research, keeping control of the data, and eliciting in-depth reflections, were all issues which needed to be balanced.

On the one hand, asking the participants to share their materials did constitute the least obtrusive collection method in this research (Web Center for Social Research Methods, 2006); the materials were purposively created for the lesson which would be observed, and the procedure was a part of the teachers’ lesson planning which would have happened anyway. On the other hand, the researcher wondered to what extent the materials or the development process itself would have
differed if they had not been the subject of inquiry. Moreover, one of the participants explicitly said ‘I made this lesson for you’ (Mitch, Interview-2). This could be taken to mean that they did experience an increased workload ensuing from their participation.

The participants gave their printed materials to the researcher at the end of the lesson she observed, and sent her a digital copy of the materials by e-mail.

4.3.5 Stage 4: Observing the Participants in Their Classrooms

As outlined above, the next stage of data collection involved a direct, non-participant observation of the lesson in which the teacher used his or her own materials. This method was aimed at uncovering the ways in which the participants were guided by their pedagogic principles during actual use of the materials in a classroom setting (research questions 3 and 5). Chapter 3 offered several examples of how such principles could be reflected in practice.

A familiarity with the participants’ professional context was perceived at several moments during the classroom observations. When the pupils came in noisily and made their way to their seats, and when the teacher presented an overview of the lesson, for instance, the researcher was reminded of prior work experiences. It was felt that this kind of proximity to the participants ‘enabled more meaningful relationships to be established than would have been possible for an outsider’ (Stutchbury and Fox, 2009: 498). At the same time, an awareness emerged of the researcher’s ‘dual identity’ (Hanson, 2013: 391) as a teacher educator, who is used to providing EFL student teachers with feedback in simulations at the University. This time, there was no need to share or even have an opinion about the teachers’ pedagogic decisions, the way they managed a group, or how they responded to pupils’ questions. These professional and personal opinions arose nonetheless, and when it was decided consciously not to act upon them, this led to a sense of role ambiguity and contested positionality (ibid.; Hopkins, 2007; Sultana, 2007).

The researcher interacted with some of the pupils before, during, and after the observation but tried not to interrupt the lesson. However, she reflected upon whether the observation was truly non-participant, as it had been defined in Chapter 3. Perhaps ‘the question [was] not whether [she] interfered with the normal flow of events in the classroom, but how much [she] interfered’ (Klein, 2004: 91). Some pupils responded to the researcher’s presence by greeting her or the camera, and asked her for the meaning of an English word. Two participants approached her during their lessons to ask a question or explain a teaching decision. Otherwise, as only one participant invited the researcher to explain the reason for her presence in the classroom, interference seemed to have been kept to a minimum. According to the four participants, their pupils were used to classroom observations by student teachers and teachers who are new to the school. This seems to support the argument that established social phenomena, like these secondary school lessons, are not easily interrupted (Pring, 2000).
One occasion which did make the researcher feel like an intruder in the research environment was when it became clear that miscommunication had arisen between her and one of the participants. When the researcher arrived at the school, the lesson which was to be observed had already finished. Generally punctual, she was distressed to have missed the appointment. The teacher insisted on repeating the instruction for the listening assignment he had planned a few days later and invited the researcher back to observe and video record this instruction. The pupils, whose parents had given their informed consent, agreed to this. Even though it appeared later that the researcher may not have been to blame for this communication breakdown, that particular observation felt far from unobtrusive (Web Center for Social Research Methods, 2006).

Several obstacles to listening and watching closely were experienced during the observations. These include being paper-focused, rehearsing, judging, and filtering, which have been identified as obstacles in relation to other qualitative research methods, such as interviews (Wengraf, 2001). Note-taking distracted the researcher from being fully present and, as a data collection method, might not have been necessary during the observation. However, notes regarding the atmosphere and utterances by the teacher which may not have been video recorded properly were useful in retrospect. The researcher also found herself rehearsing what she would say to the participant about the lesson, and judging the participant’s teaching approach, as discussed above. In addition, she filtered what appeared to be relevant teaching behaviours in relation to the research questions, and what to refer to in the follow-up interview. In short, although they made the research come to life, the four classroom observations were experienced as highly intensive and demanding moments.

Video recording the lessons allowed the researcher to focus on and process all that happened simultaneously from the moment the pupils entered the classroom. A dilemma arose when one parent refused consent. The researcher was concerned that her role as an outsider, which had been communicated to the parents as discussed in Chapter 3, had led to this refusal, and that it was her presence which would potentially disturb the pupil in question. She discussed these concerns with the teacher, and reflected upon whether recording the lesson outweighed the potentially negative consequences. In the end, the matter was resolved by recording another class of pupils, whose parents had all granted consent. The video recordings proved to be a valuable addition to the observation notes in the subsequent analysis of the teachers’ pedagogic principles-in-use, which will be further discussed in the final three chapters.

The observed lessons lasted between 42 and 50 minutes. The data resulting from this method consisted of observation notes (see Appendix 4), and a video recording of each lesson. After the lesson, the researcher and the participant agreed on a date and time for the follow-up interview which would suit them both in the next one to two weeks, and the participant was requested to bring the materials he or she used in the lesson to this interview as a prompt for discussion.
4.3.6 Stage 5: Conducting the Follow-up Interview

To address research questions 1, 6 and 7, the fifth and final stage of the data collection procedure consisted of a semi-structured follow-up interview with each individual participant. Between the classroom observation and this interview one or two weeks later, the researcher conducted preliminary analyses of the first interview, the participant’s log, his or her materials, and the observation video and notes, to serve as input for discussion. These analysis procedures will be further discussed in sections 4.4 and 4.5 below. As anticipated and discussed in Chapter 3, the open-ended questions in Appendix 5 served as a guide during the interview.

As described by Roulston et al. (2003), challenges encountered during the interviews included constructing and delivering questions, and dealing with the consequences of one’s own subjectivities. While the interview was conducted, the interview guide was found to include leading questions regarding the development of critically reflective practice (CRP) through the creation and use of materials. Especially when participants indicated that the materials development process had not resulted in an enhanced awareness of their pedagogic principles, the researcher became conscious of her own assumption that it must have. The follow-up questions, which had been intended to probe further, seemed to be pushing for answers. Question 8, for example, which focussed on the impact of the two interviews, presupposed that the interviews had an impact on the teachers’ awareness in the first place. These ‘awkward moments’ offered a chance to explore ‘alternative views of the situation’ (Abell and Myers, 2008: 158), which would later benefit the discussion of the findings in the final chapters. It was decided to finish the interview as planned, yet rephrase this final set of questions to make them more open-ended.

The interview questions helped draw out the teacher’s reflections on his or her principles in theory, identified as espoused principles in the first interview and the reflective log, and principles in practice, as revealed in the materials and the classroom. They also helped address the teacher’s general experience of the observed lesson, and the role and function of the materials in it. The interviews lasted between 20 and 35 minutes, and resulted in four audio recordings. After the interview, the researcher told the participant that the presentation of the data pertaining to his or her case would be sent to them by e-mail for the member check.

4.4 Data Transcription and Translation

4.4.1 Transcription

The interview recordings were transcribed verbatim with the aim to make the participants’ spoken words ‘amenable to content analyses’, a process which has metaphorically been described as ‘freezing’ texts which are ‘otherwise in constant movement’ (Temple and Young, 2004: 165). Following Roulston (2014), ‘uhm’s and ‘yeah’s were included in the transcripts initially to represent the flow of the interviews. As these utterances did not contribute to the topics under discussion, they
were omitted in the presentation of the data to enhance readability. The transcription conventions which were found most appropriate are presented in table 4.1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>falling intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>phrase-final rise in intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>unfinished sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[text]</td>
<td>descriptive commentary from the researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[onduidelijk]</td>
<td>unintelligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bold</strong></td>
<td>English terms or titles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>á / é / í / ó / ú</td>
<td>marked stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>researcher’s turn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H / X / P / S</td>
<td>participant’s turn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*table 4.1. Conventions used during the transcription process*

Any names referring to people, places, and coursebook titles were replaced by the researcher’s comments to anonymise the transcripts. This would later enhance the confidential treatment of the data when they were discussed with the two critical friends. Using Excel sheets as a format facilitated the selection of key phrases and codes, and filtering by column so they could be viewed in context.

It was decided at the start of the first classroom observation that there would be no point in transcribing the video recordings; there was too much background noise, especially during group work, to distinguish individual voices. Although transcription of the interview recordings was arduous, the process enhanced familiarisation with, and examination of, their contents to develop detailed descriptions of context (Roulston et al., 2003). The proximity to the participants discussed above was recognised most poignantly when the interview recordings were transcribed. This was when the researcher noticed the participants’ use of topoi or commonplaces, characterised by ‘the absence of fully formed statements of shared knowledge’, such as acronyms and place references (Abell and Myers, 2008: 154). They were seen to reveal the participants’ assumptions about the researcher’s background and knowledge (ibid.). If the researcher had asked the teachers to explain what they meant when they alluded to the potential of television programmes for their materials, for example, or elaborate how their teaching context shapes their pedagogic decisions, this may have resulted in deeper insights into their perceptions and lived experiences (Willig, 2014).

**4.4.2 Translation**

The interviews were conducted in Dutch, as all the participants had indicated that it was their preferred medium of communication. Using Dutch in the interviews and in their reflective logs arguably enabled the teachers to speak and write more comfortably, and ‘to construct more detailed and nuanced accounts’ (Miller, 2011: 53). It made the researcher an insider in terms of a shared linguistic background (Temple and Young, 2004; Gawlewicz, 2016). However, once the data had been
collected, it became clear that the decision-making and dilemmas involved in conducting research in a different language from the one in which the research would be presented had been highly underestimated (Roulston, 2014).

During the first analysis stage, which involved deductive coding with the help of Hadfield’s (2014b) fifteen principles, English and Dutch were used interchangeably, as illustrated in figure 4.1:

*figure 4.1. Example of preliminary written analysis of first interview with Mitch*

The inductive analysis stage also involved code-switching throughout: codes and themes were noted in English or in Dutch, as some derived literally from the participants’ words. This enabled the researcher to organise her thoughts and delay any definitive decisions on translations, but did entail processing the data in two languages simultaneously (Temple and Young, 2004). It resulted in a mixed overview of themes, categories and examples, losing some of its readability (see figure 4.2):

*figure 4.2. Excerpt from overview of themes, categories and examples for Helen’s case*
The real dilemmas occurred when, at the start of the writing up stage, an awareness of the dual researcher-translator role arose. Selecting citations from the data and deciding on the most appropriate English phrases to translate them was a challenging experience. Researchers who know the languages in which their research is conducted and presented are arguably ‘best situated to do cross-language data analysis’ (Temple and Young, 2004: 167). However, if one of the languages is not their native language, they may struggle to express nuanced shades of meaning in the L2. The Dutch adjective ‘schools’, for instance, could be translated as methodical or structured but is generally considered less positive (Researcher’s journal, 3/8). Proverbial expressions were translated literally, inevitably losing the uniqueness of the original phrases. The processes of decision-making and evaluating ‘assumptions about meaning equivalence’ (Temple and Young, 2004: 171) proved to be intense, and led to representations of the participants which were not on all accounts satisfactory in the eyes of the researcher. How this impacted on the findings will be discussed further in Chapter 7.

Ultimately, the translation process resulted in a deepened understanding that

the solutions to many of the translator’s dilemmas are not to be found in dictionaries, but rather in an understanding of the way language is tied to local realities, to literary forms and to changing identities. Translators must constantly make decisions about the cultural meanings which language carries, and evaluate the degree to which the two different worlds they inhibit are ‘the same’ (Simon, 1996, cited in Temple and Young, 2004: 165).

4.5 Data Analysis

4.5.1 General Reflections

After the data had been collected, the first step in the analysis consisted of re-reading the interview transcripts, reflective logs, materials, and notes, and playing back the observation videos. The researcher was confronted with having collected great amounts of data which now required management and analysis (Baxter and Jack, 2008). The data analysis process, which was aimed at making sense of this apparent chaos by condensing, reorganising, and representing the data, was far from chronological (Malterud, 2012; Roulston, 2014). Even during the writing up stage, reorganisation and reduction of the data for presentation were required. As illustrated by the reflections in the following sections, it became clear that analysing data involves more than coding. Much of the analysis happened through critical thinking and writing in the researcher’s journal and the dissertation itself (St. Pierre and Jackson, 2014).

4.5.2 In Relation to Research Questions 1 to 5

Interpretative memos were written alongside the transcript of each participant’s first interview in preparation for the follow-up interview, so that the researcher could personalise the questions based on the pedagogic principles the teacher had espoused. Identifying themes and noticeable features
were ways to enhance familiarisation with the practice of analysing the data (Corbin and Strauss, 2008; Cohen et al., 2011). As illustrated in figure 4.1 above, this preliminary analysis included numbers, which referred to the fifteen codes derived from Hadfield’s (2014b) list of principles behind EFL classroom materials development (please refer back to table 3.2). Systematic, in-depth content analysis of the interview and log data was then conducted deductively, as discussed in Chapter 3, on the basis of these fifteen codes. Appendix 8 offers a longer sample of an original interview transcript, as well as a translation in English, to illustrate this coding approach.

The initial coding scheme was soon found to be inadequate. One issue which arose was that a number of codes proved to be redundant (Creswell, 2011). The participants never discussed any principles which would require materials to demonstrate a focus on meaning, on generalisable and frequently occurring features of the L2, on formulaic expressions and rules, on implicit and explicit knowledge, on using prior knowledge, or on metacognition (codes 3, 5, 7, 8, 12, and 14). Another issue was that the codes did not always seem to match what the participants expressed and thus required refining. More importantly, the participants discussed various principles which appealed to focal points not covered by the fifteen codes (Researcher’s journal, 22/7). It was these alternative principles which appeared to illustrate the unique pedagogic approach of each teacher (Researcher’s journal, 24/8).

Although the preliminary codes had made the initial steps less daunting, as coding progressed, an inductive approach was found to be more helpful in data analysis (Burgess et al., 2006; Fram, 2013). It allowed for the modification and supplementation of codes (Malterud, 2012). It also facilitated in-depth analyses of the participants’ classroom materials and the video recordings, which, as they included multimodal representations of the teachers’ principles rather than static text, were less straightforward. The new coding scheme, constructed on the basis of the topics emerging from the interview and log data, offered the possibility to identify principles-in-use in the materials and the recordings. Appendix 9 illustrates the inductive coding approach, which involved adding memos in Dutch to develop focussed codes which stayed as close to the participants’ words as possible. Table 4.2 below provides an overview of the focussed codes and themes identified to help address research questions 1 to 5 for each case.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Helen</td>
<td>affective engagement, active and independent learning, usefulness, addressing learner differences, deep processing</td>
<td>Motivating pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>control, structure and coverage, divergence, self-expression, responsiveness, testing and assessment</td>
<td>Supporting the teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mitch</td>
<td>authentic L2 input, form, topics of interest, comprehensiveness, pushed L2 output</td>
<td>Creating an authentic learning experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>challenging proficient pupils, increasing levels of difficulty</td>
<td>Gradual advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collectivity and individuality, atmosphere</td>
<td>Optimising teaching conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Phoebe</td>
<td>sharing a passion, pupils' commitment, current life experiences, connecting to the world</td>
<td>Enhancing affective and social engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>central focus on form, presentation-practice-production, pre-structured presentation, visual support, filling time</td>
<td>Planning and presenting the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>finding out 'what works', fitting in</td>
<td>Professional growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Shaun</td>
<td>measured input, differentiated instruction and practice, current and future life experiences</td>
<td>Tailoring to pupils’ individual needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>matching current attainment levels, repeated practice, application of recently acquired knowledge, meeting national standards</td>
<td>Preparing for tests and exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collaboration between pupils, collaboration among colleagues, uniformity</td>
<td>Stimulating collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*table 4.2. Codes and themes in relation to research questions 1-5*

A consciousness arose of the use of codes, themes, and translations of the data into words which were not the participants’ but the researcher’s, leading to the realisation that ‘what we come to see depends upon what we seek, and what we seek depends upon what we know how to say’
Writing up the research and reflecting on the processes of data collection and analysis made the researcher increasingly aware that the qualitative findings of this research were shaped by her own professional context as much as the context of the participants (Researcher’s journal, 22/9, 22/7, 12/8). Specifically, the codes *structure and coverage, responsiveness, collectivity versus individuality, and filling time*, did not literally emerge from either Hadfield’s (2014b) list of principles or the participants’ words, nor did they echo commonly used phrases in the EFL pedagogy literature of which the researcher is aware.

**4.5.3 In Relation to Research Questions 6 and 7**

When it came to addressing research questions 6 and 7, concerning when and how the participants’ pedagogic principles were revealed during the materials development process, themes emerging from the follow-up interviews were hand-written in the margin of the four transcripts (illustrated in Appendix 10). Again, they were first expressed in Dutch to stay as close to the data as possible, then translated into English (Temple and Young, 2004). Comparing, contrasting and conflating these themes constituted the cross-case synthesis which will be presented in the final sections of Chapter 5. Much like the process discussed above, this one was also experienced as complex. The researcher noted that the labels chosen for the general themes remained somewhat arbitrary (Researcher’s journal, 14/8). A decision which helped provide focus and structure was to limit the presentation of this synthesis to themes emerging from all four data sets, as each participant’s personal perspectives would be represented in detail in the section dedicated to their case.

A light-bulb moment in the analysis of the follow-up interview data occurred when it was realised that the questions which focussed on whether and how the teachers became more aware of their pedagogic principles were mostly misinterpreted or remained unanswered. One participant’s counter-question, ‘Am I answering your question sufficiently?’ (Phoebe, Interview-2), illustrates this problem. It not only alerted the researcher to the complexity of the interview questions, but also to the subjective nature of the research questions. She found comfort in Roulston’s (2014) suggestion that ‘methodological analysis of what went awry’ (307) could help explore data seemingly unrelated to the initial analytic focus. The challenge was to make this exploration more thorough in order to find out whether and in what ways the research questions would still be addressed. The outcomes of this process will be further discussed in Chapters 5 and 6.

The metaphor-led discourse analysis (MLDA) approach outlined in Chapter 3 was conducted to interrogate the data more deeply with regard to the participants’ tacit pedagogic principles regarding EFL classroom materials (Cameron and Deignan, 2006; Cameron et al., 2009). As discussed in Chapter 2, this methodological decision was underpinned by the idea that metaphors can reveal the less conscious principles held by the craftsperson who engages in a creative process. The approach entailed going over the interview and log data again, highlighting the metaphoric words and phrases
by hand (as illustrated in Appendix 11), then combining them into general themes for the collection of cases. It was not easy to focus on the metaphors in relation to the research question only, as the interview transcripts and reflective logs contained many more instances of metaphoric language:

What is a metaphor? Just lexical items like ‘keurslijf’ (straightjacket) and ‘kapstok’ (coat hooks)? Continuously keep in mind: it is about the role and function of materials, not general didactic principles or pupil behaviour (Researcher’s journal, 11/8).

Other decisive moments, which will be further reflected on in the final chapters, included the realisation that metaphors can offer insights into pedagogic principles which are to a large extent also explicitly espoused, not just tacit, and that tacitly held principles are not necessarily the same as principles-in-use (Researcher’s journal, 16/11). Some of the participants’ principles revealed in practice, i.e. in their materials and their classrooms, were also espoused. Up to that point, as defined in the first three chapters, the terms tacit principles and principles-in-use had been used interchangeably. It now seemed that they should be regarded as partly separate sets. Figure 4.3 below illustrates the assumed overlap between the three categories, and shows how principles-in-use may have both tacit and espoused elements in them. This realisation led to the decision to distinguish between those pedagogic principles which are espoused and those which are revealed in use in the final three chapters, and to constrain the use of the word tacit.

![Figure 4.3: Assumed relationship amongst three sets of pedagogic principles](image)

4.6 Outcomes of the Analysis Process

As discussed above, coding the data and looking for patterns within them were ‘not independent, sequential steps’ but ‘hermeneutic, recursive processes that [informed] each other’ (Cameron et al., 2009: 73). These processes included continuously observing and reflecting on the acts of translating, interpreting and understanding. They resulted in memos typed in the original Excel format of the interview transcripts, hand-written codes and themes on the printed excerpts of the transcripts and the teachers’ classroom materials, highlighted key phrases and metaphors, notes of dilemmas in the researcher’s reflective journal, and codes conflated into themes in separate Word documents. To
ensure consistency, notes were taken of decisions regarding the coding schemes and the themes which emerged (Malterud, 2012). These notes were used as input for a critical appraisal of the decisions made throughout the data analysis stage.

The two teacher educator colleagues who were sent the anonymised transcripts of the follow-up interviews and the outcome of the analysis procedure had no personal investment in the research. Discussions with them provided an opportunity to clarify how data had been selected for presentation (Roulston, 2014). Both colleagues acted as a critical friend, ‘a trusted person who asks provocative questions, provides data to be examined through another lens, and offers critique of [the researcher’s] work as a friend’ (Costa and Kallick, 1993: 50). Minor differences in interpretation were discussed thoroughly. Modifications made as a result of these discussions involved two headings which, in hindsight, seemed better suited to match the contents of the paragraphs. Although there were limitations to the extent to which the critical friends could take the time to understand the research context and objectives completely (ibid.), the researcher felt challenged and supported by them.

Each participant was asked to member check the outcome dedicated to their case to verify accuracy of representation. The participants were asked to comment on factual information such as their professional background and context, as well as on the section content and interpretations. After receiving a reminder by e-mail, one participant indicated that he had been busy and had not been able to comment. Even after the researcher assured him that he could send in his remarks until a month later, she did not receive any response. Despite the lack of clarity regarding his perspective on the representation of his case and the research itself, it was decided not to probe any further. In the end, three participants commented positively on the way they had been represented, suggestions regarding spelling were used to improve Chapter 5, and the single remark concerning content was added in a footnote.

4.7 Conclusion

This chapter has been used to provide a reflexive account of the field research and the data transcription, translation, and analysis processes. Each step of these processes posed its own challenges and dilemmas. In the end, the content analysis and MLDA approaches facilitated the analysis and interpretation of the data as part of an inductive, constant-comparison procedure aimed at identifying similarities and differences between observations to present a triangulated account of the findings in the final chapters (Corbin and Strauss, 2008; Cohen et al., 2011; Fram, 2013). Deconstructing the data enabled the researcher to reconstruct them into thematic units, which, in addition to the detailed descriptions of the context of and materials created by each participant, will form the backbone to the presentation of the findings in Chapter 5. The last step in the data analysis procedure, which entailed synthesising the categorised data into general findings and understandings, will inform the discussion in Chapter 6.
5. Presentation of the Data

5.1 Introduction
The objective of this chapter is to present the data which were collected during the field research and analysed following the procedures discussed in Chapters 3 and 4. The data are intended to ‘portray ‘what it is like’ to be in a particular situation, to catch the close-up reality and ‘thick description’ (Geertz, 1973) of participants’ lived experiences’ (Cohen et al., 2011: 290). This approach has been associated with an interpretative research tradition, in which this research is positioned. To offer insight into four Dutch teachers’ lived experiences of the materials development process, the data will be presented in the form of representative citations from the interviews and the participants’ reflective logs, sample materials, and observation notes, to support interpretations and assertions (Bachor, 2002).

To structure the data and to underline the individuality of each participant as a case, data will be presented ‘case by case’ (Klein, 2004: 97). Each section starts with a descriptive profile of the participant and their materials. Following the profile are outcomes of the data collection and analysis procedures in relation to research questions 1-5. The themes and categories which were produced as part of the analysis process will be used as headings to organise the data; as discussed in Chapter 3, they are related to the embedded units of analysis of each case. Each participant’s espoused principles will be discussed to address research question 1. The ways in which these principles were reflected in his or her materials, and guided the use of the materials in class, will be discussed to address research questions 2 and 3. Under the same category headings, the additional pedagogic principles which were reflected in the materials and during the lesson will be discussed to address research questions 4 and 5. The final section contains outcomes of the cross-case synthesis in relation to research questions 6 and 7. Again, the themes identified during the analysis phase will be used as headings.

5.2 Case 1: Helen

5.2.1 Background and Professional Context
Helen is a 47-year-old teacher of English and history who worked at other schools for nearly twenty years before she started teaching at her current school six years ago. This school offers programmes at HAVO and VWO levels (see Appendix 1). When she was the head of the English department, she promoted collegial collaboration and the standardisation of materials. She then became a Learning Support Teacher. Helen has a Master of Education, and is currently pursuing a doctorate degree. The materials Helen created for the observed lesson consisted of a board game with cue cards called The Great Grammar Game, and a PowerPoint presentation.
5.2.2 Espoused Pedagogic Principles and Principles-in-Use

Theme 1: Motivating Pupils

- Affective Engagement

Helen expressed that classroom materials should enhance pupils’ affective engagement. One way in which she made sure her own materials did was through their professional presentation, ‘so that they’re ... simply materials that look good’ (Interview-1). Adding quirky and surprising features to the materials also helped engage and motivate pupils:

I teach a lesson on the present perfect according to Donald Duck… And then they go “Well, what’s this?”... But often they do remember it because they remember the pictures of what Donald Duck is doing... and in the ELE [electronic learning environment], when they have scored well on a quiz… they’ll get a silly picture. (Interview-1)

She felt materials could engage pupils affectively by taking account of their life experiences, and regularly used the online application Socrative to evaluate their progress:

They really love that… because then they get to use their phones in the classroom. (Interview-1)

Helen’s PowerPoint, aimed at introducing The Great Grammar Game, reflected this principle through its structured layout, with the school logo on each slide, questions such as ‘What are we going to do?’, and a miniature overview of the board (see figure 5.1):

![figure 5.1. Helen’s PowerPoint, slide 3](image)

The game board and cue cards were all laminated. Each card contained sentences in the colours corresponding with the squares on the board, with the answers provided on the back (see figure 5.2):

![figure 5.2. One of Helen’s cue cards](image)
The game had the potential to engage Helen’s pupils through references to school, pets, computers, and the Simpsons. Guided by this espoused principle during the lesson, Helen engaged her pupils by repeating the rules to teams who appeared unsure how to start, and by challenging pupils to make the grammar rules explicit (e.g. Recording, 19:24-20:00).

- Active and Independent Learning
Helen allowed her pupils ‘control over their own learning through curricular decision-making’ (Lesikin, 2001: 25), a motivational strategy discussed in Chapter 2, by offering choices:

I have let them pick a book and they came up with The Fantastic Mr. Fox by Roald Dahl. And I have let them make questions [about each chapter] by themselves. (Interview-1)

She created materials which provided automated feedback so pupils could practise independently:

I have made quite a lot of [self-correcting] quizzes, with pools of questions [which] can be used time and again for practice. (Interview-1)

This type of computer-assisted feedback has been found to be among the most effective forms of feedback, and reflects a wider expansion of computer-assisted language learning (Higgins and Johns, 1984; Hattie and Timperley, 2007; Tomlinson, 2012). Other tasks encouraged pupils’ kinaesthetic engagement, like the one which required them to research and present a British tradition, such as pancake runs or maypole dancing, in a video clip (Interview-1).

This principle was reflected in the repetition of the six items on the cue cards and in the keys, which, read aloud by the quiz masters, provided instant feedback. The final PowerPoint slide promoted active learning by inviting pupils’ questions. By distributing empty sheets to complement the materials in class, Helen demonstrated that she valued pupils’ responses. The questions stimulated their input, but the position of the pawns dictated which were to be answered. When pupils asked Helen a question or challenged an answer, she encouraged them to resolve the issue themselves by throwing her hands up in the air (Recording, 26:50-27:00). The game accessories and the clusters of tables per team challenged pupils to engage with the task kinaesthetically.

- Usefulness
Helen espoused that, in order to motivate pupils, materials should be useful. Every coursebook she knew provided only minimal practice through gap-filling exercises:

It would be more useful for many pupils to have fewer assignments which they need to write down completely… than this enormous number of assignments with just filling in a word. (Interview-1)

The quizzes she developed herself met her pupils’ intelligence levels, to counter the limited and predictable exercises on the publisher’s website, for which the school did not provide a licence:
When you do the exercise the second time you will see the exact same questions... [whereas] in the ELE I will have forty questions on the present simple... Well then they have to take it often before they see the same questions. (Interview-1)

As it contained instructions on the division of pupils into teams, the role of the quiz master, and the game rules, the PowerPoint reflected this principle in practice. The game itself enabled pupils to apply their knowledge of the grammar items, learn from each other's answers and the keys, and become aware of any gaps in their knowledge. Helen pointed out that all the items in the game were grammar topics they had studied that year (Recording, 36:50), making it a useful tool for revision.

- Addressing Learner Differences
Helen created materials which were, on the one hand, intended for remedial purposes to motivate pupils who were less proficient in English and, on the other hand, challenged those who were proficient already:

That class is just very, very good... So you have to provide extra challenge, because if you only give them this [points at coursebook], you will have finished the book by Christmas. (Interview-1, see Appendix 8)

Quiz master is excellent pupils -> they are capable of evaluating answer (Log)

Offering different perspectives on the same contents for different pupils (Interview-1) can be seen as a major advantage of developing one's own classroom materials (Howard and Major, 2005).

One way in which Helen applied this principle in practice was by taking account of the needs of Dutch learners:

There are a few things we know they will do badly in advance... In Year 1 of course it's questions and negations... and also dates, they really struggle with... Because they are so different from Dutch. (Interview-1, see Appendix 8)

These grammar items were addressed on the cue cards. Numerous contexts were provided in the sentences to practise the items repeatedly, which could be interpreted as a remedial element.

- Deep Processing
Not wanting to bore her pupils with reproductive gap-filling exercises which would undermine their intelligence, Helen created her own materials to facilitate deep processing (Mishan, 2017). This, she expressed, could be achieved through productive tasks, i.e. those which focus on extensive speaking and writing:

If you're required to copy this full sentence... including the word that you need to fill in... then you will also get the spelling and everything... in your motor memory. (Interview-1)

In her log, Helen reflected that her own materials aimed at engaging her pupils through a focus on metacognition, by making them aware of mistakes they were likely to make:
Helen’s materials for the observed lesson focussed on the application and reproduction of grammar rules as opposed to productive skills. The cue cards invoked pupils’ metacognitive skills by asking them to provide rules and analyse errors. As discussed above, in class, Helen regularly challenged pupils to recognise and analyse errors, too.

**Theme 2: Supporting the Teacher**

- **Control**
  Although Helen valued her pupils’ input and encouraged their contributions, she was ultimately in charge. Materials helped her retain control over the lesson content and manage the classroom. When pupils had devised questions about Roald Dahl’s *The Fantastic Mr. Fox* for a previous lesson, she said:

  Of course I will make a few additional questions about the entire story … but then it will be an actual test. (Interview-1)

The decision to provide the correct answers as part of the game in the observed lesson illustrated this espoused principle:

  Give answers to the questions, yes or no? To be evaluated by quiz master? Better to print on the back. Leads to less discussion. (Log)

Helen’s materials could all be seen as tools to control the lesson, by providing the boundaries, rules and answer keys. Through their precise nature, they helped her stay in charge and prevent any lack of clarity. They allowed Helen to walk around the classroom and adopt the role of facilitator, taking centre stage to address the class only at the beginning, to provide instructions, and at the end, to tell the teams to write down their respective positions on the board and return the materials (Recording, 10:23-10:36; 40:14-40:18). The boundaries she had put in place ensured that the six teams remained focussed throughout the game and that there was little discussion about the answers.

- **Structure and Coverage**
  Materials, especially the coursebook, also supported Helen in structuring her lessons. This principle echoes research findings discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, which suggest that the coursebook often functions as the organiser of lesson content in the EFL classroom (Guerrettaz and Johnston, 2013). For Helen, it provided the ‘coat hooks’ on which she could hang her lessons; as a source of security, the coursebook made sure ‘things [were] taught to pupils in a very structured way’ (Interview-1). An additional function of materials in their support of the teacher was illustrated by Helen’s contemplation whether the materials would cover a 50-minute lesson (Log, as illustrated in *Appendix 6*).
In theory, the combined materials seemed to offer structure and be sufficient for one lesson: there were seven slides to introduce the game, and the 45 cue cards resulted in 270 possible questions to be answered as the pupils would move along the squares. Although the lesson started 10 minutes late due to a train delay, the PowerPoint allowed Helen to begin in a structured manner immediately (Recording, 12:27-15:25). When none of the teams managed to finish the game, her solution was to continue it next time. Putting this principle into practice, the materials Helen had intended to cover one lesson now covered two.

- **Divergence**

While Helen appreciated structure as a feature of classroom materials and as something that could be created by those materials, designing her own games and projects also helped her divert from this routine (Interview-1). She started her reflective log by stating her aim to develop extra materials for grammar practice, and followed by weighing up the following two strategies:

- Worksheet -> they do often already
- Game -> they never do, may be more fun and also more interesting for pupils who do understand everything

Both the rigid structure of the coursebook, referred to by Helen as a ‘straightjacket’, and the sheer number of exercises offered in it, allowed her to divert (Interview-1). The accessories of The Great Grammar Game supported her in creating variation and teaching grammar differently.

- **Self-Expression**

Creating her own materials, together with her colleagues at the English department, seemed to make Helen proud:

> The sentences are based on this coursebook… but have been designed in such a way that they’re truly ours… (Interview-1)

Materials development, by allowing her to add her own touch, seemed to be a craft which supported her in expressing herself creatively.

> They do know what we will be doing in class… But how it will ultimately turn out, no they don’t know that… That’s what they are going to find out. [laughs] (Interview-1)

The fact that the materials had been designed from scratch, as well as the use of colour and an image of the board (see figure 5.1 above), revealed that they facilitated creative expression. During the lesson, Helen appeared to enjoy how her pupils responded to the materials by engaging with the game, which she confirmed in the follow-up interview. She nodded approvingly when she overheard correct answers, and appeared pleased with the game she had created (Observation sheet).
Responsiveness

Creating classroom materials or adapting those at her disposal not only allowed Helen to answer to her pupils’ need for remedial exercises, as discussed above; it also helped her respond to their appeal to do something different for a change:

After a few weeks they will have had enough of [the coursebook] and then you’ll think of something new. (Interview-1)

Her materials supported her in responding to the needs and wants of as many pupils as possible:

Just questions and negations? That is too easy for some. Quiz game with a variety of types of questions? Is interesting for more pupils. (Log)

Testing and Assessment

Materials, including comprehension questions she created in the application Socrative, offered Helen a means of checking transfer and progress (Interview-1). She and her colleagues also complemented the tests offered by the coursebook with their own assignments:

We always have a free translation assignment included... Those are not literal sentences from the coursebook. And that’s where they do get a bit of freedom to say it somewhat in their own words. (Interview-1)

This espoused principle was reflected in Helen’s materials through the squares on the board, which could help assess pupils’ progress literally: the further they reached, the more questions they would have answered correctly. Their explicit knowledge of grammar rules was formatively tested through the questions on the cue cards, as discussed above. These questions were aimed at assessing her pupils’ explicit knowledge of grammar rules:

What is the rule? this these, much / many, some / any > because important to know the rule and not apply ‘instinctively’ ...important that they can name the tenses (Log)

Helen herself did not provide feedback on their answers, nor did pupils receive a mark for their participation or final score.

5.3 Case 2: Mitch

5.3.1 Background and Professional Context

Mitch is a 54-year-old teacher at a school which offers bilingual programmes at HAVO and VWO levels (see Appendix 1) in so-called English streams, in which most subjects are taught in English. Mitch first studied music, then enrolled in a part-time teacher education programme and completed his Master’s degree. He worked as a substitute teacher at a dozen schools before moving to Australia, where he lived for five years. He comes across as a knowledgeable, self-reliant teacher with high regard for his
pupils. The materials Mitch created for the observed lesson consisted of a handout with questions about a 60-minute documentary on Australia’s Great Barrier Reef, and an answer sheet.

5.3.2 Espoused Pedagogic Principles and Principles-in-Use

Theme 1: Creating an Authentic Learning Experience

- Authentic L2 Input

Mitch’s main motive for creating his own classroom materials was to compensate for the contrived nature of many published materials (Tomlinson, 2012):

> In coursebooks I feel the materials can be so artificial, so fake... It gives me curly toes. I’d much rather use real materials at an appropriate level. (Interview-1)

He repeatedly contrasted the publishers’ ‘phony business’ to authentic L2 materials, which he considered ‘much more valuable’ (Interview-1). The examples he gave in the first interview were of reading English teen novels and newspaper articles, and watching a teen television series, with the aim to answer questions about them. If authentic EFL classroom materials are defined as those produced for purposes other than to teach language, then the documentary could be called authentic: it was broadcast for an audience interested in the Great Barrier Reef, not for Dutch pupils improving their English listening proficiency (Nunan, 1988; Gilmore, 2007).

By the same definition, Mitch’s handout would not qualify as being authentic. However, it did reflect this espoused principle to some extent, as it offered pupils written input in English, and only the word ‘shallow’ was translated for their understanding (see figure 5.3):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Great Barrier Reef Listening Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(the real thing)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Why are plants able to grow in the shallow (ondiep) water?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What land animal is the dugong or sea cow related to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How much sea grass does the dugong eat every day?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*figure 5.3. Part of Mitch’s handout with questions*

Using it as the main medium of instruction during the lesson, Mitch asked the pupils some introductory questions to refresh their memories on where the Great Barrier Reef is located, and why it has a tropical climate, in English (Recording, 3:21). Forms of non-linguistic authentic input were an Australian flag and map on the classroom walls.
- Form

What made Mitch’s materials unique was ‘they’re always a bit clumsily made’ (Interview-1). He valued their authentic contents more than their layout:

> When you copy a newspaper article and enlarge it and it covers two pages across the centre… I can never quite get it straight… So it’s always a bit sloppy. But the part it’s all about is there. So the real material. (Interview-1)

The recording of the documentary included the final minutes of a sports programme, commercials, and the start of the television programme Top Gear. Mitch later explained that this was because his DVD recorder did not allow him to cut and paste very precisely. He reflected on this ‘adventurous’ process in his log, as illustrated in Appendix 6. The principle was also reflected through two typing errors on the handout: sftr (after) and train (rain). His materials could be described as objects ‘possessing specificity and character’, which Sennett (2008: 104) regards as the result of craftsmanship. In class, Mitch drew his pupils’ attention to one of the typing errors, and a pupil pointed out the other one.

- Topics of Interest

Mitch considered it important that classroom materials matched his pupils’ interests:

> We used [English coursebook] for a few years… But it was typically aimed at adult learners… So twelve-year-old children would be making sentences like “The secretary…”; you know, “has bought flowers for her boss”… Well, that really wasn’t appropriate. (Interview-1)

The authenticity of coursebook topics has been found to impact on pupils’ engagement and willingness to communicate (Siegel, 2014). The novels Mitch selected for his pupils for previous lessons could enhance their authentic learning experience by appealing to their interests: they involved teenagers, and the one they were reading now was a detective novel (Interview-1). In his reflective log, Mitch described his initial plan to record ‘children’s programmes’. Later, he explained that because the documentary was broadcast in the early evening, he assumed it would be appropriate for the observed lesson (Interview-2). After the lesson, some of his pupils approached him to share their own stories and questions, which confirmed the appeal of the topic for him.

- Comprehensiveness

By using written and spoken English, Mitch aimed to provide his pupils with comprehensive input so they ‘are brought face to face with all the aspects of the language’ (Interview-1):

> When you take a listening test from the coursebook, people talk in an unnaturally slow manner, they talk with a fake American accent… When you record something from TV… they will talk fast or slowly, or high-pitched or low-pitched, or a man or a woman, and [in] any dialect. (Interview-1)
In addition to focussing on variation within the language, Mitch facilitated authentic learning experiences through multimedia projects showing variation between modalities of language (Interview-1). Such an approach can have positive effects on language production and interpretation (Gilakjani et al., 2011).

In line with this principle, the documentary familiarised Mitch’s pupils with various aspects of the English language and offered a multimodal view of it. The presenter spoke in an English accent, understanding of which was facilitated by the underwater images. Only the name of the presenter, the documentary title and its subtitle were shown in writing. The question sheet offered written support, with words like dugong and casuariy spelt out. It may have helped pupils practise their reading skills and taught them implicitly about subject-verb inversion in interrogative sentences.

- Pushed L2 Output

To support his pupils to move beyond the materials towards more authentic communication, Mitch and his colleagues regularly created materials with the aim to engage pupils in extended speaking assignments (Interview-1).

The open-ended questions on the handout were created by Mitch to push his pupils’ L2 output. Some, like ‘Why is the casuariy said to be the most dangerous bird?’, elicited a full clause. For others, a number or short phrase would suffice, as confirmed on the answer sheet. The handout did not instruct pupils to answer in English. Guided by this principle, Mitch elicited one-word answers to some introductory questions about the Great Barrier Reef at the start of the lesson. He instructed his pupils to make their answers to the listening test as short as possible and to not write on the handout (Recording, 4:48, 7:00).

Theme 2: Gradual Advancement

- Challenging Proficient Pupils

Mitch emphasised that materials should challenge pupils to maximise their learning potential:

> I feel that when they have to write down something themselves, I feel that is actually better than when they have to choose multiple choice. Because they need to think for themselves. They need to listen and write. (Interview-2)

This applied especially to his pupils in the English stream, who seemed to be proficient already: they were taught all the English verb tenses except the past perfect in Year 1, which was ‘completely different’ from what pupils in the regular Dutch programme did (Interview-1), and ‘should be well able’ to pass the listening test he had designed for them (Interview-2).

The materials seemed to reflect this principle and appeal to pupils’ learning potential by offering L2 input in the form of a documentary on a topic which might be considered specialist. It included words like barren, furrow, encroached, and the names of species living in the reef, such as
sea urchin. As these words do not occur in Brezina and Gablasova’s (2015) New General Service List, a comparison of four language corpora, they can be considered low-frequency. The question sheet elicited L2 output through open-ended rather than multiple-choice questions. In class, Mitch provided corrective feedback to one pupil’s pronunciation of the word Australia (Recording, 3:30). He scaffolded the learning experience by instructing pupils to have a quick look at the sheet and tell him if there were words on it which they did not understand before they started the test (7:02-7:23).

- Increasing Levels of Difficulty
The materials Mitch used seemed to help him advance the level of the pupils in his classroom by, on the one hand, exposing them to increasingly difficult input:

First we read an extremely easy booklet. But that’s when these children have just come in, when they’re all still panicking, [having] moved from a Dutch to English environment… Then quite quickly after that a booklet which is a bit more demanding.

and, on the other hand, eliciting increasingly difficult output with increasingly less guidance in the speaking assignments discussed above:

At first what the one person says has been printed and they will have to complete the second person… I believe they have to make sixteen conversations… And the further… they have to do both sides. Then the instructions tell them what has to be in it and they have to work that out in the conversation. (Interview-1)

The gradual advancement of his pupils’ EFL knowledge and skills was also reflected in the fact that Mitch assessed their work increasingly strictly. He used the same materials and the same question types to test listening skills in different forms, but was more lenient in assessing the work of his first-form pupils (Interview-2).

Theme 3: Optimising Teaching Conditions

- Collectivity versus Individuality
The materials created by Mitch and his colleagues were shared on an online platform, and agreement was reached on the grammar topics which would be discussed and tested (Interview-1).

Within the department we exchange lots of things. But we don’t make a fuss about “This is my copyright” or things like that… We give it to each other. (Interview-1)

When asked whether his recording and question sheet were also being used by his colleagues, Mitch replied:

That’s where it gets complicated, because I’m leaving this team. So you’re actually the only one who has this… [chuckles] They we use several things I made over the years. I can draw their attention to this and then they can have it. (Interview-2)

Mitch was not always happy to use the ‘limited’ materials made by one of his colleagues, and enjoyed
the freedom to make his own decisions about how to present the contents of her syllabus (Interview-1). He described this as being ‘the boss in your own classroom’ (Interview-1).

Mitch was the teacher of the only Year 1 HAVO class in the English stream, which allowed him the freedom to create materials especially for them (Interview-2, see Appendix 1). After the documentary had started, he took up his position next to the classroom door (Recording, 12:48) to keep an eye on the screen and on his pupils during the listening test.

- Atmosphere

Mitch made clear that he believed that a pleasant classroom atmosphere, based on a sense of ‘mutual trust’, was conducive to learning:

When the classroom is a sociable place to be, it always promotes production. That’s sort of my basic principle. (Interview-1)

An example of the role his materials played in contributing to this atmosphere was provided in his reflective log, in which Mitch described his quest for a suitable television programme for a listening test. He started with an episode of Spring Watch, a programme with a high rate of speech and jokes which give it a ‘feel good’ character (Log). When the speech rate definitely proved to be too high, Mitch turned towards a previously recorded documentary instead.

Because he had a hearing impairment, Mitch always insisted on silence in his classroom, which he half-jokingly considered to be ‘convenient’ (Interview-1). He expressed that visual and aural materials automatically captured his pupils’ attention:

When it’s dark and there is a large screen and there is good-quality sound which is loud enough, then everyone will basically be silent… Children, when the TV is turned on will be like… [mimics a child in trance], right?… But that is not something that I have to take care of, it’s in the materials themselves. (Interview-2)

The documentary, the questions and the picture of the Great Barrier Reef on the handout were factual in nature. During the lesson, Mitch was guided by this principle as he engaged his pupils in discussions, and they appeared to be captivated by the documentary on the screen (Observation sheet). Reflecting on the lesson in the follow-up interview, Mitch himself described a scene in which a group of pearl fish was shown to hide inside a sea cucumber, which caused great amusement.

5.4 Case 3: Phoebe

5.4.1 Background and Professional Context

Phoebe is 45 years old and has just started teaching English. She used to be an executive secretary, decided on a career change, and completed her part-time Bachelor’s degree a year ago. She teaches at an urban school close to a city centre, which offers programmes at HAVO and VWO levels (see Appendix 1). Phoebe comes across as eager to learn, well-organised, excited about her pupils and the
subject she teaches, yet lacking in confidence about her classroom management skills. The materials she created for the observed lesson consisted of a PowerPoint presentation, and a printed version of this presentation as a handout. The first two pages of this handout are presented in Appendix 7. Phoebe also used an excerpt of the 2008 film *Slumdog Millionaire*.

5.4.2 Espoused Pedagogic Principles and Principles-in-Use

**Theme 1: Enhancing Affective and Social Engagement**

- **Sharing a Passion**

Phoebe claimed to have a passion for the English language and for English as a versatile school subject (Interview-1). One of her motives for developing materials was to promote ‘that passion’ in her pupils:

> ...to have a stimulating effect on the enthusiasm for the subject. It’s a core subject. They take it here at school for five, six years... So I feel it is important to explain it at the basis in a fun way... as opposed to just being... compulsory. (Interview-1)

Phoebe’s excitement about *Slumdog Millionaire*, her assignments, and English, were reflected in the handout through the list of awards the film had won, exclamation marks, and references to multisensory and multimodal experiences and tasks, including those which focussed on making a photo documentary. On the final slide, Phoebe offered recommendations for pupils interested in reading more from the author on whose book the film was based (see figure 5.4):

![figure 5.4. Phoebe’s PowerPoint, slide 18](image)

In class, Phoebe was guided by this principle, too: she herself seemed captivated by the film excerpt (Recording, 26:42-45:42), smiling at funny utterances and making eye contact with pupils to share those moments (28:25, 43:32).

- **Pupils’ Commitment**

Phoebe wanted her pupils to be committed to the subject. She expressed that creative activities aimed at ‘brightening up’ her lessons helped ‘strengthen that commitment’ (Interview-1). She seemed to acknowledge that pupils’ commitment to attaining academic goals cannot be assumed and needs
to be developed (Hattie and Timperley, 2007). Her materials were aimed at engaging them despite their short attention span (Log).

You can engage them... really only for ten minutes maybe. So I’d like to include other methods, apps, videos. (Interview-1)

This principle was reflected in Phoebe’s choice for a film with fast-paced and vibrant scenes, and in the assignments on the handout, which elicited their understanding of the contents of the film, their analysis of its title and themes, and their personal reflections. Room for answers was provided after each question, so pupils would be physically engaged with the materials, too (see figure 5.5).

You can engage them... really only for ten minutes maybe. So I’d like to include other methods, apps, videos. (Interview-1)

This principle was reflected in Phoebe’s choice for a film with fast-paced and vibrant scenes, and in the assignments on the handout, which elicited their understanding of the contents of the film, their analysis of its title and themes, and their personal reflections. Room for answers was provided after each question, so pupils would be physically engaged with the materials, too (see figure 5.5).

7. YOUR OPINION

This film was: Gucci, Romantic, or... (Try your best to describe the scene, emotive, romantic or...)

1. On which basis criteria can you agree the most? Write down your answer.

2. On which criteria can you disagree the least? Write down your answer.

figure 5.5. Phoebe’s PowerPoint, slide 10

In class, Phoebe was guided by this principle as she asked pupils to read out loud and involved the class with questions like ‘Can we continue with exercise 4?’ (Recording, 17:02). She invoked their creativity when emphasising that there was no right or wrong answer to the assignment which elicited an alternative film title (19:37). After the observation, she expressed positive feelings about pupils’ commitment to the lesson (Observation sheet).

- Current Life Experiences

Phoebe’s own materials were attuned to her pupils’ current life experiences in terms of topics, themes and level; she chose what she considered to be suitable illustrations and examples to this effect (Interview-1). In her reflective log, she made this consideration explicit when discussing the decision to use a film. This principle seemed important to Phoebe for another reason, too:

You have to have [their] public support… If there’s a whole group of them and you are there on your own and you give them something which completely misses the mark, then you’ve got some serious pulling and pushing to do. (Interview-2)

Phoebe saw a direct link between the extent to which her materials took account of the social world of her pupils, and the extent to which she felt she could manage the classroom.

The materials for the observed lesson reflected this principle. Most pupils would be familiar with the Dutch version of the television quiz show Who Wants To Be a Millionaire?, which plays a big role in the film, and recognise character traits of its teenage protagonist. The question ‘What does the
abbreviation Q&A stand for in real-life?’ on slide 6 made explicit reference to pupils’ experiences. During the lesson, Phoebe told pupils to check some of their answers on the Internet for homework (Recording, 8:33-8:55). This potentially appealed to these ‘digital natives’, for whom ‘the Internet, cell phones and instant messaging are integral parts of their lives’ (Prensky, 2001: 1).

- Connecting to the World
Phoebe wanted her materials to extend beyond pupils’ existing life experiences and lead to their social engagement. The materials should contain a universal message:

Themes like sustainability, exploitation… That pupils know about those things… That it’s not just about English but that there’s also an actual message behind it. (Interview-1)

EFL classroom materials should emphasise the role of English as a global language with the power to connect people across cultures (Interview-1). Phoebe created them for pupils to ‘acquire and deepen general knowledge of countries and the relationship with English and the United Kingdom’ (Log).

Phoebe chose Slumdog Millionaire and incorporated universal themes like karma, poverty and hope in the assignments on slide 5. The film could be said to contain a universal message of dealing with and overcoming prejudice. Intercultural elements of English as a global language were shown in the warm-up exercise which drew out pupils’ background knowledge on India as a former British colony, and through references to the Taj Mahal, India’s currency, and awards like Oscars and BAFTAs. Intercultural awareness was also addressed in the discussion statement ‘If the story took place in a different country it wouldn’t have been a bestseller’.

Theme 2: Planning and Presenting the Curriculum
- Central Focus on Form
Grammar was a central feature for Phoebe. It constituted a major part of the coursebook and her own materials used in previous lessons:

Explaining grammar of course is a substantial part of the English lessons… eighty per cent of the lesson. (Interview-1)

Although Phoebe expressed a wish for sufficient variation in focus to compensate for the ‘heavier, theoretical grammar part’, she added that it was incorporated in all the texts she used (Interview-1).

Contrary to most materials used and developed by Phoebe, the film and the PowerPoint made no reference to grammar. Her focus on form was revealed in class when she corrected a pupil’s pronunciation (Recording, 6:10, 6:22). Another pupil thought he had discovered a grammar error on slide 5, which read ‘Why do the police...’ (14:43). Phoebe’s quick response could be interpreted as a sign that she had anticipated this question about form; in Dutch, the collective noun ‘police’ is singular, whereas in English it is always followed by a plural verb (Bouckaert and Ederveen, 2014).
• Presentation-Practice-Production

When asked how she used the coursebook in her lessons, Phoebe explained:

You start with a text… in which grammar is used. And then I will explain that… that’s what you then practise with afterwards with the coursebook, in all kinds of exercises. And you conclude with a self-test, whether pupils have actually understood it. (Interview-1)

This pedagogic approach, identified as a commonly used framework in EFL classrooms (Anderson, 2016), is known as PPP: the teacher starts with the plenary presentation of a language feature, pupils practise the rule with the help of controlled exercises, and finally they apply it when producing open-ended stretches of text.

Phoebe’s personal, traditional schooling experiences seemed to be the source of this pedagogic principle (Opfer and Pedder, 2011; Sahin and Yildirim, 2016). She was aware of the existence of other pedagogic theories, but because the PPP-approach had worked for her, she still considered it ‘kind of essential to let grammar sink in properly’ (Interview-1) and use it in her materials.

• Pre-structured Presentation

As a former executive secretary, Phoebe used her organisational skills in her lesson planning, to create materials that would help present the lesson in a ‘clear’ and ‘structured’ fashion:

I can just look at the screen… what I want to say… There is no need for me to keep my attention focussed on the lesson content all the time… So I can keep the class in order… Those PowerPoints help me teach more easily. (Interview-1)

While pupils were entering the classroom, Phoebe selected the starting point of the film excerpt and the first PowerPoint slide (Recording, 1:47). To help out a pupil who was unsure which countries share a border with India, she returned to the correct slide, then reminded him that the handout contained the same map for reference (11:20-11:32). When introducing the next part of the film, she told the class that they could now answer the question about the Taj Mahal (23:50). Reflecting this espoused principle, the combined materials thus formed the backbone to the lesson.

• Visual Support

One of the key characteristics of materials for Phoebe was that they visualised the lesson content:

There are a lot of children with dyslexia. Just talking… won’t get you there… You need to dress it up. (Interview-1)

Because Phoebe’s own children suffered from dyslexia, too, she knew that ‘when you visualise it or when it is auditory, that helps them process it much better than written words’ (Interview-2). She considered it a shame that the coursebook did not allow her to show anything on the screen, and created her own PowerPoints to compensate (Interview-1).

The film and the PowerPoint both offered full-colour visual input, complemented with English
subtitles and auditory input of spoken English in the film. The tangible handout offered another form of visual support, which pupils seemed to be focussed on more than the presentation (Observation sheet). This principle was also reflected in the pictures on the handout, most of which supported the questions (as illustrated in figure 5.4 above). Guided by her espoused principle, Phoebe regularly pointed at the slides. After having started the film excerpt, she increased the volume and let down the blinds to maximise the quality of the input.

- **Filling Time**
  The coursebook used by Phoebe and her colleagues usually covered one academic year (Interview-1). This year, due to the late start of the summer holiday in her region, she noted in her reflective log that:

  > The contents of the coursebook will have been covered approximately 2 weeks before the end of the academic year.

Having time to spare gave Phoebe the opportunity and motive to develop her own materials (Interview-1). It seemed to allow her to focus on language skills and creative assignments instead of grammar for a change, as reflected in the materials for the observed lesson. As discussed in relation to the first theme, *enhancing affective and social engagement*, this also applied to individual lessons; her own creative assignments served to ‘brighten up’ those lessons (Interview-1).

**Theme 3: Professional Growth**

The categories presented and discussed below were identified for this theme as espoused principles; they were not reflected in Phoebe’s materials, nor did they noticeably guide how she used them.

- **Finding Out ‘What Works’**
  Having just finished her Bachelor’s degree, Phoebe claimed to be in the process of discovering English as a school subject; she described her own materials as work in progress, as ‘working’ and ‘living’ documents (Interviews 1 and 2). They enabled her as a novice teacher to gain experience regarding what worked in practice. She would notice when materials did not work as expected:

    > That it makes perfect sense to me, but when I then explain it they don’t understand. (Interview-1)

Opfer and Pedder (2011) refer to this kind of ‘dissonance between personal expectations and sense of efficacy’ as a ‘possibility for teacher learning to occur’ (388). Phoebe intended to keep working on a period overview of grammar topics, which she handed out to pupils and posted in the ELE:

  > If I want to use it again next year… I will definitely use it again. But then I will brighten it up, adapt it… My intention is to keep drawing on that. (Interview-1)

So once the materials had been created, they would remain a source of input and development.
Fitting In

Lastly, materials development could be seen as a means for Phoebe to fit in with the school and department culture. On the one hand, she said:

There is a plan for what you need to do each lesson. And that is basically just completely full… And that’s what I follow. And also, it’s my first year teaching here… I abide by the rules. (Interview-1)

She used materials agreed upon at school, which included the coursebook and grammar exercises concluding each unit (Interview-1). On the other hand, Phoebe experienced room to develop materials, and doing so seemed to help her fit in, too. Her contemplations illustrated that school norms and practices ‘both enable and constrain teachers’ (Opfer and Pedder, 2011: 390). She called it an ‘assignment’ from her English colleagues to develop a lesson sequence, which ‘gave’ her freedom to create what she wanted (Log). By involving them in her pedagogic decisions, she gained support from the teachers and pupils at her school (Log).

5.5 Case 4: Shaun

5.5.1 Background and Professional Context

Shaun is a 30-year-old teacher at a VMBO-school (see Appendix 1) which offers pre-vocational profiles in Health and Wellbeing, Engineering, Agriculture, and Administration. He started working there as an unqualified teacher completing his Bachelor’s degree eight years ago. Quite a few of his pupils have learning difficulties, caused by dyslexia or autism spectrum disorders. Shaun feels that teaching the subject is of secondary importance to establishing rapport with them. His materials consisted of a handout with rules and exercises on using ‘some’ and ‘any’ (which can be found in Appendix 7), and a lesson overview to be projected on the smartboard. He also used vocabulary lists, a dialogue, and a recording of that dialogue from the coursebook.

5.5.2 Espoused Pedagogic Principles and Principles-in-Use

Theme 1: Tailoring to Pupils’ Individual Needs

Measured Input

Shaun repeatedly referred to the low proficiency level of the pupils at his school (Interviews 1 and 2). One way in which he addressed their needs was to offer them exercises in ‘small portions’:

I couldn’t tell them “Now write about your entire holiday”… You really have to… small bits and pieces and then make it clear that “Now you’re going to write a story with the grammar points we’ve practised over the past three weeks”. (Interview-1)

This pedagogic principle was illustrated by the three sections on the handout which presented the

---

* During the member check, Phoebe commented: ‘Especially Opfer and Pedder aptly illustrate the dilemma I experience in wishing to innovate at my school while also being tied to the prescribed curriculum’ (Personal communication, 5/10/2016).
grammar rules for some/any, somebody/anybody, and something/anything. *Figure 5.6* below depicts the first section:

![Grammar rules](image)

*Figure 5.6. Part of Shaun’s handout (front)*

The sections were identical in structure: they introduced the words concerned, then offered translations, explanations, symbols indicating ‘(+)' for confirmative, ‘(-)' for negative, and ‘ (?) ’ for interrogative, and three examples with the symbols repeated. The five exercises at the back contained five sentences each. None of the English sentences on the handout exceeded ten words. The lesson overview listed the classroom activities in short chunks, too (see *figure 5.7*):

This lesson:
- Words SB 1 + 2
- Game: could you spell that? (1 minute per round)
- TB p.26-27 What do we see?
- Were you ever injured?
- Listening exercises
- Grammar: some/any
- Exercises

*Figure 5.7. Video still from Shaun’s lesson observation showing the lesson overview*

Throughout the lesson, this principle guided Shaun as he prepared pupils for what was coming. He scaffolded any new activity, concluded his instructions to every phase by asking if there were any questions, and checked the answers to each assignment before continuing (Observation sheet). The duration of each activity was restricted to ten minutes. When introducing the game in which pupils needed to spell as many words from the vocabulary lists as they could in a minute, he presented the rules chronologically, and projected a stopwatch on the screen to mark the time (Recording, 10:27). When introducing the handout, he revealed that the final exercise would combine all the grammar points, but ‘we start off very easy’ (43:16).
Differentiated Instruction and Practice

The pedagogic approach used by Shaun entailed ‘working on different levels’, providing tailor-made practice to pupils (Interview-1). He would put pupils into three proficiency groups, which received a set of materials with either a detailed explanation, some general guidelines, or no explanation at all. This is a common strategy in differentiated classrooms, where ‘varied and accommodating’ methods cater for pupils with different abilities (Chaves Gomes, 2012: 20). At Shaun’s school, materials could be aimed at a particular level (Log), a class, or an individual pupil (Interview-1):

When it appears that it is not feasible… you do have the freedom to take a step back and take it more slowly. (Interview-1)

The materials themselves did not differentiate between proficiency levels. During the lesson, Shaun was guided by this principle when he offered auditory support in the form of translations, synonyms, and paraphrased instructions. Some of his strategies to offer visual support were selecting and crossing out activities on the smartboard (Recording, 4:14), projecting the publisher’s website and the handout (28:38, 36:55), and showing coursebook pages and the handout to the class (26:16-27:30). Furthermore, Shaun put his pedagogic principle of differentiation into practice by providing individual pupils with an explanation (45:12-46:44) and a clean copy of the handout to discuss with their tutor (Observation sheet).

Current and Future Life Experiences

Shaun expressed that the contents of classroom materials should match the interests and experiences of his pre-vocational pupils (Interviews 1 and 2). When they had already decided on one of the pre-vocational profiles, he would choose and create materials with that particular field of interest in mind:

If I were to introduce the technical details of a tractor to a Health and Wellbeing class… well, then these girls will look at me eyes wide open and think ‘Why do I need to read anything about a tractor?’. (Interview-1)

However, ‘the final exam will also contain texts which do not interest them at all’ (Interview-1), so they needed to learn to deal with alternative topics through the materials, too. Either approach would seem to incorporate topics intended to ‘better prepare students for the ‘world out there’, as proposed by Siegel (2014: 374), amongst others.

During the lesson, Shaun related the content of the coursebook dialogue to pupils’ personal experiences in a planned class discussion. They were challenged to ‘think about what might happen if you don’t watch out’ (Recording, 25:19), and imagine an accident at school. General first aid strategies were also discussed.
**Theme 2: Preparing for Tests and Final Exams**

- **Matching Current Attainment Levels**

  Shaun identified a lack of fit between existing materials and the pupils’ current attainment levels:

  The materials which are offered are either too simple… All they have to do is choose between two options… and it will be clear from the start which option is correct… or… far too complicated… so that pupils are at a complete loss. (Interview-1)

  Shaun was conscious of the constraints of teaching lower-proficiency groups for him as a materials developer:

  I can create fun materials which involve working with lyrics, but if they don’t understand the first three lines of the song, then what’s the use? (Interview-1)

  Reflecting this principle in practice, Shaun’s handout seemed to be attuned to what his Year 2 pupils ‘need to know’ (Interview-1). National objectives for the lower two forms require that pupils learn to use strategies to search for, extract, and evaluate information in spoken and written English texts, which includes recognising and interpreting signals (Trimbos, 2007). Pupils should thus be able to understand the use of symbols and punctuation marks in Shaun’s exercises on using ‘some’ and ‘any’.

- **Repeated Practice**

  Shaun used a lot of repetition and structure in his materials, which ‘really suits this level’ (Interview-1). Especially when it came to grammar, his pupils benefited from repeated opportunities to practise (Log). It was what Shaun expected coursebooks to offer, yet failed to find in them:

  Experience in practice teaches us that pupils at [this VMBO-level] consider the explanation in the book too concise and that the exercises in the coursebook are too small and too few. (Log)

  [The coursebook] offers hardly any practice material… and grammar repetition. (Interview-1)

  A recent survey found that compensating what the coursebook lacks is a common motive for VMBO teachers to engage in materials development (Dutch Institute for Curriculum Development, SLO, 2016; see Appendix 1). Discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, this strategy of ‘simply making new exercises’ (Interview-1) was used by Shaun to compensate for the lack of repeated practice, too.

  Shaun’s handout with explanations and exercises reflected the espoused principle of repetition. The rules and the instructions for pupils used the same words and symbols six times. In the final exercise, the instructions were repeated and rephrased again (see figure 5.8):
In class, Shaun was guided by this principle when he asked his pupils, ‘as always’, to repeat the words from the vocabulary lists after him (Recording, 5:46-8:05). This drilling practice seemed to emulate behaviourist teaching methodologies (Littlejohn, 2012), with pupils trying to mimic his accent and intonation. Shaun repeated many of his instructions involving the materials (Recording, 26:30-27:30). He drew pupils’ attention to the fact that the dialogue recording contained a lot of repetition, and that the answer to one of the listening comprehension questions was depicted in the coursebook (32:56).

- Application of Recently Acquired Knowledge
As discussed earlier, Shaun consciously assigned tasks which allowed his pupils to put what they had just learnt into practice:

> Anytime we have covered a bit of grammar… let’s take the present simple, for example, then at the end of the story… they will get a writing assignment which requires them to use that tense (Interview-1).

Both newly acquired grammar structures and vocabulary were tested by means of communicative tasks involving one of the language skills:

> You start off with an exercise with words to build that vocabulary, right? So I’d give them ten words relating to a text about engineering. Ten words, which they need to know, use in a few exercises… and then they will get a short text and it’s about engineering. (Interview-1)

The front of the handout used in the observed lesson provided pupils with the rules they would need to apply in the exercises at the back. When introducing the second exercise, Shaun told his pupils to ‘cheat’ by peeking at the front (Recording, 48:29). He promoted logical reasoning in deciding which multiple-choice answer was correct (Observation sheet). The materials did not contain any communicative tasks for pupils to express themselves by using these grammar points.

- Meeting National Standards
One of Shaun’s main concerns seemed to be that materials should help him prepare his pupils for their final exams in Year 4: he referred to them twelve times during the interviews. The reason Shaun used
dictionaries in class, for example, was to teach pupils how to consult one during their English exam (Interview-1). In the Netherlands, this exam is a national, standardised test with an emphasis on reading comprehension skills (Dutch Institute for the Development of Testing, CITO, 2016; Governmental College for Testing and Exams, CvTE, 2016).

The dialogue recording featured voices with a variety of comprehensible English accents (Recording, 30:26-32:40), which pupils at this level should get used to and be able to understand according to the national core objectives (Trimbos, 2007; SLO, 2015c). Shaun himself also offered spoken L2 input to start the lesson, mark some of the transitions, and read his materials out loud (e.g. Recording, 3:05, 4:27). While distributing the handout, he referred to the upcoming test and his pupils’ future needs for these grammar points in writing assignments.

**Theme 3: Stimulating Collaboration**

- **Between Pupils**

  Shaun recently explored alternatives to the ‘outdated’ coursebook he and his colleagues used before (Interview-1). When asked what outdated meant to him, he compared the two coursebooks:

  [The older coursebook] assumes that pupils are independent learners... work on their own, do a lot of assignments by themselves... They are not allowed to discuss with their peers... [Yet] that’s what these children would prefer... [The new coursebook] expects a lot of collaboration between pupils (Interview-1)

  Shaun wanted materials to stimulate collaborative learning (Johnson et al., 1991). The change of coursebook meant that Shaun’s role had evolved from ‘needing to help out lots of pupils, while another pupil could do that’, to ‘monitoring and making sure that they actually do it’ (Interview-1).

  Throughout the lesson, Shaun stimulated involvement and contributions from the entire class. The only time when pupils worked in pairs was when they played the game revolving around the vocabulary lists in the coursebook. The materials themselves lacked instructions to working and learning collaboratively.

- **Among Colleagues**

  Shaun frequently used the word ‘we’. When asked whether we referred to him and his colleagues at the English department, Shaun confirmed that they exchanged their materials all the time:

  Someone will propose an idea, like ‘well, I found this video and it’s so much fun for Year 2’. So then we’ll all watch it and be like, ‘yes, that would be great fun for them indeed’... We have been working together a lot more and spending less time on our separate islands. (Interview-1)

  For Shaun, it made perfect sense that materials were shared, especially among colleagues teaching parallel classes:
Usually when I can use it, so can my colleague... I always ask my colleague who also teaches Year 4 classes to check whether it's appropriate... So it has actually become a kind of collaborative project. (Interview-1)

In the follow-up interview, Shaun revealed that his handout for the observed lesson had been shared on an online platform.

- Uniformity

When asked how his own classroom materials could be recognised and what characterised them, Shaun replied:

That’s tricky, because we try to create a sense of uniformity in the materials we offer. So when I make something then it will be moulded to a kind of format... It’s the same with tests, they all have the same heading... They all look exactly the same. (Interview-1)

The materials used at the English department were not only printed in the same font type, but also on coloured paper, ‘so pupils will know right away ‘this is an English test’’ (Interview-1). The aim of this uniform layout was to provide consistent clarity for the pupils across the school’s departments. This espoused principle of uniformity was illustrated in practice by the font type, the use of capitalised, bold, and underlined words, and the pale yellow colour of Shaun’s handout.

5.6 Cross-Case Synthesis

As discussed in Chapters 3 and 4, to complement the within-case analysis of the data for each case, this case study approach included a cross-case analysis with the aim to present an exploratory, interpretative synthesis of the data (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Strauss and Corbin, 1990). Following John (2002), this synthesis incorporates the more general findings, whilst respecting the individual perspectives of the participants, in relation to research questions 6 and 7. The first two sections discuss when and how the teachers’ espoused pedagogic principles and their principles-in-use, as well as the differences and similarities between them, were revealed during the materials development process. The third section presents and discusses data which addresses the question to what extent an awareness of these principles emerged and critical reflection took place. In addition to general observations, the six ‘key discourse topics’ (Cameron et al., 2009: 74) emerging from the data will be used as headings. The citations in this section are all taken from the follow-up interviews, unless otherwise specified.

5.6.1 When and How Espoused Principles are Revealed

General Observations

The participants’ espoused principles regarding the role and function of classroom materials in EFL teaching and learning were primarily revealed in the first interview conducted with each of them, and
in their reflective logs. To some extent, the two interviews were considered informative in revealing their pedagogic principles:

[The questions may have helped me] look at things from a different perspective. And then afterwards, you start reflecting ‘Yes, this is what I want, and is this also how I do it?’ But I had never thought about that before… So in hindsight, it was a valuable conversation for me. (Shaun)

The teachers’ principles were sometimes revealed through metaphors, used in different data sources to discuss the role and function of their materials. As discussed in Chapter 4, the metaphors illustrate that the participants resorted to implicit meanings in the interviews and logs to express their principles, which were not necessarily tacit. Participants expressed, for instance, that classroom materials can help pupils ‘freshen up’ previously acquired knowledge (Helen; Phoebe), let grammar ‘sink in’ (Phoebe, Interview-1; Shaun, Log), and ‘build’ their vocabulary (Shaun, Interview-1). In addition, materials can show pupils what their ‘weak point’ or the ‘dent’ in their knowledge is (Helen); ‘give them self-confidence’; make teachers ‘feel like a fish in water’ (Mitch); ‘touch upon’ socially relevant issues; ‘hit’ pupils with a message; ‘draft an image’ of English-speaking countries (Phoebe, Interviews 1 and 2), and offer ‘matter’ to practise with in ‘doses’ and small ‘bites’ (Shaun, Interviews 1 and 2). Lastly, they can ‘invite’ (Helen) certain behaviour from the pupils, like treating the materials with care, and be a ‘source’ or ‘well’ for the teacher to draw from (Phoebe).

**A Creative, Continuous Process**

Phoebe expressed that she became aware of her pedagogic principles by talking to her colleagues and family members in between the ‘three, four, five times’ she worked on the creation of her materials:

Like I wrote in the reflective log, you talk to everybody about it. And when you wake up at night, you’ll think of something new… And when you’re in your car, waiting in front of a red light, something will pop up… It really is a process.

Other teachers also thought aloud during the follow-up interview to explain the intricacy and time-consuming nature of this first stage of the materials development process. Mitch, for example, elaborated:

Oh, but you should see me constructing those questions, you know. I would be… I would turn on the documentary. And then I would watch it for ten minutes and then I’d think ‘This is suitable material’. And then I’m sitting there with my paper and my pen… I will have my remote control… Then, when I have almost finished, I will start cooking, and then if I was home alone I would continue later… And five days later, I would finish it. And five days later, I would type the questions and make the answer sheet… And still three days later I would burn the CD. It really is a process which took about two and a half weeks.

Illustrated by the metaphors the participants used, they also resorted to implicit meanings in the interviews and logs to explain what the materials development process is like, and which principles underpin it. According to Mitch, it is a creative process which ‘costs’ a lot of time (Interview-2), and can become an ‘adventure’ (Log). The process may involve ‘dressing up’ existing materials for pupils
with dyslexia (Phoebe, Interview-1), ‘pimping’ materials to make them more appealing, and do some ‘polishing’ to end up with a worthwhile result. ‘Cutting and pasting’ from other sources (Helen, Interview-1; Mitch; Phoebe) is not considered a positive approach, but ‘it’s better to steal something good than invent something bad’ (Shaun, Interview-1). Colleagues and family members can function as ‘sources of inspiration’ and a ‘framework of reference’ (Phoebe); talking and writing about the materials development process helps teachers ‘ventilate’ their experiences (Mitch).

5.6.2 When and How Principles-in-Use are Revealed

General Observations

The teachers’ principles-in-use seemed to be revealed particularly during the lessons in which the materials were used, and in the materials themselves. It seemed that in the classroom, the most revealing moments occurred for the teachers:

Only afterwards, of course, it turns out that something will be just a little bit different, or that a minor adjustment will have to be made. (Helen)

Phoebe considered the moments when her pupils responded to the materials and gave her feedback in class particularly informative:

I noticed… that they were now allowed to work independently. That [the lesson contents] weren’t poured on top of them by the teacher… That was just a different method and I think it made them more active.

After class, Mitch and Shaun reflected on how their materials worked in practice and on the difficulty level of their respective handouts. This was a revealing moment for them both:

If I had marked it now, I would have made the questions slightly more complicated. (Mitch)

In hindsight yes, of course. Afterwards, you reflect “Has it been useful? Has it worked? Has it served the pupils?”. (Shaun)

Being Pragmatic

The teachers expressed that differences between espoused pedagogic principles and principles-in-use naturally occur, and seemed to adopt a pragmatic stance towards any discrepancies:

I don’t mind. It can turn out differently and then you think ‘Oh well, it turned out differently…, too bad’. It will always be a bit different from what you think it’s going to be, because it’s just… it’s an interaction. (Helen)

You cannot execute and apply everything you’ve imagined, and… It will still remain a human endeavour. (Phoebe)

It’s really just a matter of trying out. (Shaun)
5.6.3 The Development of Critically Reflective Practice

**Degrees of Awareness**

The participants differed in the extent to which they were or became aware of their principles about the role and function of materials. Helen claimed to be conscious, even before she started, of what kinds of materials she wanted to develop, and what she wanted to achieve with them:

That is why there are few things which deviated from what I had expected... I always know [what I am doing].

Mitch, on the other hand, claimed:

I am not aware of many things... I do my own thing.

When asked whether the first interview had enhanced his awareness, he replied:

No, because I was going to do something I had done many times before. And I explained how that works.

Phoebe said that the materials development process had made her more aware of her pedagogic principles, and referred to the two interviews as defining moments in this respect. Shaun also expressed that he had become more aware of his pedagogic principles, mainly through reflection on classroom experiences. When creating his materials, however, he worked 'relatively subconsciously':

The idea behind [the materials], no, I don't really think about that anymore... I just trust my own ability... I don't see the need to justify that for myself.

**Experience and Routine**

The participants with several years of teaching experience explained that they develop their materials on the basis of that experience and the routines and habits they had developed over time. Helen said:

I have created many games during my career, so I do have a lot of basic ideas sort of ready... I have always made a lot of materials myself.

When asked to explain what contributed to her awareness of her pedagogic principles, Helen replied that it was tutoring student teachers, discussing her approach with them, and giving them feedback, which had helped her reflect on her own decisions. Whereas Helen thought that early career teachers focussed on 'keeping it all under control' instead of consciously considering what their pedagogic objectives were, Mitch suggested that teachers with less experience were, in fact, very conscious of what they were doing and 'whether the level is right and how it all works'. After that first phase, the thinking and reflecting would become less prominent, he believed:

The routine stays the same... You don't really think about it that much anymore... You're just doing it.

Shaun added:
You know 'This is a Health and Wellbeing class..., so this kind of assignment will be suitable'... It's an automated routine.

**Metalanguage**

When discussing whether and to what extent the development process enhanced their awareness of what they considered important qualities of classroom materials, and whether they became aware of the differences and similarities between what they talked and wrote about and what they actually did in practice, the participants commented on the complexity of those questions:

> Do I become aware of what I find important in those materials?... That’s a very difficult question. (Mitch)

> And so what is your question; whether it has made me aware? (Phoebe)
> What do you mean? (Shaun)

At some points during the interviews, the questions were misinterpreted, and the participants repeated the concrete characteristics of materials they valued rather than commented on whether they had become aware of them. As reflected on in Chapter 4, this appeared to be due, at least in part, to the construction of the questions and the way they were delivered. In addition, it seemed that the participants lacked the metalanguage to engage in critical reflection on their pedagogic principles and their awareness thereof. This will be further discussed in Chapters 6 and 7.

**Gains**

Although generally speaking, the participating EFL teachers either did not become more aware of their pedagogic principles or struggled to find the words to express what they gained from the materials development process, they appeared to have enjoyed the experience and were happy with the concrete materials in which it had resulted:

> I might not have made it otherwise... Because I thought 'well, it's kind of busy, and the final term, and... marking final exams and so on'... But now I do have this fun game, and next year, the English Department will have this game. (Helen)

> Now I do have a listening comprehension test and a mark for [the pupils].
> What I really enjoyed about this is I had never done this for Year 1 before... So that was a learning moment for me. (Mitch)

> For me, personally, I was happy to participate. Because I learn from it... So I like that. (Shaun)

**5.7 Conclusion**

This chapter has presented descriptions of the lived experiences of the four participants in relation to the research questions. It aimed at providing insight into and a better understanding of these lived experiences and their meanings for the teachers. The case study approach discussed in Chapters 3 and 4 facilitated the presentation of data per case as well as for the collection of cases. As anticipated in Chapter 3, the participants’ espoused pedagogic principles regarding the role and function of EFL classroom materials were revealed in the interviews conducted with each of them, and in their
reflective logs. Analysis of these data resulted in a rich and extensive collection of principles, which reflected the uniqueness of each teacher’s pedagogic approach in relation to their professional background and context.

The teachers’ principles-in-use were revealed during the lessons in which the materials were used, and in the materials themselves. The materials ranged from a game intended to revise previously taught grammar lessons, and a sheet with listening comprehension questions, to a PowerPoint presentation containing assignments about a film, and a handout with grammar rules and exercises. This range of materials offered insight into the individual teachers’ principles about EFL teaching and learning. Yet it was especially when the materials were used in practice that similarities and differences between what teachers say they do and aim to do, and their actual teaching behaviours, could be observed.

Lastly, the chapter has presented ‘reflexive practitioner commentaries on both the nature of the reflective process and its value and impact’ (Walsh and Mann, 2015: 352). As discussed in Chapters 1 and 3, the research methodology was aimed at encouraging participants to confront their espoused principles and principles-in-use by engaging in reflection. The teachers-as-craftspersons reflected on the intricate and creative nature of the materials development process, and on the inevitable discrepancies between principles and practice. The extent to which they were or became aware of their pedagogic principles, the role of experience and routine, the use of reflexive metalanguage, and what the participants gained from the materials development process, were examined as key issues in the final section. In Chapter 6, the main findings arising from this chapter will be critically discussed.
6. Discussion

6.1 Introduction

With the acknowledgement that one will never exactly ‘catch’ a lived experience, but may ‘discover and reveal new insights in the recasting of that experience’ (Caulley, 2008: 447), this chapter will be used to synthesise the data presented and discussed in Chapter 5. The assumption behind this kind of synthesis is that there is a degree of order and logic in the social phenomenon explored. Unreflectively comparing and conflating findings to arrive at consistency is recognised as a potential pitfall (Horsburgh, 2003; Davis, 2007; St. Pierre and Jackson, 2014). This pitfall will be avoided as much as possible by acknowledging the participants’ individual contributions and perspectives in each section, by presenting the findings case by case, and by critically reflecting on the research approach and the issues and dilemmas raised in previous chapters.

Findings will be presented in three main parts, guided by the embedded units of analysis and data sets of each case, and will be critically discussed in relation to the research questions as well as the literature to support the researcher’s interpretations. Section 6.2 will focus on the participants’ espoused pedagogic principles and address research question 1. Section 6.3 will discuss the participants’ pedagogic principles-in-use as reflected in their materials and in their classrooms, thus addressing research questions 2 to 5. Section 6.4 contains a critical discussion of materials development as a form of critically reflective practice (CRP), and addresses research questions 6 and 7. The final section will offer concluding thoughts on the research outcomes.

6.2 EFL Teachers’ Espoused Pedagogic Principles

The first question addressed in this research is:

1. What are the teachers’ espoused pedagogic principles regarding the role and function of classroom materials in English as a foreign language (EFL) teaching and learning?

As discussed in Chapter 2, espoused theories of action are those which people consciously believe to guide their behaviour, and can communicate (Argyris and Schön, 1974). In this research, these theories of action have been conceptualised as teachers’ context-bound, reflexive pedagogic principles, and have been related to the teaching and learning of English. Working in what seems to be a recent tradition of using second language acquisition (SLA) research findings to inform materials development, Hadfield (2014b) presented an overview of such principles. In her article, she ‘[examined] language learning and teaching principles as stated by both theorists and materials writers’ (ibid., p. 71), including her own. The list of principles was introduced in section 2.5.4 of this
dissertation, condensed and labelled in table 2.1, and used as a preliminary coding scheme to analyse the interview transcripts and the participants' reflective logs.

As discussed in Chapter 4, traces of Hadfield's original principles were reflected in the data. Presented and discussed in relation to the cases in Chapter 5, the themes and categories motivating pupils, topics of interest, challenging proficient pupils, enhancing affective and social engagement, and tailoring to pupils' individual needs, suggest that Helen, Mitch, Phoebe and Shaun share a focus on affective engagement (code 9), and on learner differences, learner needs and teaching conditions (code 11). These outcomes seem to echo the notion that classroom materials made specifically for the learner are expected to enhance learner motivation (Shawer et al., 2008; Shawer et al., 2009; Bahous et al., 2011). They also confirm that an important motive for teachers to engage in materials development is to personalise the materials to address learner differences and needs (Richards, 2001; Howard and Major, 2005; Dutch Institute for Curriculum Development, SLO, 2016).

Besides a shared focus on affective engagement and on learner differences, learner needs and teaching conditions, the four teachers each appear to have a unique set of pedagogic principles. These principles are not necessarily informed by SLA research findings or developments in Communicative Language Teaching, nor do they all appear to be aimed at facilitating language acquisition in the first place. This raises the question whether, had they been asked for their personal definition, the participants would have agreed that materials development is 'intended to facilitate language acquisition and development', as discussed in Chapter 1 (Tomlinson, 2016: 2). Instead, the teachers seem to 'balance their pedagogical ambitions [with] the need for control of the classroom' and the practical conditions of their work (Carlgren, 1999: 49). These are two key findings of the research, which will be further discussed in Chapter 7.

The category headings which were used in Chapter 5, summarised below for ease of reference, will be repeated here to discuss the most prominent interpretations and findings as they relate to the first research question.

6.2.1 Case 1: Helen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles and functions of classroom materials</th>
<th>Helen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivating pupils</td>
<td>affective engagement, active and independent learning, usefulness, addressing learner differences, and deep processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting the teacher</td>
<td>control, structure and coverage, divergence, self-expression, responsiveness, and testing and assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*table 6.1. Helen’s espoused pedagogic principles*

For Helen, whose pedagogic principles are summarised in table 6.1 above, motivation is a key element
in her pedagogy. She wants her materials to engage pupils affectively through their design, quirky features, and use of modern applications to facilitate computer-assisted language learning. The automated feedback offered in the self-correcting quizzes she develops may support pupils’ active and independent learning, but could, at the same time, invoke ‘more trial-and-error strategies and less cognitive effort’ on their part (Hattie and Timperley, 2007: 91). It is unsure whether and how this type of feedback allows her pupils to improve their language in use (Nation, 1993; Hadfield, 2014b).

Helen compensates for the limited and repetitive exercises in the existing materials used at her school by creating materials which she considers more useful for her pupils. She also involves them in curricular decision-making, which has been identified as a major strategy to enhance pupil autonomy and motivation (Bimmel et al., 2008; Borg and Al-Busaidi, 2012). However, there can be a significant gap between the extent to which teachers [feel] it [is] desirable to involve learners in a range of decisions about their learning and teachers’ beliefs about the feasibility of doing so, particularly in relation to objectives, assessment and materials (ibid.: 20).

This gap seems to be reflected in Helen’s desire to remain in control of and prevent discussion about the lesson content.

It could be argued that the second main function of classroom materials for Helen, supporting the teacher, is also related to motivation. The data presented and discussed in Chapter 5 imply that creating her own materials keeps Helen motivated, too, as it helps her add variation, and express herself creatively. Findings suggest that motivated teachers are better equipped to motivate their pupils, and are eager to keep developing and learning, which in turn may renew their commitment to the profession (Mann, 2005; Ros and Bakx, 2014). The way both Helen and Mitch speak about their proficient pupils and how they respond to their materials appears to reflect their positive perception of classroom interactions after years of teaching experience.

### 6.2.2 Case 2: Mitch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Roles and functions of classroom materials</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mitch</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating an authentic learning experience</td>
<td>authentic L2 input, form, topics of interest, comprehensiveness, and pushed L2 output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradual advancement</td>
<td>challenging proficient pupils, and increasing levels of difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimising teaching conditions</td>
<td>collectivity versus individuality, and atmosphere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*table 6.2. Mitch’s espoused pedagogic principles*

For Mitch, whose pedagogic principles are summarised in table 6.2 above, creating an authentic
learning experience, including offering authentic second language (L2) input and pushing for L2 output, is a key element in his pedagogy. Although he makes no reference to Communicative Language Teaching or the development of communicative competence, nor do any of the other participants, this focus on using English as the medium of instruction and practice in the classroom has been identified as a key principle in communicative teaching approaches (Richards, 2002; Kwakernaak, 2011a). As discussed in Chapter 5, Mitch places higher value on the contents of his materials than on their layout. It could be argued that their ‘sloppy’ (Interview-1) form contributes to their authentic nature.

Mitch, like Phoebe and Shaun, wants classroom materials to appeal to his pupils’ interests. They belong to a majority of Dutch secondary school teachers; those who participated in a recent survey indicated that taking account of pupils’ life experiences is their main motive for developing materials to supplement the coursebook (SLO, 2016). Given that Mitch’s pupils are enrolled in the English stream, an ulterior motive underpinning this desire might be to enhance their engagement with the lesson contents and their willingness to communicate in the target language with him (Siegel, 2014). His love for English is reflected in the comprehensive and multimodal image of the language he wants his materials to portray.

By maximising difficulty of input as well as strictness of assessment, it seems that Mitch wants to ensure that his pupils reach a higher level quickly, with increasingly less guidance on his part. Helping them ‘become effective and independent language learners’, one of Nation’s (1993) principles cited in Hadfield (2014b: 87), reflects the aims of the Common European Framework of Reference for languages (Council of Europe, 2011). Indeed, the level of this framework which most likely applies to most of Mitch’s pupils at the end of the lower forms, referred to as B1, denotes ‘independent users’ (ibid.: 24). This endeavour seems to mirror Mitch’s own wish to ‘be the boss’ (Interview-1) in his classroom; the materials he creates could be seen to promote both his pupils’ and his own autonomy.

### 6.2.3 Case 3: Phoebe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles and functions of classroom materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phoebe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancing affective and social engagement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and presenting the curriculum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional growth</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*table 6.3. Phoebe’s espoused pedagogic principles*

For Phoebe, whose pedagogic principles are summarised in table 6.3 above, enhancing affective and
social engagement is a key element in her pedagogy. Phoebe expressed her love for the English language, its versatility, and its ability to connect people across the world in the interviews and her reflective log. In this sense, she seems to be the only participant who addresses the sociocultural dimension of EFL teaching. However, she does so without ‘exploring and examining the moral, political and social issues that impact [her] practice’ and her own materials (Farrell, 2015a: 8). This finding will be further discussed in relation to all four participants later in this chapter.

Phoebe balances the message she wants her materials to get across with a pragmatic view towards planning and presenting the curriculum as she feels is expected. Both the coursebook and her own materials appear to provide structure to her lessons, and offer her a sense of security (Guerrettaz and Johnston, 2013; Levrai, 2013). The PPP (presentation – practice – production) approach she usually adopts has been criticised for being teacher-centred and inflexible, and for assuming that linguistic features ‘can be isolated, taught, practised, and learnt separately’ (Anderson, 2016: 5). This trend towards standardised procedures has been referred to as the ‘McDonaldization’ of language teaching, in which materials only focus on chunks and fixed, predictable sequences (Littlejohn, 2012: 291). For Phoebe, it seems that PPP provides a structured approach to focusing on form, one of the pedagogic principles based on SLA research findings (Ellis, 2005; Hadfield, 2014b).

While it has been suggested that experienced teachers are more critical in their selection and use of published classroom materials and have more resources to draw from, Phoebe is also actively searching for new teaching ideas and materials (Guerrettaz and Johnston, 2013). These materials, which she intends to keep developing as discussed in Chapter 5, appear to offer her input for professional reflection and learning (Opfer and Pedder, 2011). Her materials help her discover what works in the classroom, what works within the school culture, and what works for her as a newly qualified teacher. She espouses that materials both help her fit in with existing norms and practices, and find her own way.

6.2.4 Case 4: Shaun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles and functions of classroom materials</th>
<th>Shaun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tailoring to pupils’ individual needs</strong></td>
<td>measured input, differentiated instruction and practice, and current and future life experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparing for tests and exams</strong></td>
<td>matching current attainment levels, repeated practice, application of recently acquired knowledge, and meeting national standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stimulating collaboration</strong></td>
<td>collaboration between pupils, collaboration among colleagues, and uniformity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6.4. Shaun’s espoused pedagogic principles*
For Shaun, whose espoused pedagogic principles are summarised in table 6.4 above, tailor-made materials are a key element in his pedagogy. He wants classroom materials to cater for the individual needs of his pupils, whom he characterises as low in proficiency. They benefit from differentiated instruction and practice in small doses. While matching pupils’ interests is seen as a desirable characteristic of classroom materials, as confirmed by the other participants, Shaun emphasises the importance of familiarising pupils with lesser-known topics, too (Interview-1). He espouses that materials may, through the authenticity of the topics they deal with, expand pupils’ knowledge beyond their own local context (Siegel, 2014).

Shaun seems preoccupied with the evaluation of his pupils’ progress, and the contribution his materials can make to the preparation for tests and national exams. The tests used at his school are based on the contents of the coursebook, which is the case in many educational institutions today (Harwood, 2016). Despite Shaun’s desire to use communicative tasks to assess language skills, in practice, knowledge of grammar points and vocabulary ‘is often tested at the expense of skills, which are more difficult to assess’ (Kuiper, 2015: 7, translated). His materials offer his pupils ‘repeated opportunities to give attention to wanted items’, one of Nation’s (1993) principles cited in Hadfield (2014b: 88).

Another key principle in Communicative Language Teaching Shaun espouses is collaborative learning (Johnson et al., 1991; Richards, 2002; Belchamber, 2010). Classroom materials can elicit and support collaboration between pupils, and can simultaneously be the outcome of collaborative projects among him and his fellow teachers. The outcomes of a recent SLO (2016) survey suggest that, while two-thirds of the participating teachers develop classroom materials on their own, 51% also claim they do this together with their colleagues. Recently, appeals have been made in the Netherlands for teachers to engage in collaboration more, as discussed in Chapter 1. Whereas the other three participants appeared to create materials to put their own stamp on them, for Shaun, it resulted in a sense of uniformity which he claimed benefited both pupils and teachers at his school.

In sum, the data collection methods which were used to draw out the participants’ espoused pedagogic principles resulted in a rich and extensive collection. The principles are unique for each teacher and seem to reflect their characteristic pedagogic views. On the one hand, creating their own materials is a means for these teachers to keep up with trends, such as computer-assisted language learning (Higgins and Johns, 1984; Tomlinson, 2012), to collaborate, and to conform to existing practices. On the other hand, it allows them to express themselves creatively and ‘do [their] own thing’ (Mitch, Interview-2). Many of their principles regarding materials for EFL teaching and learning are based on general pedagogic and pragmatic considerations, some on SLA theory and Communicative Language Teaching. Meeting the needs of their pupils as well as their own needs appear to be two fundamental wishes of these teachers which underpin all their espoused principles.
It would thus seem from the discussion of the data so far that classroom materials are not merely created to act out the desire ‘to do a job well for its own sake’ (Sennett, 2008: 9), as was proposed in Chapter 2. The limitation of the metaphor which regards their creation as a form of craftsmanship is illustrated by the finding that various other reasons and motives behind materials development are at play. Still, it has been considered helpful to conceptualise the teacher-as-developer as a crafts-person, and the development process as a craft. For one, it has helped focus on the cases in relation to the research questions as opposed to the questions only. Moreover, it has provided a view of the complex, creative development process as one which involves anticipation and imagination (ibid.). The outcome of this process, i.e. the materials and their subsequent use in the classroom, will be the focus of the following section.

6.3 EFL Teachers’ Pedagogic Principles-in-Use

As discussed in Chapter 2, the second type of theories of action are assumed to be those which govern people’s behaviour (Argyris and Schön, 1974). In this research, they have been conceptualised as teachers’ pedagogic principles-in-use. A discovery resulting from the analysis of the data reflected on in Chapter 4 was that principles-in-use are not necessarily tacit. Those which were identified from the analysis of the participants’ materials and the classroom observation data included principles the teachers had also espoused. This is why it was suggested that there may indeed be three sets of pedagogic principles which guide behaviour: tacit principles, principles-in-use, and espoused principles. This suggestion has implications for the representation of the conceptual framework, offered in Chapter 3 to illustrate the connections between the case components. Figure 6.1 depicts the revised model:

**Figure 6.1. Components of each case – revised**
This model still presents the Dutch teacher as the case, but now, the pedagogic principles he or she holds regarding the role and function of classroom materials are assumed to consist of three, partially overlapping sets. All these principles are assumed to affect the materials development process in which the teacher engages, and vice versa, as discussed in Chapter 2 (Graves, 1996b). The materials can help the teacher reflect critically on these sets of principles, and the differences and similarities between them. Whether tacit principles are revealed and conscious awareness of them can be gained through the materials development process will be discussed critically below. Again, the themes which were used as headings in Chapter 5 will be presented here to discuss the main interpretations and findings of the research (Malterud, 2012).

6.3.1 Reflected in the Materials
The first set of questions which focus on the participants’ pedagogic principles-in-use addressed in this research is:

2. In what ways are the teachers’ espoused pedagogic principles reflected in their materials?
4. What are the teachers’ tacit pedagogic principles regarding the role and function of classroom materials in EFL teaching and learning, as reflected in their materials?

The materials which were analysed as part of the within-case analysis procedure discussed in Chapters 3 and 4 consisted of Helen’s Great Grammar Game and PowerPoint presentation, Mitch’s question sheet about a documentary on the Great Barrier Reef, Phoebe’s PowerPoint and handout with assignments about the film *Slumdog Millionaire*, and Shaun’s lesson overview and handout with rules and exercises on using ‘some’ and ‘any’ (see also the sample materials in Appendix 7). In first instance, these sets of materials were analysed with the help of the revised coding scheme as presented in Table 4.2. *Table 6.5* on the following two pages presents an overview of the ways in which the teachers’ espoused principles seem to be reflected in their materials in terms of their contents, form and design, and quantity, and through a number of miscellaneous elements of the materials. The outcome of within-case analysis, it summarises the data presented in relation to research question 2 for each individual case in Chapter 5. All the elements can be observed in the materials; nonetheless, it is acknowledged that descriptive words like clear, structured, specialist, minor, much, familiarity, suited, universal, fast-paced, vibrant, and short, are interpretations on the part of the researcher.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Themes (Espoused Principles)</th>
<th>Reflect through (Principles-in-Use)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Helen | Motivating pupils | **Contents**<br>clear instructions and game rules<br>gap-filling items in L2<br>grammar items potentially causing interference from the L1<br>instant feedback (answer keys)<br>opportunity for questions<br>questions eliciting grammar rules, oral and written answers<br>references to school, pets, food, places of interest, etc.<br>repetition of grammar items and question types<br>symbols<br><br>**Form & Design**<br>board game eliciting kinaesthetic engagement<br>clear font<br>colours (correspondence PowerPoint/game)<br>laminated<br>school logo<br>structured layout<br>underlined, italicised, bold words<br><br>**Supporting the teacher** | **Contents**<br>answer keys<br>boundaries and rules<br>formative test questions<br>image of board in PowerPoint<br><br>**Quantity**<br>number of slides, cue cards, questions, squares<br><br><br><br>**Form & Design**<br>colours<br>game accessories<br><br><br><br>**Miscellaneous**<br>movement along the board indicative of progress<br>originality of questions designed from scratch<br><br>**2. Mitch** | Creating an authentic learning experience | **Contents**<br>incl.usion of low-frequency lexicon<br>open-ended questions eliciting written L2 output<br>specialist focus on nature, Australia, the Great Barrier Reef<br>spoken and written L2 input (documentary and handout)<br><br>**Form & Design**<br>inclusion of other BBC programmes on recording<br>minor spelling errors<br>multimodality (video, audio)<br>spoken language variation: pace, accent, underwater voice<br><br>Gradual advancement | **Contents**<br>idem<br><br>Optimising teaching conditions | **Miscellaneous**<br>potential coverage of full lesson without much teacher guidance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Phoebe</th>
<th><strong>Enhancing affective and social engagement</strong></th>
<th><strong>Contents</strong></th>
<th><strong>Form &amp; Design</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elicitation of background knowledge, analysis, opinion, reflection, discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td>fast-paced and vibrant film scenes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exclamation marks</td>
<td></td>
<td>room for answers (grid/lines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intercultural elements of English as a global language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>list of awards for the film</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>potential familiarity with game show and character traits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recommendations for further reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>references to multisensory and multimodal experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and presenting the curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contents</strong></td>
<td>auditory L2 input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>visual input: moving images and still pictures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Shaun</th>
<th><strong>Tailoring to pupils’ individual needs</strong></th>
<th><strong>Contents</strong></th>
<th><strong>Form &amp; Design</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>references to mums, dads, pets, homework, food, etc. symbols</td>
<td></td>
<td>lesson overview in short chunks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>short English sentences (10 words max.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>short exercises (5 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>short sections on handout with identical structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Preparing for tests and exams</strong></th>
<th><strong>Contents</strong></th>
<th><strong>Form &amp; Design</strong></th>
<th><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>application of grammar rules (front) to exercises (back)</td>
<td></td>
<td>shared with colleagues on online platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>increasingly less guidance to exercises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>literal repetition of rules and instructions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>match with national core objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Stimulating collaboration</strong></th>
<th><strong>Form &amp; Design</strong></th>
<th><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>font type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>paper colour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>underlined, bold, capitalised words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6.5. Ways in which the participants’ materials reflect their principles*
From the overview in table 6.5, it can be concluded that pedagogic principles are revealed through teachers’ classroom materials in a plethora of ways. Most elements apply to the contents of the materials, while their form and design can also be seen as revelatory. A major finding from the analysis of the materials as data is that some principles the teachers had espoused were not, and could not, be reflected in them. Because Mitch’s materials covered one lesson, it was impossible to discern an increase in difficulty level of either input or output, or in strictness of assessment. Similarly, it could not be determined on the basis of Shaun’s materials for this lesson alone whether and how they would contribute to getting Year 2 pupils ready for their exams in Year 4. While Phoebe had espoused that creating her own materials helped her find out ‘what works’ and fit in with school practices, this was not reflected in the materials themselves either. This explains why Professional growth, a theme identified for Phoebe’s case, was excluded from table 6.5.

As the overview reveals, some of the distinct principles seem to be reflected in the materials in similar ways. Mitch’s desire to create an authentic learning experience and to gradually advance his pupils’ proficiency levels, for instance, are both reflected in the contents of his documentary and question sheet: they offer spoken and written input including low-frequency lexicon and open-ended questions, and a specialist focus, which could be said to reflect both espoused principles. Some of the elements in table 6.5 seem to reflect different principles simultaneously. The materials created by both Helen and Shaun contain textual features like symbols and underlined words, but while Helen’s intention with their layout is to motivate her pupils, Shaun uses it to tailor to his pupils’ individual needs and stimulate collaboration within the English department through uniformity of layout. These findings would suggest that characteristics of classroom materials, even when they are the same, can still reflect a variety of pedagogic principles.

Although seemingly comprehensive, table 6.5 raises the question which elements of the materials reveal the participants’ more tacit pedagogic principles, and, if they can be uncovered in the first place, what those tacit principles are. Based on the data presented and discussed in Chapter 5, it would seem that one way in which research question 4 can be addressed is to explore the materials from the perspective of the teachers’ espoused principles, and look at those which were not reflected in practice. This approach could help identify elements the materials seem to lack, which might have been expected on the basis of the teachers’ espoused pedagogic principles as discussed in section 6.2.

In Helen’s case, for example, the materials might have offered pupils opportunities for decision-making, contained instructions to the game in English to match their proficiency level, and pushed for L2 output through extended speaking and writing assignments. Mitch’s materials might also have elicited more extended stretches of written L2 output, and presented authentic questions about the documentary with English synonyms rather than Dutch translations. In Phoebe’s case, the materials might have elicited pupils’ personal experiences with foreign cultures, and focussed on grammar items used in the film through a PPP structure. Lastly, Shaun’s materials might have
consisted of multiple, differentiated handouts, instructed pupils to work together, and offered communicative tasks to apply the grammar points they had just learnt.

What made the teachers decide against incorporating these elements has not been fully addressed in this research. Phoebe was the only teacher to acknowledge and explain the discrepancy between one of her espoused principles and the outcome in her materials for the observed lesson. She expressed that she was happy her materials did not revolve around grammar:

No, that is not reflected here at all, actually… There I want to meet the pupils halfway because they are basically bothered with grammar throughout the year… We now finally have assignments which do not focus on it, fortunately. (Interview-2)

It would seem that other, possibly more tacit, principles and considerations underpinned the teachers’ pedagogic decisions in these cases. As a data set, the materials were considered useful in making this finding visible, although they themselves did not uncover any underlying considerations. This seems to illustrate the problematic nature of tacit principles and principles-in-use as a research topic, as discussed in Chapter 2 (Polanyi, 1967; Osmond and O’Connor, 2004; Kubanyiova and Feryok, 2015). A suggestion for further educational research and practice, which will be discussed in Chapter 7, is to use classroom materials as input for critical discussion on such pedagogic decisions (Tarrant, 2013).

In sum, the diverse classroom materials created by the four participants offer insight into their individual pedagogic approaches and the plethora of ways in which principles can be put into practice. It seems that EFL teachers’ own materials, much like the coursebooks they use, can lend themselves to be used as cultural artefacts to be problematised and analysed (Gray, 2010; Littlejohn, 2012). The elements presented in table 6.5 could be regarded as strategies to aim for certain principled effects in EFL teaching and learning. However, materials and ‘tasks-as-workplans’ can be considered ‘quite distinct from tasks-in-process in the context of actual classroom use’ (Littlejohn, 1992: 288; Carlgren, 1999; Pang, 2016). The ways in which the participants’ pedagogic principles are reflected in the classroom context will be central to the following section.

6.3.2 Reflected in the Classroom

The second set of questions regarding pedagogic principles-in-use addressed in this research is:

3. In what ways are the teachers guided by their espoused pedagogic principles during the use of their materials in class?

5. In what ways are the teachers guided by their tacit pedagogic principles during the use of their materials in class?

Table 6.6 below presents an overview of the ways in which the four teachers’ espoused principles seem to be reflected in their use of the materials in the classroom.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Themes (Espoused Principles)</th>
<th>Reflected through (Principles-in-Use)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Helen</td>
<td><strong>Motivating pupils</strong></td>
<td>formation of clusters of tables and chairs per team refusal to give the answers herself reminder that all the items have been covered this year repetition of rules to individual teams and pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Supporting the teacher</strong></td>
<td>decision to continue the game next time taking centre stage at the start and end of the lesson only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mitch</td>
<td><strong>Creating an authentic learning experience</strong></td>
<td>instruction to write short answers on separate sheet; spelling errors won't count provided answer makes sense introductory questions and most instructions in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Gradual advancement</strong></td>
<td>reminder that keeping concentration is essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Optimising teaching conditions</strong></td>
<td>involvement of pupils in discussions and classroom procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Phoebe</td>
<td><strong>Enhancing affective and social engagement</strong></td>
<td>involvement of pupils in classroom procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Planning and presenting the curriculum | corrective feedback on pronunciation  
English subtitles to film  
increasing volume and letting down blinds  
instruction to answer assignments in English  
instruction to finish assignments at home (oral and written)  
pausing the recording for instruction  
pointing at projected slides  
PowerPoint, handout and film excerpt as backbone to the lesson; coverage of full lesson | projection of PowerPoint and film in full colour  
quick response to pupil’s question regarding ‘police’  
selection of starting point of the film excerpt and first PowerPoint slide before class  
selection of previous slide in response to pupils’ questions  
skipping questions on the handout  
tangible handout |
|---|---|---|
| 4. Shaun | Tailoring to pupils’ individual needs | auditory support (e.g. translations, synonyms, bell, increased volume of recording)  
calm, structured, short, chronological instructions  
checking answers before continuing the exercises  
discussion of personal experiences in relation to dialogue content  
helping pupils notice symbols (?)  
instruction to give short answers | presentation and discussion of lesson overview  
provision of clean copy for pupil in tutoring  
relation of dialogue content to general first aid strategies  
restriction of duration of each activity to 10 minutes max.  
scaffolding to any new activity  
stopwatch and countdown projected on the screen  
visual support (e.g. selecting, crossing out, writing, showing, pointing) |
| | Preparing for tests and exams | instruction to “cheat” by peeking on the handout  
instruction to use logical reasoning  
reference to upcoming test and future needs for grammar points | repetition of instructions  
repetition of vocabulary lists (out loud)  
use of English to mark transitions and read materials  
variety of English accents in dialogue recording |
| | Stimulating collaboration | involvement of pupils in discussions and classroom procedures  
pair work in spelling activity | |

*table 6.6. Ways in which the participants’ use of their materials in class reflects their principles*
Table 6.6 lists the observed elements of the four lessons and the pedagogic strategies employed by the respective teachers. The outcome of within-case analysis on the basis of the revised coding scheme in table 4.2, it summarises the data presented in relation to research question 3 for each individual case in Chapter 5. All the elements can be observed in the materials; nonetheless, it is acknowledged that descriptive words like calm, structured, most, much, quick, and short, are interpretations on the part of the researcher.

From table 6.6, it can be concluded that pedagogic principles are revealed through the teachers’ use of their materials in numerous ways. A greater number of elements and strategies could be observed in the lessons of Phoebe and Shaun, who spent considerably more time in class managing and instructing pupils than Helen and Mitch did. After their introductions to The Great Grammar Game and the documentary on the Great Barrier Reef, respectively, the latter seemed to let their materials do the work: the game and the documentary each took up approximately 40 minutes of their 50-minute lessons. Again, one theme identified for Phoebe’s case, Professional growth, was excluded from this table, as it was not possible to determine whether this principle was reflected in her use of the materials either.

The overview in table 6.6 contains elements and strategies reflecting the participants’ espoused pedagogic principles about the role and function of classroom materials. A way to address research question 5, which focuses on the teachers’ tacit principles, is to look at the espoused principles which were not reflected in the lessons, to identify missing elements and strategies which might have been expected on the basis of the teachers’ espoused pedagogic principles as discussed in section 6.2. For example, Helen’s use of the materials in class might have included more spoken L2 input in the form of instructions and feedback in English, on the basis of her espoused principle that materials can motivate by challenging proficient pupils. What made her decide against using the target language has not been addressed in this research. It could be argued that the demands which teaching in the target language places on non-native EFL teachers affected this decision, as was discussed in Chapter 1 (Richards, 2001; Freeman et al., 2015).

Teacher talk in the classroom and how it facilitates language learning has been described as ‘fundamental to the success of L2 pedagogy’ (Skinner, 2016: 1). The overview in table 6.6 illustrates some of the ways in which the teachers’ use of language may potentially have contributed to learning English. In materials mode, a micro context of the classroom in which teachers’ pedagogic goals and language use involve the materials, the participants provided language input and practice, elicited responses in relation to the materials, checked and displayed answers, and evaluated and extended contributions by pupils (Walsh, 2006; Seedhouse, 2011). Typical language features of this mode included in the overview are the extensive use of display questions to check understanding and draw out responses, form-focused feedback and corrective repair, and the use of scaffolding (Walsh, 2006). Such features seem to arise as practical reflections of the teachers’ espoused principles.
A major finding in relation to these two questions is that there are limitations to what can be observed, and assessed through direct observation, in terms of the participants’ pedagogic principles. It remains unclear whether Helen’s use of her materials in practice facilitated successful learning experiences, stimulated deep processing, and led to the storage of new vocabulary in motor memory on the part of her pupils, as she had espoused classroom materials can do. In Phoebe’s case, determining whether her use of the film and her assignments enhanced her pupils’ commitment to English as a compulsory subject or their social engagement, and whether the visual input her materials provided supported their learning process, was beyond what is observable in practice.

In sum, the four cases were unique not only with respect to their espoused pedagogic principles, but also in how they applied those principles in practice, as they engaged in the practical craft of creating their materials and using them in their respective classrooms. As anticipated in Chapter 3, considering them as cases meant that, through within-case analyses of the various types of data connected to the embedded units of analysis, their individual professional contexts, experiences, motives, and principles could be investigated (Yin, 2014). It meant that each teacher-as-craftsperson could form the central focus of the presentation and discussion of the data, whilst allowing for a cross-case synthesis to shed light on the multiple perspectives on the phenomenon under investigation (Stake, 2006; Small, 2009). In the next section of the chapter, the outcomes of this cross-case synthesis in relation to the final two research questions will be discussed.

6.4 Materials Development as Critically Reflective Practice

The final set of questions, which will be addressed together in this part of the chapter, is:

6. At which point(s) in the materials development process, and in what ways, are (the differences and similarities between) the teachers’ espoused principles and their tacit principles revealed?

7. Which part of the materials development process do the teachers consider to be most informative in revealing their pedagogic principles?

As discussed in Chapter 5 and in the sections above, the participants’ espoused pedagogic principles were revealed through the interviews and the reflective logs. The teachers themselves expressed that the first interview facilitated reflection on their pedagogic principles about the role and function of EFL materials to some extent. Their reflections on the creation of the materials during the follow-up interviews made it clear that talking to colleagues and others during this process can also help them ‘ventilate’ (Mitch, Interview-2) their principles. It seems that they appreciated the opportunity to share their dilemmas and considerations, as illustrated by Mitch:

No-one here knows about that, you know? So now there was finally someone I could show that there’s doubts at times... And
that I couldn’t find any children’s programmes on the BBC… That was my first wave of panic… So it was kind of a relief that I found this documentary… Without the log it would have happened anyway… but now I had actually written it down. So that was quite funny. (Interview-2)

In turn, discussions with colleagues, feedback from pupils, as well as other people’s materials, can be sources of inspiration during the materials development process (Helen, Interview-1; Mitch, Interview-2; Phoebe, Interview-2; Shaun, Interview-1). It seems that collaborative approaches facilitated the consideration of alternative interpretations and reflection on classroom materials as artefacts, as has been suggested by Nickel (2013) on the basis of research in teacher education.

In retrospect, it seems obvious that similarities and differences between the participants’ espoused principles and principles-in-use could only be observed through their materials and in their classroom contexts. However, in addition to the observations discussed in section 6.3, which aimed to clarify how the teachers’ principles were revealed in practice, this also happened through their use of metaphors. The participants used these metaphors not only to discuss the role and function of their classroom materials, but also to explain how they experienced the creative materials development process, and to characterise the coursebook. As such, the metaphors presented in Chapter 5 offer ‘insights into ideas that are [possibly] not explicit or consciously held’ (Leavy et al., 2007: 1220), and have painted an image of which the details can be filled in by others (Caulley, 2008).

The data in this research echo McGrath’s (2006; 2013) finding that metaphors for coursebooks and other materials can reveal how EFL teachers perceive them. Personifying these materials, the participants expressed how materials can desire, draft, explain, give, invite, limit, and touch upon things. It appears from the data discussed in Chapter 5 that both positive and negative metaphors of control, support and choice are used to refer to the role and function of classroom materials, with an emphasis on the support they offer both pupils and teachers (McGrath, 2002). The coursebook in particular is referred to as the ‘coat hooks’ on which lessons can be hung, and as a ‘straightjacket’ because of its rigid structure (Helen, Interview-1). It is this structure which, at the same time, affords ‘space’ to digress (Helen, Interview-1). The coursebook offers contents to ‘cover’ one year (Phoebe, Interview-1) and ‘something to hold onto’ (Interview-2) for both teachers and pupils. Yet, sometimes, it fails to provide much-needed ‘handles’ and instead forces pupils to just ‘pick’ contents ‘out of the air’ when the level and number of exercises ‘do not reach far enough’ (Shaun, Interviews 1 and 2).

A major, unanticipated finding emerging from the data is that the participants struggle to make their knowledge-of-practice explicit. As discussed in Chapter 2, knowledge-of-practice is generated when teachers treat their own classrooms and schools as sites for intentional investigation ..., interrogation and interpretation. In this sense, teachers learn when they generate local knowledge of practice by working within the contexts of inquiry communities to theorize and construct their work and to connect it to larger social, cultural, and political issues (Cochran-Smith and Lytle, 1999: 250).
None of the teachers theorise their practice in the interviews, nor do they allude to this kind of knowledge in written form in their reflective logs. As discussed in Chapter 4, and illustrated in Appendix 6, the logs focussed mainly on what the teachers were creating rather than how and why, and thus contained rather superficial reflections on the materials development process. This finding confirms the outcomes of prior research involving EFL teachers’ logs and journals (Mena Marcos and Tillema, 2006; Abednia et al., 2013; Thorsen and DeVore, 2013).

Multiple levels of reflection, including theoretical, sociocultural, philosophical, and moral considerations, might have been elicited with the help of more explicit guidance, such as a question-and-answer format for the logs based on Farrell’s (2015b) reflective practice framework (Nickel, 2013). Similarly, adopting an approach to post-observation discussions which focusses on solutions and motives, and includes watching the video recording together, might have resulted in critical reflections in the follow-up interviews (Farrell, 2016; Skinner, 2016). Furthermore, as observation and analysis of their own classroom discourse has been found to support EFL teachers’ development of CRP, an in-depth analysis and discussion of their language use in class, and how it reflects their principles, might have enhanced the participants’ awareness of them (Ghafarpour, 2016; Skinner, 2016).

Based on the data and findings of this research discussed so far, it could be argued that developing one’s own materials facilitates reflection on and gaining practical experience in ‘what works and what does not work’ (Phoebe, Interview-1), but that this does not necessarily happen through enhanced awareness of pedagogic principles. In the follow-up interview, Mitch explains that he had never made these kinds of materials for Year 1 pupils before:

…so I was actually forced to consider the level of the questions… and how strict I would mark them… So that was a learning moment for me.

Based on his description, it seems that this ‘learning moment’ involves retrospective evaluation of his pedagogic approach more so than awareness of any underlying principles. It raises the question whether being challenged to think about the differences between one’s espoused principles and principles-in-use is a prerequisite for professional learning (Gleeson and Davison, 2016).

Teachers have been found to ‘manoeuvre amongst repertoires’ (Biesta and Tedder, 2006: 11), and build ‘[collections] of images, ideas, examples and actions’ to draw from as they gain teaching experience (Dewey, 1933; Schön, 1983). Phoebe describes this process, and how developing her own materials supports her in it, from the perspective of a newly qualified teacher. As teachers learn from making ‘pre-active decisions’ when planning their lessons and making ‘interactive decisions’ when enacting them (Freeman et al., 2015: 4), they may come to accept a degree of cognitive dissonance between their espoused principles and principles-in-use (Warin et al., 2006; Nickel, 2013).

As discussed in Chapter 5, the participants in this research, too, appear to adopt a pragmatic
stance towards this cognitive dissonance. They acknowledge and accept the notion of incongruity between principles and practices, as revealed in the different data sets and discussed with them during the follow-up interviews. This incongruity may have depended on contextual factors such as class size, pupil characteristics, and examination pressure (Li and Walsh, 2011; Garcia and Lewis, 2014). Internal factors, like prior teaching experiences, a lack of subject matter knowledge, or a lack of pedagogic skills could also have played a role (Garcia and Lewis, 2014; Qingmin et al., 2014; Gleeson and Davison, 2016).

A conclusive finding of the research is that the teachers’ espoused pedagogic principles and pedagogic principles-in-use, as well as the differences and similarities between those two sets, were uncovered through the data collection methods, which had been organised around the materials development process. Even though the participants differed with respect to the awareness they claimed to have of their principles, their years of teaching experience and routines, the metalanguage they employed to reflect on the materials development process, and what they claimed to have gained from this process, the principles were revealed to the researcher.

6.5 Conclusion

This chapter has been used to synthesise the data as presented and discussed in Chapter 5. Findings were critically discussed in relation to the case study research approach, its questions, and the dilemmas raised in earlier chapters. Four main conclusions will be taken into Chapter 7 to discuss them and their implications for educational practice:

The first is that the Dutch EFL teachers who took part in this research espouse a wide range of pedagogic principles behind materials development, which reveal a shared focus on affective engagement and meeting learner needs as well as their own, yet also show their unique, individual preoccupations.

The second is that the teachers’ principles behind materials development seem to be based on general pedagogic and pragmatic considerations in addition to SLA and Communicative Language Teaching theory; their espoused principles and principles-in-use are not theorised or explicitly connected ‘to larger social, cultural, and political issues’ (Cochran-Smith and Lytle, 1999: 250), nor are the differences between them necessarily regarded as an issue for further exploration.

The third is that procedures organised around the materials development process, such as interviews, reflective logs, and classroom observations, can uncover teachers’ espoused principles and principles-in-use; the teachers’ materials themselves, as well as their use of them in class, can reveal the similarities and differences between these two sets of principles.

Lastly, the fourth conclusion is that the opportunity to share their thoughts on the materials development process, in particular through pre- and post-lesson discussions, can help teachers
themselves become aware of and reflect on the contents of their pedagogic principles regarding the role and function of classroom materials.
7. Conclusion

The research presented in this dissertation has been aimed at exploring the interaction between secondary school English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers and the materials they develop, and at gaining insight into the potential value of this creative process for teachers’ development of critically reflective practice (CRP). It could be argued that in an exploratory study like this, ‘we do not head for a complete description of all aspects of the phenomenon we study’, but look to ‘[open] some doors to hitherto unknown territory by presenting examples that contribute to new understanding’ (Malterud, 2012: 802). This final chapter will be used to discuss what that new understanding could be, and which unknown territory may be worthy of further exploration. It will first present the main conclusions based on the findings discussed in Chapter 6. It will then discuss these conclusions in light of the scope and limitations of the research. The chapter offers critical discussions about the contribution of the research to the body of knowledge and to educational practice, situating the research in the existing literature and in current practice. As part of these discussions, the impact of the research on the researcher’s own professional practice will be addressed, and suggestions for practice and for further research will be provided.

7.1 Main Conclusions

7.1.1 Multifarious Espoused Pedagogic Principles

The first conclusion which can be drawn from this research is that the four Dutch EFL teachers who agreed to participate all regularly develop their own materials but seem to have their individual reasons for doing so. They espouse a wide range of pedagogic principles about the role and function of classroom materials. On the one hand, these principles reveal that the teachers want their materials to enhance their pupils’ affective engagement and to take account of learner differences, learner needs, and teaching conditions. These are two shared motives behind materials development. On the other hand, the espoused principles reflect the teachers’ unique pedagogic approaches and considerations. Specifically, developing their own materials has been a means for the Dutch EFL teachers in this research to:

- collaborate with their colleagues;
- create a pleasant classroom atmosphere;
- express themselves creatively;
- fill time;
- find out what works;
- focus on form;
- keep in control of their classrooms;
- meet national standards;
- offer variation and diverge from routines;
- offer visual support;
- prepare for and engage in testing and assessment;
- provide structure and coverage;
- reach uniformity and fit in with existing practices and cultures;
- respond to pupils’ questions and concerns.

This list captures the wide variety of pedagogic principles about EFL classroom materials espoused by the four teachers. They seem to be underpinned by two basic, underlying principles, which could be summarised as meeting their pupils’ needs and meeting their own needs.

### 7.1.2 Practical and Pragmatic Considerations

The second conclusion is that some of the teachers’ principles behind materials development seem to be aimed at facilitating second language acquisition (SLA), but they also reflect practical, general pedagogic, and instrumental considerations. Helen’s materials, for example, allow her to be in control and stay motivated herself. Through creating his own materials, Mitch can be the boss in his own classroom, and engaging in this process precludes the need for extensive lesson planning. As he explained in the follow-up interview:

> When you create your own materials, it means you don’t have to plan your lesson anymore. Because you know exactly what’s going to happen... And that’s nice.

Phoebe’s materials help her fill up spare time. And for Shaun, developing materials which conform to the school’s guidelines is necessary to prepare his pupils for examinations. These principles reveal practical rather than theoretical considerations from the perspective of the teacher instead of the second language learner.

At no point during the field research did the four teachers theorise their pedagogic principles. No explicit references were made to the Common European Framework of Reference for languages or a broader communicative teaching approach. The differences between their espoused principles and principles-in-use, when pointed out during the follow-up interview, did not seem to lead to further reflexive exploration. Instead, the teachers acknowledged that classroom practice ‘will always be a bit different from what you think it’s going to be’ (Helen, Interview-2). This pragmatic stance was mirrored in the participants’ reflections on what they gained from this materials development experience, which included their enjoyment of the process, and the concrete materials in which it had resulted.

Despite the lack of references to theory in the interviews and reflective logs, the data presented and discussed in Chapters 5 and 6 offer evidence of the participants’ tacit knowledge of
SLA principles, such as the vital importance of extensive second language input and output, usefulness of classroom materials and activities, and affective engagement, in language learning.

### 7.1.3 Procedures for CRP

The conclusion above suggests that, in line with the metaphor for materials developer as a craftsperson, the teachers were ‘absorbed in doing something well, unable to explain the value of what [they were] doing’ (Sennett, 2008: 117). Especially Helen, Mitch and Shaun claimed to be mostly unaware of their pedagogic principles. The participants might never have consciously thought about, may have never been asked to share, or may not be used to considering, the principles which underpin their teaching practices. Perhaps they lack the metalanguage needed to address it, as was suggested on the basis of the data presented in Chapter 5. Perhaps they have not developed a reflective habit or disposition, do not consider themselves to be reflexive professionals, or lack the support of peers (Warin et al., 2006; Pang, 2016).

Still, examples of reflective practice by the four participants were revealed to the researcher. This happened through a process of empathic interpretation, in which the teachers helped the researcher enter their world, and the researcher helped the teachers ‘notice aspects of their experience’ of which they may not have been aware (Willig, 2014: 139). The third conclusion, therefore, is that procedures organised around the materials development process, such as interviews, reflective logs, and classroom observations, can lead to pedagogic awareness by uncovering teachers’ espoused principles and principles-in-use, and that the teachers’ materials themselves, as well as their use of them in class, can reveal the similarities and differences between these two sets of principles. This has implications for practice and future research, further discussed in sections 7.3 and 7.4 below.

### 7.1.4 A Catalyst for Reflection

The fourth conclusion is that dialogue can help teachers themselves become aware of and reflect on the contents of their pedagogic principles regarding the role and function of classroom materials. In this research, those dialogues took the form of pre- and post-lesson interviews. These interviews challenged the teachers’ thinking. They were considered amongst the most informative moments of the materials development process. Phoebe expressed that talking to trusted colleagues and family members during the creation of her materials, as well as asking her pupils for feedback, facilitated reflection on her pedagogic principles, too. It therefore seems that the opportunity to share thought processes is a valuable means to enhance awareness.

Arguably, as suggested in literature on EFL teacher reflection and language teacher education, a catalyst for critical reflection is always required, whether in the form of an experienced facilitator, the researcher in this case, or a peer (Johnson, 2015; Farrell, 2016). Based on an extensive
literature review of recent research on the practices that encourage EFL teachers to reflect, Farrell’s (ibid.) list of reflective tools includes many which involve professional dialogue with one or more critical friends, such as teacher discussion groups, classroom observations, post-observation conferences, lesson study, team teaching, peer coaching, and online forum discussions. In such dialogic settings, critical friends can provide guidance, input, stimulus or scaffolding to strengthen EFL teachers’ critical stance towards their pedagogy, create light bulb moments, and support them when incorporating recently acquired pedagogic knowledge and skills in their practice (Walsh and Mann, 2015; Sahin and Yildirim, 2016).

7.2 Scope and Limitations of the Research
7.2.1 Case Study Approach and Design
The multiple-case study approach enabled the researcher to tell a number of stories about materials development. The four cases, whose professional backgrounds, experiences, and circumstances, as well as their personal characteristics, varied, offered ‘a variety of lenses’ (Baxter and Jack, 2008: 544) through which the research questions could be explored. Even though the same data sources and data analysis methods were used, the research procedures resulted in very different themes and categories as outcomes for each case. As concluded in section 7.1, each teacher’s unique pedagogic approach was reflected in their range of espoused principles and in the ways in which they applied these principles in practice.

As anticipated in Chapter 3, the case study approach facilitated the organisation and presentation of the data with regard to the individual cases and the collection of cases. The writing up of the findings and conclusions of the research in the final chapters, however, was hampered by the sheer number of research questions. It was realised that research questions 4 and 5, regarding the teachers’ tacit pedagogic principles, were superfluous as far as the presentation of principles-in-use was concerned. When it became clear that it was difficult for the participants to pinpoint when and how the materials development process enhanced their awareness of their pedagogic principles, research questions 6 and 7 might have been rephrased and combined. As discussed in Chapter 4, these realisations might have occurred earlier if a pilot case had been conducted first, to facilitate assessment of the potential of the data to address the research questions (Roulston, 2014; Yin, 2014).

7.2.2 Data Collection Methods
To study actual behaviours and events, direct observation was regarded as a particularly insightful research tool, ‘faithful to the real-life, in situ and holistic nature’ of case study approaches like this (Verschuren, 2003: 131; Cohen et al., 2011; De Lange et al., 2011). It became clear during the analysis of the observation data, however, that the classroom observations were mere snapshots of the teachers’ practices. To rely less on researcher observations alone, and more on the teachers’ own
descriptions and interpretations, gathering reflective logs was considered a less intrusive method than non-participant observations of the creation of the materials (Breen et al., 2001). It made the participants in charge of the place and the time, or times, they engaged with the creative process and wrote about it. One important consideration had been to minimise the impact of the research on the participants' workload (British Educational Research Association, BERA, 2011).

In hindsight, the participants did not seem to have regarded or used the log as a tool for critical reflection. As discussed in Chapter 6, a question-and-answer format and more explicit instructions may have drawn out deeper reflections on their materials and the pedagogic principles informing them. Taped monologue, a 'kind of 'internal' talking aloud' (Ford, 2016: 257), might have been a suitable alternative method. In Ford's single-case study, it resulted in more revelatory, critical reflections on the part of the participating EFL teacher than written logs. Watching the video recording together, focussing on critical moments identified beforehand, might have further facilitated recall and elicited more critical reflections on the part of the teachers in the post-lesson interviews (Skinner, 2016).

7.2.3 Data Analysis Methods
Confirming prior findings, exploring the metaphors the teachers used for their materials and for materials development in general was a 'powerful cognitive tool' (Wan et al., 2011: 403) to gain insight into their principles regarding the role and function of classroom materials (McGrath, 2006). As discussed in Chapter 6, involving the participating EFL teachers in the analysis of their own classroom discourse may have further illuminated how the use of their own materials, as mediated by teachers' language through their instructions and questions, reflects their pedagogic principles (Walsh, 2006; Ghafarpour, 2016; Skinner, 2016).

7.2.4 Presentation
As elaborated in Chapter 4, seeking to represent the participants' viewpoints in a different language from the one in which they expressed themselves, and the one in which interpretations were made, led to unanticipated dilemmas and limitations. Most were addressed through consulting dictionaries and online reference sources, debating possible translations with critical friends, and asking each participant to comment on the outcome of the analysis to enhance its credibility (Temple and Young, 2004). No objections were raised during these member checks. Still problematic was the notion that 'people using different languages may construct different ways of seeing social life' (ibid.: 164), and that linguistic ambiguity undoubtedly left 'room for misinterpretation' (Pring, 2000: 105). The researcher-as-translator acknowledges this aspect of interpretative inquiry, and takes responsibility for the words chosen to represent the teachers' points of view (Thomas, 2002; Temple, 2006).
7.3 Contribution to the Body of Knowledge

As anticipated in Chapter 1, the research has contributed to knowledge in the following areas: teachers’ perspectives and motives, the impact of materials on the teacher, teachers’ theories of action, and materials development as CRP. A further aim of this exploratory case study approach was to identify questions and procedures for future research. Based on the discussion of the findings in Chapter 6 and on the conclusions regarding the contributions and limitations of the research in the first parts of this chapter, this section includes suggestions for taking the findings forward.

7.3.1 Teachers’ Perspectives and Motives

The research has focussed on qualitative pedagogic principles, thereby complementing large-scale surveys on the development and use of classroom materials conducted in the Netherlands, by involving teachers of English in various secondary school contexts (Dutch Institute for Curriculum Development, SLO, 2012; SLO, 2016). The case study approach facilitated gathering, analysing, and presenting data with this original aim in mind. It has answered Harwood’s (2016) appeal for more in-depth case studies in the literature on EFL teaching.

Including evaluation of existing theory, the research has shed light on Hadfield’s (2014b) theoretical overview of principles behind materials development through a variety of empirical data (Malterud, 2012). It would seem from the discussion in Chapter 6 that existing theory is partly supported, and can be extended, through the findings of this research. EFL teachers’ pedagogic principles about classroom materials are multifarious and include practical and pragmatic objectives. Theory triangulation can allow researchers in the field of materials development to incorporate this conclusion and more, updated findings from SLA research and applied linguistics in manageable frameworks (Guilloteaux, 2013). Such frameworks can then be used to inform (research on) coursebook selection and evaluation (Tomlinson, 2008, 2013).

7.3.2 Impact of Materials on the Teacher

The research has addressed a perceived gap in empirical research, particularly in the Netherlands, by focussing on the impact materials have on the teacher as opposed to the learner (Tomlinson and Masuhara, 2010). As presented and discussed in Chapter 5, despite its time-consuming nature, the participants enjoyed the creative materials development process. Providing opportunities to experiment with new ideas and pedagogic approaches, it seemed to be a way for them to learn by doing (Banegas, 2011; Odenthal et al., 2014). From a learning style theory perspective, it could be argued that these four teachers classify as activists and pragmatists, as opposed to reflectors and theorists (Honey and Mumford, 1992; Kahn and Walsh, 2006; Pritchard, 2014). Regarding teachers as learners, future research could set out to explore the ways in which learning styles and preferences impact on the creation and use of classroom materials.
Teachers’ own materials offer them a ‘source’ or ‘well’ (Phoebe, Interview-2) to draw from. As cultural artefacts, they could be further studied to explore recent trends discussed in Chapter 1, such as situated, localised foreign language pedagogies (Gray, 2010; Littlejohn, 2012; Canagarajah, 2016). This could be done to uncover other teachers’ pedagogic principles-in-use, and provide an impetus for dialogue between teachers researching and theorising their own practice. As recently suggested by Tomlinson (2016), who has seen a ‘dramatic increase’ (1) in university courses and doctoral research projects in the field, materials development as a principled endeavour will benefit from well-researched and observation-based principles like the ones presented in this dissertation.

7.3.3 Teachers’ Theories of Action
To some extent, the outcomes of this research illustrate the theoretical proposition that theories of action govern behaviour (Argyris and Schön, 1974). The teachers’ pedagogic principles appear to consist of the ones they can espouse, those which are revealed in use, and those which remain tacit. Confirming prior findings, the relationship between teacher cognition and practice, as explored through the analysis of the teachers’ materials and their use of them in the classroom, can be characterised as highly complex, personal, and multifaceted (Li and Walsh, 2011; Guerrettaz and Johnston, 2013; Garcia and Lewis, 2014). Based on the experiences discussed in this dissertation, it would seem that theorising teachers’ practice as a means to ‘engage with the complexity of teaching’ (Kiely, 2014: 447) should not only be done by educational researchers. Attempting to make explicit teachers’ intuitive knowledge and principles can also benefit other teachers as they develop their professional repertoires (Dewey, 1933; Schön, 1983; Allwright, 2005), and inform teacher educators and policy makers, as will be suggested in section 7.4 below.

7.3.4 Materials Development as a CRP Strategy
The methodology of this research hints at the potential for using materials development as a tool or strategy for CRP. Its participants confronted their explicit and implicit thinking by engaging in reflection. A major conclusion is that this happened mainly through engaging in dialogue. As the field research was limited to three face-to-face interactions with each participant, including one lesson observation, it was beyond the scope of this research to observe any longitudinal changes in reflective practice. Based on the data, it remains unsure whether the four teachers’ reflections will ‘lead to further actions, including [theorising] and seeking further resources’ (Wyatt, 2010: 236). As Shaun explains,

whether I will consciously apply that knowledge is another matter, of course… I am more aware of it now, much more than before. But whether that means I will eventually start developing materials in a completely different way, I couldn’t tell you… I think I won’t, actually (Interview-2).
To further illuminate the ways in which materials development can help EFL teachers reflect on their practice, a similar methodological approach could be used in future research. It would be recommended to use the reflections on the data collection and analysis approaches given in section 7.2. Through the suggested changes, educational researchers may aim at ‘helping teachers reflect on their own teaching and learning, seeking to stimulate teachers’ inquiry into their own work’, and, with this end in mind, further ‘develop frameworks, materials, and experimental environments in support of such reflection’ (Schön, 1992: 134). To strengthen reciprocity, potential participants could be involved in the research design from the start. Focussing on their own concerns and professional conditions, this could facilitate teachers’ transformation of their practice through research (Trainor and Bouchard, 2013).

The employment of a variety of triangulated methods is likely to contribute to a multimodal and multidimensional representation of teachers’ reflective practice. Classroom observations supplemented with interviews, in particular, will facilitate the collection of ‘descriptions of teaching to compare to cognitions elicited beforehand or subsequently when the rationale behind the observed practices can be explored’ (Wyatt, 2010: 245). While credibility could be strengthened through repeated cycles of observations and interviews, especially when the focus of the research is on teachers’ development of CRP, the impact on the workload of participants should be minimised (BERA, 2011; Harwood, 2016).

Based on appeals in the Dutch context, a continuing question for further exploration would be how collaboration and collegial exchange can ‘lead to more success and wisdom in the development of education’ (Van den Akker, 2005: 343, translated). This includes inquiries into how CRP through materials development can be a ‘catalyst for change’ (Tarrant, 2013: 44) at both the individual and institutional level, leading to professional growth on the part of the teacher and his colleagues, and enhanced learning opportunities for pupils (Richards and Farrell, 2005).

7.4 Contribution to Educational Practice
7.4.1 Evidence of Impact
The contribution of this professional doctorate research, in which the researcher’s position has been between insider and outsider, pertains not only to the research field in which it was conducted, but also to the improvement of the teachers’ practice (Nakata, 2015). As discussed in Chapter 3, a question was whether the teachers could name concrete benefits as a result of their participation (Zigo, 2001). Besides the valued opportunity to discuss their pedagogic considerations, the teachers expressed that they enjoyed trying out new approaches and materials, and were happy with the concrete materials they developed. Their responses to the member check suggest that the outcomes pertaining to their cases were perceived as relevant and contextualised (Trainor and Bouchard, 2013).
7.4.2 The Researcher’s Own Professional Practice

Reflexivity has been valued as criterion of qualitative research to be demonstrated throughout the research process (Sultana, 2007; Malterud, 2012). For novice researchers at doctoral level, however, beginning to grasp the concept of reflexivity and attempting to apply it in their thinking and writing may take considerable time and effort. There was a growing awareness that educational researchers, especially those who embark on a professional doctorate, are part of the social world they investigate, and that their assumptions shape the research and its questions (Cohen et al., 2011). In addition, as the writing of the dissertation progressed, an unanticipated consciousness arose of how the research in turn changes these assumptions. So rather than limiting the definition of reflexivity, cited in Chapter 4, to the ‘active acknowledgement by the researcher that [her] own actions and decisions will inevitably impact upon the meaning and context of the experience under investigation’ (Horsburgh, 2003: 308), she would suggest that reflexivity also includes the acknowledgement of the impact the research has on the researcher.

This impact includes the development of critically reflexive reading, writing, and thinking; an awareness that the power of conducting research lies in stimulating this kind of thinking more so than in its conclusions (Stake and Kerr, 1995; Ramaekers, 2007); first-hand experience of conducting rigorous research, and a strengthened ability and confidence to coach EFL student teachers in their research projects (Flyvbjerg, 2006); the stimulation of student teachers’ CRP, acceptance and appreciation of ambiguity, and their willingness to ask questions; an appreciation of the intricacies of language, and of the ability to process and speak more than one; continuous critical reflection on the materials used at the teacher education institute, and a strengthened ability to critique the curriculum and the course objectives and principles underpinning it.

The concrete contribution of the research also lies in the further refinement of methodology courses at the researcher’s institute, enhanced professional dialogues with other educators, and the development and execution of a materials development course as part of the Master of Education programme offered there. This course is underpinned by the literature and empirical findings presented in this dissertation.

7.4.3 Teachers

Based on the outcomes of this research, teachers are advised to express their personal pedagogic principles and objectives. This can help them be critical of the coursebook as opposed to accepting it as the authority (Tomlinson, 2012) and the ‘arbiter of validity’ in the classroom (Guerrettaz and Johnston, 2013: 785). The coursebook does not determine the pace for teachers and pupils, who might finish it weeks before the end of the academic year (Phoebe, Log) or, hypothetically speaking, as early as Christmas (Helen, Interview-1). Nor does it decide which grammar points should be tested (Shaun, Interview-1), or which types of comprehension questions should be asked (Mitch, Interview-2).
As Phoebe is discovering, professional development and learning in the area of materials development can occur through ‘intensive engagement with pedagogical reasoning in lesson or larger units of curriculum planning’ (Pang, 2016: 258). Considering the option that teaching experience may not be the result of, but rather, a ‘precondition for later theory development’ (Garcia and Lewis, 2014: 153), the habits, routines and repertoires of practice teachers develop as they gain teaching experience are likely to inform their knowledge-in-practice (Cochran-Smith and Lytle, 1999).

As suggested in Chapters 2 and 6, teachers may help and learn from each other through their use of metaphors for the coursebook, teaching and their own roles, as ‘expressive imaginative language can serve the practical end of guidance’ (Sennett, 2008: 192). This guidance could be offered by experienced teachers like Helen and Mitch, through discussions of their own metaphors, and those from the student teachers and newly qualified colleagues who observe them in their classrooms. Working with trusted peers, as especially Phoebe and Shaun already seem to be doing, and forming critical friendships, would be highly recommended ‘to consider alternative interpretations and deepen reflections’ on practice (Nickel, 2013: 70; Warin et al., 2006). Artefacts such as teachers’ own materials can form a rich data source for reflection, as well as an impetus for critical discussion (Walsh and Mann, 2015). As these artefacts are created as part of many teachers’ daily practice anyway, they offer the potential to make critical reflection part of their practice as well.

7.4.4 Teacher Educators and Others Involved in Facilitating Teachers’ Professional Development

The pre-service and in-service programmes offered at the institute where the researcher works will be informed by the empirical findings of the research in the ways discussed below.

Pre-Service Teacher Education

In the Dutch context, Kelchtermans (2013) has made an appeal for artefacts to be used as prompts for discussions, to support the emergence of a dialogical research disposition and reflective attitude on the part of student teachers. This suggestion, which is supported by the conclusions of this research, offers teacher educators strategies to help future teachers become more critical, as they ‘overcome their everyday notions of what it means to be a teacher, how to teach, and how to support student learning’ (Johnson, 2015: 517). EFL student teachers will be continually encouraged to consider materials development as a strategy to think about and reflect on their practice.

This research complements other educational case studies used to explore the interplay between different teaching contexts, materials development, and the personal and professional growth of EFL teachers (Popovici and Bolitho, 2003; Wyatt, 2010; Jolly and Bolitho, 2011). These and other case studies will be used in the pre-service programme to ‘look at teaching practice as a context for generating, not only for applying, usable knowledge’ (Schön, 1992: 134). In hindsight, using them for teaching purposes justifies the decision to anonymise the four cases as reflected on in Chapter 4.
In-service teacher education can foster teacher reflection and self-awareness through feedback from peers and educators provided in a supportive environment (Nickel, 2013; Diaz Maggioli, 2014). The methodology and outcomes of this research suggest that, as discussed in Chapter 2, materials development can indeed be defined as an ‘effective way of helping language education professionals to articulate and develop their own theories of language learning and to help them to develop the skills which they need in order to apply these theories to practice’ (Tomlinson, 2003: 460). Materials development projects or courses involving teachers’ own concerns, contexts and experiences appear to be suitable forms to enhance teachers’ reflective practice. Any project or course in language teacher education, as proposed by Canniveng and Martinez (2003), McGrath (2013) and Tomlinson (2016), could start with an invitation to teachers to share their pedagogic principles. The methods employed in this research can be included to draw out the teachers’ principles-in-use, and address the potential differences between what teachers espouse and what practice reveals. The materials development course at the researcher’s institute, for example, requires student teachers to write down their pedagogic principles in a teaching portfolio, and to reflect back on them during a criterion-based interview at the end of the course, after having executed a lesson series in practice.

7.4.5 Policy Makers, Curriculum Designers, and Materials Developers

In the first interview, Helen expressed that, although some of her colleagues feel they must work their way through all the exercises in the book, it is the teacher who needs to make use of the space and opportunities which are afforded by the coursebook. The outcomes of this research confirm that classroom materials themselves are a valuable source for professional decision-making and development (Ball and Cohen, 1996; Harwood, 2016). Those in charge of curriculum and materials development should be aware of the implications of this finding, because of their recommended responsibility to guide teachers in curricular professional development (SLO, 2015a). Suffering from the ‘limitation of pre-determined linearity, which is at odds with what we know of language acquisition’ (Levrai, 2013: 6), curriculum and materials developers are advised to allow space for autonomous teaching professionals to make informed, critical decisions based on their own pedagogic principles.

7.5 Concluding Thoughts

‘Mutato nomine, de te fabula narratur (change the name, and the story is about you)’ – Horace (Thomas, 2002: 427).

As an exploratory study, this small-scale case study research has illuminated the interaction between four Dutch EFL teachers and the materials they create and use. Paraphrasing Peräkylä (1997), the
results of this study are not generalisable as descriptions of what other EFL teachers do with their materials, but they are generalisable as descriptions of what an EFL teacher, with his or her materials, can do (cited in Pallotti, 2016: 386). The professional doctorate study has been aimed at offering ‘snapshots of sense making in action’ (Kubanyiova and Feryok, 2015: 443). It is sincerely hoped that it will realise its potential through this dissertation, which is to help teachers, and those involved in facilitating the professional development of teachers, recognise themselves and their practices in theory. This, in turn, may lead these teaching professionals to deepen their knowledge for and of their own practice.
Appendix 1: Dutch Secondary Education System

(Eurydice, 2013)
Appendix 2: Informed Consent Letter (translated)

Dear [name potential participant],

Thank you very much for indicating your willingness to participate in my research. In this letter, you will find more information regarding this research.

The reason I have asked you to participate is that I am conducting research for my professional doctorate at the University of Roehampton, involving teachers of English in the lower forms who use their own classroom materials to supplement the coursebook. I am curious to find out why and how they do this, and whether and how the development of materials helps them develop themselves and improve their teaching practice. The research is sponsored by my employer, the Fontys Teacher Education Institute in Tilburg.

Participating in this research entails the following:
1. a preliminary meeting in which we discuss the procedure and sign this form
2. an interview consisting of questions about your professional context, and the development and use of your own classroom materials; this interview will be audiorecorded
3. keeping a log while you develop materials for one specific lesson
4. an observation of that lesson with the help of a video recorder
5. a second interview, consisting of questions about the observed lesson and a conclusion; this will be audiorecorded

Participation is completely voluntary. If you decide against participation now, or wish to withdraw for any or no reason at any moment during the five steps explained above, you can inform me orally or in writing.

The research will entail a time investment; the first meeting will take approximately half an hour, and both interviews will take 30-60 minutes each. You can choose a location for these meetings. In addition, the research involves keeping a log during the materials development process. You can keep a written log or make an audio or video recording of yourself. Finally, signing this letter means you agree to sharing this log and your materials with me for analysis.

Because the lesson will be videorecorded, I will need to secure consent from the pupils in your classroom and/or their parents. I will contact the head teacher of your school to this end. Possibly, I will ask you to let your pupils sign a short letter of assent if necessary.

After all the steps have been completed, I will transcribe the interviews, and analyse these transcriptions together with the log, the materials, and the observation notes. I will share my findings with you. If you should have any comments or corrections, I will include these in my thesis. If you should wish to remain anonymous in the thesis, you can choose a first name as pseudonym.
The collected data will be stored in an digital database, which will be password protected. You will be granted access to your data at any time during the research. I will track any access details in a separate file. The findings of this research will be presented in my thesis. This thesis will only be published online by the University of Roehampton, and will be subject to copyright. Possibly, I will use the findings of this research in future academic journal articles and presentations. The presentation details will also be tracked in a separate file.

Please feel free to share any comments, questions, suggestions or feedback with regard to the research with me. You can reach me by e-mail (m.bouckaert@fontys.nl) and telephone at any time during the research.

Please indicate below which answer applies:

I would like to remain anonymous in all the descriptions of the research findings: yes/ no

If ‘yes’: my chosen pseudonym is ……………………………………………………………………………………………

During the research, I would like to communicate in: Dutch / English

Agreed and signed on …………………………………………………………………… (date)

……………………………………………………………………

Marina Bouckaert

(participant’s name) (researcher’s name)

……………………………………………………………………

(participant’s signature) (researcher’s signature)
Appendix 3: Interview Guide Semi-Structured Interview 1

The English translation of this interview guide is provided on the following page.

Vooraf: Dankjewel voor je tijd, heel fijn dat je mee wil doen aan dit eerste interview.

Zoals je weet wordt dit opgenomen met een audiorecorder; deze zet ik nu aan.

Introductie: Het interview bestaat uit vragen over jouw professionele context, het gebruik van lesmateriaal in je lessen en het ontwerpen van eigen materiaal.

Als er tussendoor iets onduidelijk is of als je zelf vragen hebt, schroom dan niet om dit aan te geven.

1. Zou je om te beginnen wat willen vertellen over jouw ervaringen als docent Engels? Zoals: waarom ben je docent Engels geworden, wanneer ben je begonnen met lesgeven, hoe heb je dit tot nu toe ervaren?

2. Je geeft nu les op [naam school]. Kun je wat vertellen over je ervaringen als docent op deze school, met name in de onderbouw?

3. Welke leergang gebruik je in de onderbouwklassen? Kun je wat vertellen over je ervaringen met deze leergang? Welke rol en functie heeft de leergang in je lessen?

4. Maak je naast de leergang nog gebruik van andere materialen in je lessen? Zo ja, kun je wat vertellen over de motieven/redenen die je hiervoor hebt en wat je ervaringen hiermee zijn?

5. Je gaf eerder aan zelf ook lesmateriaal te maken. Zou je wat kunnen vertellen over de aanleiding om dit te gaan doen? Welke motieven/redenen had je of heb je hiervoor?

6. Kun je wat vertellen over je ervaringen met je eigen materialen? Welke rol en functie hebben die in je lessen?

7. Zou je wat kunnen vertellen over waaraan jouw zelfontwikkelde materialen te herkennen zijn? Wat maakt ze uniek?

8. Wat zou je samenvattend zeggen over wat voor jou belangrijke kenmerken zijn van lesmaterialen?

Afsluiting: Zijn er daarnaast nog andere dingen die je kwijt wil?

Heb je nog aanvullingen op dit interview of schieten je nog dingen te binnen, laat het me dan weten.

Bedankt voor je tijd! Ik zet de recorder nu uit.

Na afloop: Hoe vond je het om deze vragen te beantwoorden?

[Maken van afspraak voor lesobservatie.]
Before: Thank you for your time, I appreciate your willingness to cooperate with this first interview.

As you know, this interview will be recorded with an audio recorder; I am turning this on now.

Introduction: The interview contains questions about your professional context, the use of classroom materials during your lessons, and the creation of your own materials.

If anything is unclear or if you have questions yourself, please let me know.

1. To start, could you tell me something about your experiences as an English teacher? Like: why did you become an English teacher, when did you start teaching, what have your experiences been so far?

2. You now teach at [name of the school]. Could you tell me about your experiences as a teacher at this school, particularly in the lower two forms?

3. Which coursebook do you use in the lower forms? Could you tell me something about your experiences with this coursebook? What role and function does it have in your lessons?

4. Do you use other materials in addition to the coursebook in your lessons? If yes, could you tell me something about the motives/reasons you have for this, and what your experiences with these materials are?

5. You indicated earlier that you also create your own materials. Could you tell me something about what made you do this? What motives/reasons did you or do you have for this?

6. Could you tell me something about your experiences with your own materials? What role and function do they have in your lessons?

7. Could you tell me about the characteristics of your own materials? What makes them uniquely yours?

8. In summary, what would you say are important characteristics of classroom materials?

Closure: Are there any other things you would like to discuss?

If you should want to add something or if something should come to mind afterwards, do let me know.

Thank you for your time! I am turning off the audio recorder.

After: What was it like for you to answer these questions?

[Make appointment for classroom observation.]
Appendix 4: Classroom Observation Guide

Please note that the actual guide used for the observations contained more room for notes than this format.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Docent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Datum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tijd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokaal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesfase (schatting)</th>
<th>Observatie: gezien, gehoord, ervaren, etc.</th>
<th>Interpretatie: gedachten, ingevingen, vragen, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voorafgaand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesfase</td>
<td>Observatie: gezien, gehoord, ervaren, etc.</td>
<td>Interpretatie: gedachten, ingevingen, vragen, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minuten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(schatting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: Interview Guide Semi-Structured Interview 2

The English translation of this interview guide is provided on the following page.

Vooraf: Dankjewel voor je tijd, heel fijn dat je mee wil doen aan dit tweede interview.

Zoals je weet wordt dit opgenomen met een audiorecorder; deze zet ik nu aan.

Introductie:

Het interview bestaat met name uit vragen over de les die ik afgelopen [dag/tijdstip] heb geobserveerd en het gebruik van lesmaterialen in die les, inclusief jouw eigen materiaal.

Als er tussendoor iets onduidelijk is of als je zelf vragen hebt, schroom dan niet om dit aan te geven.

1. Zou je om te beginnen wat willen vertellen over hoe jij deze les ervaren hebt?
   Zoals: hoe vond je het dat ik er was, hoe vond je het dat de les werd opgenomen, verliep de les zoals gepland, welke belangrijke momenten herinner je je me met name?

2. Je maakte in de les gebruik van je zelfontwikkelde materialen. Kun je wat vertellen over de rol en functie van jouw eigen materialen in deze specifieke les?

3. [Eventueel] Je gebruikte ook [beschrijving aanvullende materialen]. Kun je wat vertellen over de rol en functie van deze materialen in deze specifieke les?

4. Je gaf eerder aan dat je het in jouw lessen belangrijk vindt dat [beschrijving espoused theory 1, 2, 3]. Zou je wat kunnen vertellen over of en hoe deze elementen terug te zien waren in deze les?

5. Als je terugkijkt op het proces van materiaalontwikkeling – dus het maken van de materialen, het bijhouden van een logboek, en de uitvoering van de les – word je je dan bewust van wat jij belangrijke elementen vindt aan die materialen? Op welke momenten?

6. Word je je bewust van de overeenkomsten tussen wat je zegt (in het logboek en het eerste gesprek) en wat je doet (in de materialen en in de les)? Op welke momenten?

7. Word je je bewust van de verschillen tussen wat je zegt en wat je doet? Op welke momenten?

8. Welke rol had het eerste gesprek in het je bewust worden van wat jij belangrijke elementen vindt aan lesmateriaal? Welke rol heeft dit gesprek daarin?

Afsluiting:

Zijn er daarnaast nog andere dingen die je kwijt wil?

Hoe je nog aanvullingen op dit interview of schieten je nog dingen te binnen, laat het me dan weten.

Bedankt voor je tijd! Ik zet de recorder nu uit.

Na afloop:

Hoe vond je het om deze vragen te beantwoorden?

[Bespreken van vervolgstappen data-analyse en verwerking in proefschrift.]
Before: Thank you for your time, I appreciate your willingness to cooperate with this second interview.

As you know, this interview will be recorded with an audio recorder; I am turning this on now.

Introduction: The interview contains questions about the lesson I observed last [day/time] and the use of classroom materials during this lesson, including your own materials.

If anything is unclear or if you have questions yourself, please let me know.

1. To start, could you tell me something about how you experienced this lesson? Like: what was it like to have me there, how did you feel about the lesson being recorded, did the lesson go according to plan, which important moments do you remember specifically?

2. You used your own materials during the lesson. Could you tell me something about the role and function of your materials in this particular lesson?

3. [Optional] You also used [description of additional materials]. Could you tell me something about the role and function of these materials in this particular lesson?

4. You indicated earlier that you find it important in your lessons that [description of espoused principles 1, 2, 3]. Could you tell me something about whether and how these elements were reflected in this lesson?

5. Looking back on the materials development process – so creating the materials, keeping the reflective log, and using the materials in class – do you become aware of what you consider to be important characteristics of those materials? At which moments?

6. Do you become aware of the similarities between what you say (in the log and in the first interview) and what you do (in the materials and in the lesson)? At which moments?

7. Do you become aware of the differences between what you say and what you do? At which moments?

8. What role did the first interview have in becoming aware of what you consider to be important characteristics of classroom materials? What role does this follow-up interview have?

Closure: Are there any other things you would like to discuss?

If you should want to add something or if something should come to mind afterwards, do let me know.

Thank you for your time! I am turning off the audio recorder.

After: What was it like for you to answer these questions?

[Discuss data analysis procedure and processing in the dissertation.]
1. Excerpt from Helen’s three-page, written log

This sample log includes Helen’s name for the game she is creating, and her considerations regarding the use of a dice, the number of squares on the board, the number of pupils per team, and the types of questions she wants to include on the cue cards.

2. Excerpt from Mitch’s one-and-a-half-page, typed log

Researcher’s translation: “Wednesday, 17 June 2015. 12.20. I am about to burn the DVD. Always an adventure with the DVD recorder manual. Oh yes, formatting the disk, how did that go again? Oh yes, finalising the disk, oh it does that automatically. Then see whether the DVD actually plays on the computer, open disk, VLC player does not respond, turn everything off, turn everything on. Yes it works on the PC, now let’s hope it will work at school as well. Then finish log and send it all to Marina. It is 13.25.”
Appendix 7: Sample Classroom Materials

Project on Social Engagement

Name: Class

For Navo and VWO 3

1. PRELUDE

By watching a film you learn:
- to use your imagination
- to interpret the content
- to define your own opinion
- a different language intently

Watching a film is a personal journey through the story. Absorbing this story you travel through India and you can actually smell the surroundings, feel the humidity and see the densely populated areas.

Before we start with the film I would like to know your background knowledge of the country where the story takes place. Answer in English.

1. First page of Phoebe’s nine-page handout, showing copies of PowerPoint slides 1 and 2
2. WARMING UP

3. THE FILM

Content comprehension. Answer in full sentences in English.

1. What would have happened to Jamal and Salim if they had stayed with Mansur?

2. In what city is the Taj Mahal situated?

3. What details about the Taj Mahal does Jamal supply the tourists? List 3.

2. Second page of Phoebe's nine-page handout, showing copies of the PowerPoint slides 3 and 4
ZBK Grammatica

SOME/ANY

Betekenen beide: sommige/enkele

Some → in gewone zinnen (bevestigende zinnen) aangegeven met een: +

Any → in ontkennende zinnen (zeggen dat iets NIET zo is) aangegeven met een: -
→ in vragende zinnen (waarin een vraag gesteld wordt) aangegeven met een: ?

Voorbeelden:
Timothy has got some nice flowers. → (+)
Mary doesn’t want any of Timothy’s flowers. → (-)
Why doesn’t Mary want any of the flowers? → (?)

SOMEBODY/ANYBODY

Betekenen beide: iemand (soms: niemand)

Somebody → in gewone zinnen (bevestigende zinnen) aangegeven met een: +

Anybody → in ontkennende zinnen (zeggen dat iets NIET zo is) aangegeven met een: -
→ in vragende zinnen (waarin een vraag gesteld wordt) aangegeven met een: ?

Voorbeelden:
Mum and dad know somebody who can help. → (+)
There isn’t anybody else who can help. → (-)
Can anybody help me with my homework? → (?)

SOMETHING/ANYTHING

Betekenen beide: iets (soms: niets)

Something → in gewone zinnen (bevestigende zinnen) aangegeven met een: +

Anything → in ontkennende zinnen (zeggen dat iets NIET zo is) aangegeven met een: -
→ in vragende zinnen (waarin een vraag gesteld wordt) aangegeven met een: ?

Voorbeelden:
We want something to drink. → (+)
I don’t have anything to drink. → (-)
Do you want anything to drink? → (?)

Als je zeker wilt weten welke je moet kiezen, kijk je EERST naar de zin en stel de volgende vraag:

Is het een BEVESTIGENDE (+), ONTKENNENDE (-) of VRAANDE (?) zin?

3. Front of Shaun’s handout
Exercises

Kies bij de volgende zinnen welk van de 3: Bevestigend (+), ontkennend (-) of vragend (?). Zet het teken tussen de haakjes en schrijf bevestigend, ontkennend of vragend erachter.

1. We worked very hard on some new project. ( )
2. Did you find anybody to drive you home? ( )
3. Is there any tea? ( )
4. Marc can’t ask anybody to his birthday. ( )
5. The dog has something in his mouth. ( )

Bij de volgende oefening schrijf je EERST +, - of ? tussen de haakjes, daarna vul je pas some of any in!

Some/any
1. ( ) I’m going to buy ________ eggs.
2. ( ) They didn’t make ________ mistakes.
3. ( ) There are ________ beautiful flowers in the garden.
4. ( ) Did you buy ________ rice?
5. ( ) I am going out to buy ________ milk.

Somebody/anybody
1. ( ) Has ________ found my blue pencil?
2. ( ) Would ________ please help me?
3. ( ) ________ has broken the window.
4. ( ) There isn’t ________ in the house.
5. ( ) Tim found ________ to play with.

Something/anything
1. ( ) Mathilda said ________ nice to me.
2. ( ) Have you got ________ to eat?
3. ( ) I didn’t do ________ because I was tired.
4. ( ) Is there ________ I can do to help?
5. ( ) John doesn’t know ________ about it!

Nu moet je het helemaal zelf doen. EERST kijken of het: +, - of ? is. Daarna kijken of je: sommige/enkele, (n)iemand of (n)iets moet invullen.

Vul in: some/any, somebody/anybody OF something/anything

1. Where’s dad? - In the garage. He is repairing ________ .
2. There is ________ (2x) under the tree.
3. I can’t see ________ , it’s too dark. Where is he?
4. I can’t find my bag. - Is there ________ in it? - Yes, of course, ________ money, ________ mints, and ________ papers.
5. I don’t need ________ to help me.

4. Back of Shaun’s handout
Appendix 8: Example of Deductive Coding

The English translation of this interview excerpt, including the deductive codes attributed to it, is provided on the following page.

The codes used in this excerpt from the first interview with Helen are 11. Focus on learner differences, learner needs and teaching conditions, highlighted in green, and 12. Focus on using prior knowledge, e.g. of the L1, highlighted in grey.
The codes used in this excerpt from the first interview with Helen are 11. *Focus on learner differences, learner needs and teaching conditions*, highlighted in green, and 12. *Focus on using prior knowledge, e.g. of the L1*, highlighted in grey.
### Appendix 9: Example of Inductive Coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>Ehm kun je wat vertellen over je ervaringen met je eigen materialen in de lessen, dus welke rol, welke functie hebben die materialen in de lessen?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Ja, vooral als oefening en voorbereiding op de toets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>...moeilijk zouden we ook even niet weten hoe dat we 't anders moeten doen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Eh dat is 't nut van ° 't materiaal eigenlijk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>En om de, ja om de stof die je dan al gedaan of in kleine porties hebt aangetekend om die telaten samenvoelen, dus ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Zo doe je dat met leesvaardigheid ook: kleine stukjes, je begint inderdaad met een oefening met woordjes om de woordenschat op te bouwen, hè ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>...en oh daarna krijgen ze een klein tekstje en dat gaat dan over techniek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>...en daar heb je een tiental woorden die, die moeten ze dan kennen, daar krijgen ze wat oefeningetjes mee ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>...en daarna krijgen ze een klein tekstje en dat gaat dan over techniek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>...en de, informatie van de docenten zodat die stof dan weer terugkomt ... (15:16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Op die manier bouw je die woordenschat op.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ja.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>...en dat materiaal bij elkaar zorgt ervoor dat ze voorbereid worden op ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>...zullen we ° 't maar gewoon noemen, de toets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ja.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>En je had je noemd techniek als thema?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Stelt je aan met wat jij maakt bij wat de leerling biedt, of bij iets anders?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ehm nee, dat hangt van ° 't niveau af.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Eh bij de theoretische leerweg vaak gewoon aan wat de leerling biedt, want daar maakt ° 't in principe niet zo heel veel uit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Maar basis en kader wordt ° 't meestal wat heel erg gekeken naar ° 't welke sector de leerlingen hebben gekozen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interpretative memos used in this excerpt from the first interview with Shaun were later conflated into the following codes: *meeting national standards* (highlighted in brown), *measured input* (blue), *application of recently acquired knowledge* (pink), and *current and future life experiences* (grey).
Appendix 10: Example of Inductive Content Analysis

S: Dat je dan op de verschillende, dus techniek of zorg en welzijn, en daar ga je gericht op die sector een opdracht maken.
M: Ja.
S: Dus als ik bijvoorbeeld een folder wil laten maken.
M: Dan is de opdracht bij alle sectoren hetzelfde: maak een folder.
S: Maar dan ga je bij techniek toespitsen: maak een folder over iets wat met techniek te maken heeft.
M: Ja.
S: En dan ga je met metaaltechniek aan de slag.
M: Ja.
S: En bij zorg en welzijn zeg je “ja, maak maar een folder voor mooie kapsels” of zo.
M: Ja.
S: Daar ga je dan wel richting belevingswereld, maar da’s eigenlijk ook heel makkelijk.
S: Dat gaat heel onbewust omdat je weet “dat is een zorg en welzijn-klas....”
M: Ja.
S: …“dus daar moet ik zo’n opdracht gaan doen”.
M: Ja, dat zit er ook een beetje automatisch in dan.
S: Dat zit er automatisch in, ja.
M: Hmm, word je je gedurende dat proces, maar ook door die interviews die wij nu hebben hé, word je je dan bewust van of er overeenkomsten en verschillen zitten tussen wat je zegt dat je doet.
S: Dus bijvoorbeeld in dat interview en in het logboek, wat je verantwoordt.
M: Hmm-hm.
S: …en wat je daadwerkelijk doet?
M: Dus hoe dat in de les tot uiting komt?
S: Ik denk geen hele grote verschillen, als ze d’r zijn.
S: In ieder geval niet dat ik zelf achteraf zeg van “ik heb daar een heel mooi verhaalte opgehangen en ik doe dat eigenlijk helemaal niet”.
M: Nee.
S: Dat zou best kunnen, maar...
M: Ja.
S: Dan ben ik me daar niet bewust van, in ieder geval.
M: En helpen en helpen mijn mijn vragen dan om je er bewust van te maken, of er misschien verschillen of overeenkomsten zijn?
S: Misschien wel om anders naar dingen te kijken, ja.
M: Ik ben ik heb hier eigenlijk helemaal nooit zo over nagedacht over die opdracht.
M: Nee.
S: Ik denk “ja, oké, ‘t werkt, prima, maar...”
M: Ja.
S: Maar dat na de na de vragen en na het idee wat er achter zit, nee ja, daar denk ik eigenlijk niet zo heel erg meer bij na.
M: Nee.

(excerpt from the follow-up interview with Shaun)
Appendix 11: Example of Metaphor-Led Discourse Analysis

M Ehm als je nou terugkijkt op dat hele proces van materiaalontwikkeling, dus 't 't maken en logboek bijhouden en die les geven uiteindelijk, eh word je je dan ook bewust van wat jij belangrijk vindt aan die materialen die je zelf maakt?

P Eh ja, natuurlijk wel.

P Natuurlijk eh heeft 't gesprek 't interview dat we hebben gehad ook wel, in m'n hoofd heeft dat ook wel verder geleefd.

P Ehja, en dan komen we ook eigenlijk weer terug op wat in dat interview is gezegd.

P Eh wat ik belangrijk vind om over te brengen dat heb ik wel geprobeerd hierin te verwerken.

M Oké.

P Hè, dus aansluiten bij die actualiteit, de eh ja, de hele wereld hè...

P Engels is een eh een intermediair tussen de wereld en de mensen, om dat d'r in te gebruiken.

P En wat is dan jouw vraag, of me dat bewust heeft gemaakt?

M Ja, of je tijdens dat proces bewuster bent geworden, en op welke momenten dan inderdaad misschien, van wat wat jij belangrijk aan materialen vindt?

P Ja.

P Ehm, ja daar ben ik mee bezig geweest.

P Ik kan zo niet precies zeggen wanneer of hoe of wat.

P Maar ehm wat ik wél heb gemerkt gedurende het schooljaar is eh...

P Omdat de leerlingen 't allemaal al zo eh frontaal en klassikaal ervaren, eh van "ik geef een hele bulk met informatie en die hebben ze maar te verwerken".

P Dat ze nu wel echt gewoon zelf aan de slag konden.

P Dat 't niet meer zo eh frontaal klassikaal eh op hun over hun uitgestort werd.

M Ja.

P Dat het nu toch meer eh ja, een leuke film kijken waar je in opgaat en dan met opdrachten aan de slag.

M Dat ja, dat dat was gewoon een andere werkvorm en eh ik denk dat ze daardoor meer actiever zijn geworden.

M Oké.


M En eh je zegt van ehm in dat eerste gesprek heeft 't misschien wat gedaan, dat heeft daarna doorgewerkt?

P Hm-hm.

M [schaapt keel] Word je je ook bewust tussen wat je eh zei dat je wilde gaan doen in dat eerste interview en in 't logboek bijvoorbeeld en hoe 't daadwerkelijk is uitge- wat 't resultaat is geworden?

(excerpt from the follow-up interview with Phoebe)
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