1

Materials Development So Far

Introduction

Materials Development

The term "materials development" is used in this book to refer to all the different processes in the development and use of materials for language learning and teaching. "Such processes include materials evaluation, materials adaptation, materials design, materials production, materials exploitation and materials research." All of these processes are important and should ideally "interact in the making of any materials designed to help learners to acquire a language" (Tomlinson, 2012, pp. 143–144).

As well as being the practical undertaking described above, materials development has also become, since the mid-1990s, a popular field of academic study that investigates the principles and procedures of the design, writing, implementation, and evaluation of materials. "Ideally these two aspects of materials development are interactive in that the theoretical studies inform, and are informed by, the actual development and use of learning materials" (Tomlinson, 2001, p. 66). This is true of many recent publications about materials development, for example Tomlinson (2008, 2010a, 2011, 2013a, 2013c, 2015, 2016a), Mukundan (2009), Harwood (2010a, 2014), Tomlinson and Masuhara (2010), McDonough, Shaw, and Masuhara (2013), McGrath (2013, 2016), Garton and Graves (2014), Mishan and Timmis (2015), Masuhara, Mishan, and Tomlinson (2017), and Maley and Tomlinson (in press). Nearly all the writers in these books are both practitioners and researchers and their focus is on the theoretical principles and the practical realizations of materials development. The interaction between theory and practice and between practice and theory is also a deliberately distinctive feature of *The complete guide to the theory and practice of materials development for language learning*. Like the other writers referred to above, we have both worked on many coursebooks, supplementary books and web materials (for example, for Bulgaria, China, Ethiopia, Japan, Morocco, Namibia, Nigeria, Singapore, Zambia and the global market), we have worked on many research projects, and we have published many articles and books on theoretical and practical aspects of materials development.

Materials

There are many different definitions of what language-learning materials are. For example, "any systematic description of the techniques and exercises to be used in classroom

The Complete Guide to the Theory and Practice of Materials Development for Language Learning, First Edition. Brian Tomlinson and Hitomi Masuhara.

teaching" (Brown, 1995, p. 139). Many of these definitions focus on exercises for teaching (as Brown's definition does). We prefer to focus on materials for learning and the definition we are using for this book is that materials are anything that can be used by language learners to facilitate their learning of the target language. So materials could be a coursebook, a CD ROM, a story, a song, a video, a cartoon, a dictionary, a mobile phone interaction, a lecture, or even a photograph used to stimulate a discussion. They could also be an exercise, an activity, a task, a presentation, or even a project.

> Materials can be informative (in that they inform the learner about the target language), instructional (in that they guide the learner to practice the language), experiential (in that they provide the learner with experience of the language in use), eliciting (in that they encourage the learner to use the language) or exploratory (in that they help the learner to make discoveries about the language). (Tomlinson, 2012, p. 143)

Since L2 language teaching began, the vast majority of institutions that have provided language learning classes have either bought materials for their learners or have required their learners to buy materials for themselves. Some experts question whether commercial materials are actually necessary (e.g. Thornbury & Meddings, 2001) and some institutions even forbid their use at certain levels. For example, the Berlitz schools actually forbid the use of reading and writing at the lower levels. Their classes do not have a coursebook and their classrooms do not have whiteboards. Instead, the learners have to rely on the teacher as the source of oral input and the model of the target language. Interestingly, a Berlitz teacher at a school in Germany tried to teach Brian beginner's German in this way. Brian just could not segment the flow of language he was being exposed to by the teacher and, in desperation, the teacher took out a cigarette packet and wrote his sentences on it—thus creating useful materials and facilitating learning of the German being taught.

Materials can also be in design, as designed, in action, or in reflection. Materials in design are those that are in the process of being developed; materials as designed are those that have been finalized and are in a form ready for use; materials in action are those that are actually in the process of being used, and materials in reflection are those that are represented when users of the materials recollect their use. In theory the more thorough and principled the design process is the more effective the materials as designed are likely to be both when in action and when in reflection. However, in reality, user factors such as teacher / student rapport, teacher impact, teacher beliefs and learner motivation can mean that principled design becomes ineffective use and vice versa. This means that, ideally, materials need to be evaluated in all four states. The first three states receive a lot of attention in this book but the concept of materials in reflection has only just occurred to us. This could be a fruitful area of enquiry as knowing how users represent the materials in their minds, which they have used, could be very informative. The four states mentioned above are not necessarily just progressive; they can be recursive and interactive too. For example, the perception of materials in reflection can influence the subsequent use of the materials and / or the redesign of the materials. See Chapters 3, 4, and 15 for discussion of pre-use, whilst-use and post-use evaluation, of adaptation and of use of materials, and Ellis (2016) for a distinction between materials as work plans and materials as work plans in implementation.

In our travels around the classrooms of the world we have seen many examples of resourceful teachers creating useful homemade materials when effective commercial materials were not available. For example, a teacher in a Vanuatu primary school presented an English version of a local folk story by unrolling it across the cut-out "screen" of a make-believe cardboard television for the students to read, as well as getting puppets made by the pupils to act out dialogues. A different teacher in another Vanuatu primary school passed round a single photo of a Vietnamese girl running screaming down a road to stimulate groups to discuss the effects of war. There was a remarkably rich resource room full of wonderful homemade materials, which embarrassed the teachers in an Ethiopian primary school. And we both talked to three 7 year olds in a Guangzhou primary school who were the only pupils who could not only chant out rehearsed responses to the textbook drills but could hold a conversation with us in English. All three were dissatisfied with the teachers' limited use of the coursebook and looked out for materials of their own. One surfed the web in English every night; one subscribed to a soccer magazine written for native-speaker adults, and one went to Foreigners' Corner every weekend to talk to foreigners in English. Our point is that language learning materials can be produced commercially by professionals, they can be created by teachers, they can be found by learners, and they can even be created by learners (as when a class at one level writes stories for a class at a lower level). All four types of materials can facilitate language learning. And all four types can fail to facilitate language learning too. It all depends on the match between the materials and the needs, wants, and engagement of the learners using them (see Chapter 3).

For a discussion of whether or not commercial materials are typically necessary and useful, see Chapter 2 in this book. For suggestions about how the teacher can help learners to look for English outside the classroom see Barker (2010), Tomlinson (2014a) and Pinnard (2016).

Commercial Publications

Coursebooks

Although often under attack for inflexibility, shallowness, and lack of local relevance, the coursebook has been (and arguably still is) the main aid to learning a second or foreign language since language classes began. For example, when the learning of English first became popular in China in the early part of the nineteenth century many coursebooks were written by eminent Chinese scholars for teachers to use in their classrooms. In Daoyi and Zhaoyi (2015) there are accounts of the coursebooks used in 1920 and a reference to a general review of textbooks that listed over 200 English coursebooks published in China in the period 1912–1949.

A coursebook is usually written to contain the information, instruction, exposure, and activities that learners at a particular level need in order to increase their communicative competence in the target language. Of course, this is never enough and ideally even the best coursebook ever written needs supplementation. However, the reality for many learners and teachers is that the coursebook is all they have, and they just have to make do with it. This has been true for hundreds of years and is still true today in, for example, the schools and colleges in West Kalimantan that we visited recently and where we talked to Indonesian students who are learning English in state institutions with

government-approved, locally published coursebooks or in private institutions using global coursebooks published in the United Kingdom for worldwide consumption.

The early twentieth-century coursebooks referred to in Daoyi and Zhaoyi (2015) "normally used a form of the grammar-translation method (GTM) with a focus on reading skills rather than spoken English" (p. 29). However, in the late 1920s a version of Harold Edward Palmer's direct method started to influence some of the coursebooks being published and similar oral methods were soon driving many of the coursebooks. The teacher and her learners were dominated by the one coursebook they used, which was obeyed as an edict rather than used as a resource. This excessive reverence for the coursebook continued (according to Daoyi & Zhaoyi, 2015) until the 1990s when the shift began from "teaching the textbook" to "teaching with the textbook" (p. 122) and supplementary materials became available too. By now there were many foreign publishing firms located in China and their global coursebooks exerted an influence. Teachers complained that coursebooks were either too conventional and restricting or "they adopted new approaches unsuitable for the pedagogical situation of the local areas where the textbooks" were being used. Every teacher, it seems, used a coursebook, but no teacher was happy with the book they were using. It seemed to have been accepted that this situation was inevitable and teachers were encouraged (but not helped very much) to adapt their coursebook to make it more suitable for the learners they were using it with (see Chapter 4 for discussion of ways of doing this).

It seems that what was true for China was largely true throughout the world (certainly in our experience in Austria, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Oman, Singapore, the United States, the United Kingdom, and Vietnam). And it seems that it is still true to some extent today with, according to research done by the British Council (2008) and by Tomlinson (2010b), most teachers in many different countries saying that they use a textbook, that their textbook is chosen for them, and that they are not satisfied that it really helps their learners to acquire the target language.

Daoyi and Zhaoyi (2015, pp. 124–126) show how the early GTM and direct method were gradually supplemented in China (but not entirely replaced) by the structural approach, then the audio-lingual method, then functional / notional approaches, then communicative language teaching, then the eclectic method, and now by task-based language teaching. This "progress" can be observed by putting a line of textbooks in chronological order from the 1920s to today (as they do in the Textbook Museum in Beijing) not just in China but in most other countries around the world. What can be observed by visiting classrooms to see lessons in action (as we have done fairly recently in China, Ethiopia, Singapore, Spain and Turkey) is that the coursebook might have new buzzwords on the blurb but the way that the teacher uses it does not differ much from the way they used their previous textbook and all the ones before that too. The explicit teaching and testing of grammar still seems to dominate most classrooms (and many coursebooks too—e.g the very popular *Headway* series) and very little seems to have changed in the way that languages are typically taught and learned. There are exceptions of course (see Darici and Tomlinson, 2016, for an example of a text-driven classroom in Turkey) but most classrooms reflect what is reported in Thomas and Reinders (2015). This book reports on the introduction of task-based materials in countries and institutions in Asia and almost without exception the chapters report how the task-based approach was weakened in order to allow teachers to continue to pre-teach declarative knowledge of the grammar point to be "practiced" in the task. In other words, the much-discredited Presentation-Practice-Production procedure still prevails regardless of the

pedagogical label on the coursebook, as we have demonstrated in our coursebook evaluations in Tomlinson, Dat, Masuhara, & Rubdy (2001), Masuhara, Haan, Yi, & Tomlinson (2008), and Tomlinson and Masuhara (2013).

For a critical evaluation of the evolution of coursebook pedagogies see Mishan (2016); for a discussion about the value of coursebooks see Chapter 2 in this book, and for a summary of research reports of how teachers and learners actually use coursebooks see Chapters 5 and 15 in this book.

Digital Materials

In our experience, paper materials are still the main means in most countries of helping learners to acquire a language in the classroom. But there is no denying that digital materials are increasing almost every day in number, technological sophistication and quality of presentation. First, there came the desktop computer in the 1980s with forward-thinking language schools in the United Kingdom and the United States installing computer laboratories to impress, and hopefully help, their fee-paying students. Brian remembers how, as Director of Studies at a privileged language school in the United Kingdom, he spent a week in the shiny new lab with a group of teachers wondering what use they could put it to. Instead of asking the technician what the computers could do, they decided what they wanted the computers to do and then asked the technician to make sure that they could. As a result, the classes that were timetabled in the lab were actually popular and useful. A few years later Brian was a frequent visitor to schools in Indonesia where his meetings with principals were invariably held in unused computer labs because they were the only rooms with air conditioning and because the World Bank had provided the labs but not the training or spare parts that could make them effective. A few years after that, Hitomi was teaching in Singapore and was compelled to deliver 30% of her lessons through the computer regardless of its suitability for what she was helping students to learn. And today we received an e-mail referring us to a web article about the Tanzanian government's plan to link 2,000 primary schools to ICT facilities so that math and reading programs in particular can be delivered.

One big question about digital materials is whether or not they have provided the field with radical new modes of delivery of the same old pedagogy or whether they have stimulated new pedagogies too. Just as we were thinking about this question we received delivery of a new book published by the British Council (Kukulska-Hulme, Norris, and Donohue, 2015). Its title, *Mobile pedagogy for English language teaching: A guide for teachers,* suggests that its authors think that their pedagogy is as innovative as its delivery. A quick glance at a random pair of pages (pp. 20–21) reveals the following benefits of mobile pedagogy:

- recording and documenting learning practices;
- recording problems when they occur;
- providing learner choice of task, text, medium, intended outcome, etc.;
- recording critical reflection;
- providing an audience;
- producing multimedia texts;
- finding and recording the target language outside the classroom;
- sharing outputs with peers and other communities;
- compiling a portfolio for continuous assessment.

All these benefits are valuable and are probably best provided by student use of their mobiles. However, none of these activities, or the many more described and exemplified throughout the book, actually represent a new pedagogy. What they do is to make use of the affordances of mobile technology to achieve creative exploitation of existing pedagogies. Unlike the activities in some digital materials that we have experienced, they are informed by language-learning principles and they provide a rich variety of new opportunities. We once worked as advisors and writers on a major online English-through-football course. We were initially excited by the creative potential of multimedia delivery but were eventually dismayed by being restricted by the software being used and by "learner expectations" to such stock activities as multiple choice, filling in the blanks, and sentence completion. And today one of our postgraduate students informed us of the apparent success of the online Middlebury Interactive Language program in increasing attendance and performance in schools in Hartford, United States. The innovative pedagogy seems to consist of so-called scaffolding interventions, which aid learner comprehension (e.g. difficult words in the reading texts have pop-up boxes with visual, audio and written definitions).

Brian was once invited by Microsoft to review the pedagogies of all the major existing computer-assisted language courses and to make use of this review to recommend the optimum pedagogy for such courses. Predictably most of the courses just reproduced, in more "glamorous" form, the stock activity types to be found in most paper-based courses. However, in his recommendations Brian was able to combine some of the more creative uses of pedagogy in the courses with principles and procedures he had already developed himself. We have no idea what happened to his recommendations as, like most research undertaken for publishers, his report was totally confidential and was never actually responded to. This issue of confidential research undertaken for publishers is taken up and developed in Chapter 15.

Although there have been radical developments in the use of new technologies to deliver language learning materials (both in stand-alone courses and as supplementary materials for print delivered coursebooks) there are very few books (or even articles) that focus on the pedagogical principles and development of these materials. Most of the publications on using new technologies to deliver language courses have focused, until very recently, on the technological innovations of the delivery (for a useful article on the technologies available to teachers see Levy, 2012) and on ways of exploiting the new affordances offered by these innovations. For example, the award-winning *CALICO Journal* (accessed September 30, 2016) lists only one article amongst its list of seminal articles that appears to relate computer-assisted language learning (CALL) to materials development. However, this article (Salaberry, 1996), although suggesting in its title a focus on pedagogical tasks, is actually an excellent article about the pedagogical affordances of computer-assisted language learning. This is true also of many other articles in this and other highly respected CALL journals (e.g. *Language Learning and Technology*, *CALL* and *ReCALL*). They provide very useful overviews of how technology can help teachers to apply the principles of second-language acquisition (SLA) theory to classroom practice in new and effective ways but have often little to offer on materials development (though see Chapter 8 for examples of publications, mainly chapters in books, which do suggest and report effective ways of developing principled digital materials).

Although aware of the obvious benefits brought to the field by digital delivery of language learning materials, some materials developers have warned against the control of

language teachers and learners by technology. For example, Mukundan (2008b, p. 109) points out the danger of educationalists thinking that "multimedia can drive pedagogically sound methodology" and gives the example of Malaysia where he thinks teaching courseware "directs teaching in a prescriptive manner." Maley (2011, p. 390) is positive about the ways in which IT can be used as a resource "for the freeing of teachers and learners alike from the constraints of the coursebook" and for providing "rapid and flexible access to unlimited information resources." He also warns, though, how, as Wolf (2008) says, that the "multi-tasking, rapidly switching, superficial processing of information might … impair more reflective modes of thinking" (p. 392).

Although there are very few publications reporting research studies of the development and effects of materials for new technologies, some journals now have regular features reviewing new electronic materials (for example, *ELT Journal*) and some experts have written about the potential impact of such materials on language learning. For example, Chapelle (1998, 2001), Chapelle and Lui (2007) and Chapelle and Jamieson (2008) have written about the attitudinal and learning effects of CALL materials on learners. Eastment (1999), Derewianka (2003a, 2003b), Murray (2003), Blake (2008), Reinders and White (2010), Kervin and Derewianka (2011), Motteram (2011), Kiddle (2013), Mishan (2013), and Mishan and Timmis (2015) have written about the development and use of electronic materials for the teaching and / or learning of English. For detailed discussion about these and other publications as well as the principled development of materials for electronic delivery, see Chapter 8.

Perhaps the development that has received the most positive responses is the increase in courses that feature a blended learning approach. In these approaches decisions are made about whether to deliver each section of the course face-to-face or electronically, depending on such pragmatic criteria as cost, availability of expertise, availability of time and learner preference, as well as suitability of methodology (e.g. information is probably best delivered electronically and communicative competence is probably best developed through face-to-face interaction). There are many case studies of such courses in action in Tomlinson and Whittacker (2013), including a course for taxi drivers in Turkey in which the drivers followed up face-to-face classes on their mobile phones and received one-to-one tutorials whilst waiting for customers.

Supplementary Materials

Our early memories of materials for use in language classrooms are of coursebooks rather than supplementary materials (i.e. materials intended to provide additional language experience or instruction). Brian remembers using just a coursebook with his classes in Nigeria in 1966 and Hitomi remembers a similar experience with her classes in Nagoya in the 1980s. We were therefore rather surprised to find out from Daoyi and Zhaoyi (2015) that many series of supplementary readers were published and used in primary and secondary schools in China in the period from 1912–1949. On reflection, this was probably also true of many ESL countries where English was used as a medium of instruction. Brian now remembers that in Zambia, in 1969, senior forms in secondary schools studied English literature as well as English language and all classes had sets of extensive readers to supplement their coursebook.

Extensive readers were popular as supplementary materials in UK language schools in the 1970s and became even more so after the publication of a report on the successful impact on student's language growth of the Fiji book flood (Elley & Mangubhai,

1981). Other extensive reader experiments in the 1980s demonstrated positive effects too, for example in Singapore and in Cameroon (Davies, 1995), and many mainstream publishers developed their own series of graded readers. Brian remembers, at Bell College, Saffron Walden, in the late 1970s, not only using sets of EFL readers but of using a complete library of English literature books for the more advanced learners. In particular he remembers an Argentinian student who was inspired by a classroom activity to read a novel by Graham Green and then to read all his novels in the library. He remembers, too, an action research project in which he found that the only students who made progress in his intermediate level class were those who sought out English outside the classroom through interaction with other students and with local people and / or read English newspapers, magazines and books from the library. For powerful research-based arguments in favor of extensive reading see Day and Bamford (1998), Krashen (2004) and Maley (2008), and go to the Extensive Reading Foundation web site (www.erfoundation.org).

We think that what was beginning to happen at Bell College in the late 1970s and early 1980s with regard to supplementary materials reflected what was beginning to happen around the world. In addition to having a core coursebook, each class had access to other coursebooks, to a set of graded readers, to workbooks, to videos, to a library and to computer activities in the computer lab. In addition, at Bell College we were privileged to have access to a video studio (where Brian remembers his classes scripting, directing and producing videos of poems or stories they had responded to earlier in the week), we involved the students in projects and presentations, and we offered a program of special interest classes in which content rather than language drove the syllabus (e.g. English Through Pottery, English Through Local History, English Through Pub Architecture.). On reflection, students probably spent more time doing supplementary activities than they did using the core coursebook.

As we moved into the 1980s separate skills books became popular, to provide extra focused experience of reading, writing, listening, and speaking (e.g. the Oxford Supplementary Skills Series edited by Alan Maley in 1987 / 88) and a number of communicative activity books provided our students with enjoyable experience of communicating in order to complete a task and achieve a context dependent goal (e.g. Maley, Duff, and Grellet, 1981; Porter Ladousse, 1983). We also experimented with materials that we designed in house to implement such "eccentric" approaches as The Silent Way (Gattengo, 1963; Richards & Rodgers, 2001), Community Language Learning (Richards & Rodgers, 2001), and Suggestopedia (Hooper Hansen, 2011). Our students and those in other privileged language schools around the world certainly had a rich experience of language in use. Students in state schools and colleges had a narrower experience, which was still focused on the use of a core coursebook, but in China, for example, use was made of supporting "activity books, assessment books, skill development books, readers, flashcards and wall charts" as well as "cassette tapes and CDs" (Daoyi & Zhaoyi, 2015, p. 145). Brian remembers a book of communicative activities being written by teachers in Vanuatu for use in both primary classes and examinations (Tomlinson, 1981) and student made puppet theatres and big books being used to supplement the coursebook too. But Hitomi remembers in Japan at that time being still mainly restricted to a core coursebook.

Nowadays more supporting components than ever are being offered with coursebooks, although it is arguable that most of them simply provide additional information and practice rather than enrichening the students' language experience as

supplementary materials in the 1980s tended to do. *Speakout* (Parsons & Williams, 2011), for example, is accompanied by a teacher's resource book, which contains:

- Detailed teaching notes …
- An extensive bank of photocopiable activities covering grammar, vocabulary and functional language in communicative contexts.
- Mid-course and end-of-course tests …

Also available are Active Teach (containing the student book in digital format, integrated whiteboard software and an answer reveal function) and MySpeakout Lab (including an online learning tool with personalized practice, an automatic gradebook and video podcasts with interactive activities). A number of publishers have expressed their concerns about the cost and inessentiality of all these add-on components and certainly in our travels around the classrooms of the world we rarely see any course add-on components in evidence. We feel quite strongly that the money invested by publishers and therefore by schools in these inessential add-ons could be better invested in providing more experience of the language in use through, for example, extensive readers, authentic videos, and access to newspapers and magazines (a popular resource made use of in China since the 1930s). In our recent review of adult global coursebooks (Tomlinson & Masuhara, 2013) we complained that "there are even more and more expensive course components" (p. 248) since our equivalent reviews in 2001 and 2008. Currently, though, more and more add-ons are being made available "free" to coursebook users via the Internet. For example, the recently published fourth edition of the coursebook *Headway intermediate* (Soars & Soars, 2016) provides extra grammar practice, vocabulary practice, tests, games and dialogue practice on a freely available web site, https://elt.oup.com/student/headway/int/?cc=gb&selLanguage=en. The newly appointed chief product and marketing officer of a rival company has just announced an intention to focus even more on providing additional wrap around services to support their coursebook delivery. Interestingly the announcement also mentioned developing blended learning courses and international courses as other priorities.

Two methodologies have made a big impact recently in books about methodology, CLIL (content and language integrated learning) and TBLT (task-based language teaching). However, not only have they arguably had very little impact on what happens in mainstream coursebooks (despite claims on blurbs that they do) but they have led to the publication of very few supplementary materials either (one exception being Coyle, Hood, and Marsh, 2010). This is probably for the same reasons that one of our favorite approaches, total physical response (TPR) (see Tomlinson, 1994a) has rarely been implemented in supplementary materials for students. The activities are difficult to transfer to the page and, more importantly, they are best realized in teacher's resource books rather than student textbooks, thus selling only one copy per class rather than 40.

For extensive reviews of coursebooks used in different areas of the world see Tomlinson (2008).

Self-Access Materials

Students seem to have been learning other languages by themselves for as long as languages have been learned. In our experience the most effective way of quickly gaining basic communicative competence seems to be immersion in the target language

through, for example, moving to a country where the language is spoken or joining (or forming) a community of speakers of the language. Barker (2010) gives a successful example of forming a community of language speakers at a university in Japan where some students from his classes formed a club whose members always spoke English to each other when they met either inside or outside the university. Brian advised agricultural students at a university in Addis Ababa to do something similar, and soon they went from being laughed at to being joined by students from many different courses.

Immersion involves studying subjects in an L2 and is a potentially successful way of quickly gaining communicative competence in the L2 because of the massive exposure to relevant input and the multiple opportunities for using the target language for communication. However, there is a danger that achieving communicative effect always takes priority over accuracy and that language errors start to fossilize. This is what happened on the Canadian Immersion Programme (Swain & Lapkin, 2005) when English-speaking students studied all their school subjects in French. The students gained the target knowledge in their subjects and made rapid progress in developing fluency and communicative effect in the L2. However, they continued to make basic grammatical errors until language-awareness classes were added to the curriculum. The same thing happened to Schmidt (2001) when he assumed that he would acquire Portuguese from immersion in the language but only really made progress when he realized that he needed to pay attention to language forms too. He used the term "noticing" to label this process of paying attention to language forms encountered during communication and argued persuasively for making use of it in self-access attempts to learn a language. Bolitho and Tomlinson had already come to a similar conclusion with regard to the improvement of accuracy and pragmatic effect at higher levels in their book, *Discover English,* which was first published in 1980 and is still in print today as Bolitho and Tomlinson (2005). This is an activity book intended primarily to help higher level learners to make their own discoveries about how English is used from focused exposure to it. It focuses mainly on sentence-level grammar but its authors have started discussions about supplementing it with *Discover English Discourse*. Unfortunately though, the publishers have resisted this move as the activities are considered to be too open-ended for teachers to accept (i.e. not usable for easy to mark tests and difficult to give feedback to).

In our view many self-access materials still focus on information about and practice in specific language items or language skills which are problematic for the learners and often do not include enough exposure to authentic language in use, enough opportunities for communication, enough experience in making discoveries from authentic encounters with the language or enough material designed to engage the learners affectively and cognitively. This is partly because of the restrictions inherent in self-access study (e.g. nobody to interact with; nobody to monitor production; the perceived need for a marking key) and partly because a focus on forms is what many self-access learners believe is necessary. For a critique of forms-focused self-access materials, a suggested list of principles to humanize self-access materials, and an extended example of "access-self materials" see Tomlinson (2011c). See also Cooker (2008, 2010) who insists that criteria for evaluating self-access materials should be based on such core principles as "the ability to interest and engage learners, to be meaningful and challenging and to have a sustained positive impact" (Cooker, 2008, pp. 128–129). This is echoed and extended by Tomlinson (2010c, pp. 73–81), who proposes that criteria for developing and evaluating self-access materials should be driven by five universal principles of acquisition (e.g. "In order for the learners to maximize their exposure to language in use they need to

be engaged both affectively and cognitively in the language experience"), five principles of self-access materials development (e.g. "Provide many opportunities for the learners to produce language in order to achieve intended outcomes rather than to just practice specified features of the language") and seven principles of delivery (e.g. "The materials should aim to help the students to become truly independent so that they can continue to learn the language forever by seeking further contact with it"). He also insists that local criteria should be developed to take into account such factors specific to the learning context as:

- age;
- gender;
- levels;
- purposes for learning the language;
- amount of class learning time;
- estimated time available for self-access;
- previous experience of using self-access materials;
- attitudes to self-access;
- learning-style preferences;
- learner needs;
- learner wants.

We believe that exposure to the language in use, opportunity to use the language, and experience of making self-discoveries can and should be built into self-access programs together with texts and activities that stimulate affective and cognitive engagement. This can be achieved by, for example:

- using a text-driven approach (Tomlinson, 2013b) in which students select a potentially engaging text, respond to it personally, develop their own text (e.g. by answering a letter), make discoveries about a linguistic or pragmatic feature of the core text and then revise their development text making use of their discoveries;
- providing access to an extensive reading / listening / viewing library and offering a menu of postexperience creative tasks to those students who want to do them (Fenton-Smith, 2010);
- stimulating students to look out for English outside the classroom and then to interact with whatever language experience interests them—e.g. joining a Philosophy in Pubs group (Tomlinson, 2014a). See Cooker (2008, 2010) and Tomlinson (2010c, 2011c) for detailed examples of such humanistic self-access activities.

Many institutions now have self-access centers and one that we both think sets a very good example is in Kanda University in Japan. This center provides a very rich access to books, films, television programs, digital materials, skills-based task materials and language focused activity materials, as well as providing such facilities as a proficient speaker available for advice or conversation and advertisements for local places and events in which English will be used.

Publications about Materials Development

As recently as the 1970s and 1980s there were very few publications on materials development. There were a few books on methodology, which contained sections on, or at least reference to, materials (e.g. Moskowitch, 1978; Richards, 1978) but the phrase

"materials development" was not used. The process of producing language-learning materials tended to be referred to as materials writing and there was very little discussion of the principles that did or should inform it.

There were a few books and papers at that time on what we now refer to as materials development. Madsen and Bowen (1978) focused on teachers adapting materials and asserted that good teachers are constantly adapting the materials that are available to them. Candlin and Breen (1980) focused on the principles and procedures of evaluating and designing materials. And Cunningsworth (1984) devoted a complete book to the evaluation and selection of materials. However, most references to materials writing / design came in books and articles on language teaching methodology, which illustrated pedagogic methods and approaches with extracts from coursebooks (as Cunningsworth, 1984, does). This was the norm throughout the 1980s, with very few books taking the lead from Cunningsworth's breakthrough (Dubin and Olshtain's, 1986, book on designing language courses; Grant's, 1987, book on making the most of your textbook and Sheldon's, 1987, book on the problems of textbook evaluation and design being conspicuous exceptions). There were some articles on particular aspects of materials development published in the 1970s and 1980s in such professional journals as *ELT Journal* and *Modern English Teacher* but we had to wait until the mid-1990s for further dedicated books on materials development to appear. Both the articles and the books tended to focus on materials development as a practical undertaking. For example, in the United States Byrd (1995) published a book that provided a practical guide for materials writers, in England Cunningsworth (1995) continued his focus on evaluation by publishing a book on how to choose your coursebook and Graves (1996) published a book on teachers in the role of course developers. Tomlinson (1998) marked an important development by discussing the principles and procedures of a number of the important processes of materials development (although Hall, 1995, had already published a chapter on the theory and practice of materials production in Hidalgo, Hall, and Jacobs, 1995, a book focusing on materials writing in Southeast Asia). In Tomlinson (1998) there were chapters on data collection, the process of evaluation, the process of materials writing, the process of materials publication and, perhaps for the first time, there were chapters explicitly concerned with the effective application of theory to practice. This book was published by Cambridge University Press as a collection of papers by presenters at Materials Development Association (MATSDA) conferences and workshops on different aspects of materials development for language learning, events that also stimulated many articles on materials development in various established journals and in the MATSDA journal, *Folio*. The book has now been brought up to date and added to as Tomlinson (2011).

In the 1990s, books on language teaching methodology also gave more attention to applications of methodology to materials development and illustrated the approaches outlined with samples of published materials. A good example of such a book is McDonough and Shaw (2003), which has substantial sections on approaches to materials, on materials adaptation, and on materials evaluation. This book has been brought up to date and expanded with numerous illustrations from contemporary published materials as McDonough, Shaw, and Masuhara (2013).

In 2000, Fenner and Newby published a book on the approaches to materials design currently being implemented in European coursebooks, in 2001 Richards published a book that focused on curriculum development but made frequent reference to materials development and in 2002 McGrath published an important volume on

materials evaluation and design. McGrath (2002) is important because it was probably the first book to not only provide systematic applications of theory to the practice of evaluating, adapting and supplementing materials but also to offer principled suggestions for systematizing materials design. Johnson (2003) published a book reporting research which investigated the difference between how expert materials writers wrote materials for a task and how novice writers wrote materials for the same task. Then Tomlinson (2003) published the first book designed to be used as a coursebook on the many teacher-training and postgraduate materials development modules that were now being offered all over the world. It contains chapters on analysis, evaluation, selection, adaptation, principled frameworks for materials development, materials for teaching grammar, vocabulary and the four skills, in-house materials production by institutions and coursebook development on national projects, as well as chapters on such practical aspects of materials development as design and illustration. Practical guidance is also a feature of Tomlinson and Masuhara (2004), a book written in English for inexperienced teachers in South East Asia but since translated into Chinese, Korean, and Portuguese. The book gives advice on design, lay out, illustrations, text selection and writing instructions, and advises and exemplifies how to design, evaluate, and adapt materials in principled and feasible ways. In the early years of this century Jayakuran Mukandan in Malaysia started to run MICELT conferences for Universiti Putra Malaysia. These conferences focused on different aspects and issues of materials development, featured experts in the field from all over the world, gave a chance to large numbers of local researchers to present the results of their studies and attracted audiences of over 500 practitioners from all over Southeast Asia. Some of the papers from these conferences were published and many interesting articles on issues in materials development can be found in Mukundan (2003, 2006, 2008). Also at around this time in the same area of the world the Regional English Language Centre (RELC) in Singapore was inviting experts on materials development to speak at its conferences, and in 2003 RELC held a very well received conference on Methodology and Materials Design in Language Teaching. Some of the papers from this conference on aspects of materials development were then published as Renandya (2003). This approach of encouraging studies of materials development so that the results can be presented at conferences and then published in proceedings has continued with, for example, presentations at five recent MATSDA conferences being turned into chapters for books focusing on the themes of the conferences (Mishan & Chambers, 2010; Tomlinson 2013c, 2016a; Maley & Tomlinson, in press; Masuhara et al., 2017).

From 2006 to 2016, publications on materials development have focused very much on the application of theory to aspects of materials development practice. Tomlinson (2007) is primarily a book about language acquisition but many of its chapters include applications of theory to materials development (e.g. applications of research on recasts in the United Kingdom and Spain, on visual imaging in Japan, Singapore and Spain, on the use of the inner voice in Singapore and the United Kingdom, on comprehension approaches in Singapore and on reticent learners in Vietnam). The contribution of researchers from all over the world has become the norm in materials development and this is also evident in Tomlinson (2008). The book starts with a chapter on the interaction between language acquisition and language-learning materials and then focuses on research evaluating the potential effects of language learning materials in the United Kingdom, in the United States, in Australasia, in Ireland, in Greece, in Central and Eastern Europe, in Africa, in Japan, in South East Asia, in the Middle East, and in South America.

Harwood (2010a) also includes contributions from different areas of the world and explores the issues involved in the principled design, implementation, and evaluation of materials. It includes chapters on, for example, a genre-based approach to the development of materials for teaching writing, on an approach to developing materials that applies content-based approaches for developing reading skills, and on developing materials for community-based adult ESL programs. Tomlinson and Masuhara (2010) reports projects from all over the world in which research has been conducted on the effectiveness of materials designed to apply the principles of, for example, facilitating language acquisition through extensive reading, process, and discovery approaches to the development of writing skills, process drama approaches to developing communicative competence and the use of problem solving approaches. This book signals a new direction in publications on materials in that it focuses exclusively on reports of research projects investigating various aspects of the effects of materials development on both learners and teachers. Gray (2010) also contains references to research but it departs from the current focus on the effectiveness of materials and concerns itself with how the world is represented as affluent, materialistic, Westernized, and aspirational in global coursebooks, and especially with the effects of producing global coursebooks as promotional commodities that portray users of English in very selective ways. Tomlinson (2011), a revised version of Tomlinson (1998), also refers to the increasing body of research data on various aspects of materials development as well as proposing ideas for data collection, for processes of materials development and evaluation and for processes of electronic design and delivery of materials. There are also chapters proposing applications to materials development of such nonmainstream theories as visualization, flexi-materials, suggestopedia and humanistic approaches to developing self-access materials. McGrath (2013) is a similar mix of surveys, proposals and research reports, as is Tomlinson (2013a), a revised version of Tomlinson (2003a). McGrath (2013) introduces a relatively new and now increasingly researched focus on what teachers actually do with their textbooks. Tomlinson (2013a) attempts, in its 561 pages, a similar comprehensive coverage of different aspects of materials development as in its first edition but also includes chapters on such comparatively new areas as materials for ESOL, materials for blended learning, digital materials, and corpus-informed materials. The fact that books on materials development are now being published in revised editions is indicative of the growing demand in the field for such publications. Other examples of this are McDonough, Shaw, and Masuhara (2013) and McGrath (2016, an update of McGrath, 2002).

Most of the recent publication in the field of materials development follow the departure started by Tomlinson and Masuhara (2010) in being mainly focused on the findings of research studies investigating the effects of types of materials on their users (e.g. Maley & Tomlinson, in press; Masuhara et al., 2017). Tomlinson (2013c) explores the application to materials development of the research findings of various relevant areas of applied linguistics, as well as considering the implications of practice for the development of theory. In the first part of each chapter a review is provided of current research findings in the area being focused on and then, in the second part, published materials are evaluated against these research findings and practical applications to materials development are suggested and illustrated. A similar approach is taken in Tomlinson (2016a) but in this book the focus is specifically on the applications of findings and theories from the significant field of second language acquisition research. Another recent publication with a focus on applying theory to practice is Harwood (2014). This is a

collection of chapters either proposing applications of theory or reporting on research studies of textbook content, textbook consumption and textbook production. Garton and Graves (2014) also connects theory to practice in materials design and use in its reports of research and application in numerous international settings. The emphasis on applying theory to practice and on reporting the results of materials development research is also evident in two special materials development issues of renowned applied linguistics journals (Tomlinson, 2016b, 2016c) and in recent issues of the MATSDA journal *Folio* (see www.matsda.org), the only journal we know of dedicated to articles on materials development for language learning (though the materials development special interest groups of TESOL in the United States, IATEFL in the United Kingdom and JALT in Japan do publish newsletters and the IATEFL special interest group, MAWSIG, is about to launch a new journal, *ELT Materials Review*).

As of late 2016, the most recently published books we know of on materials development (apart from McGrath's 2016 revised version of McGrath, 2002 and the already mentioned Tomlinson, 2016a) are Mishan and Timmis (2015) and Azarnoosh, Zeraatpishe, Faravani, and Kargozari (2016). Mishan and Timmis is a book that is targeted at TESOL teachers in training or in practice and which aims to provide a practical introduction to the principles of materials development. It encourages a principled and critical approach to teachers when making choices in their evaluation, selection, adaptation and development of materials. Azarnoosh et al. (2016) is a book of chapters commenting on current issues in materials development which reflects the increasing internationalization of research on materials development by being edited by four Iranian academics and containing chapters by researchers from nine different countries.

And now there is this book, the first one to attempt coverage of the theory and practice of materials development to date, as well as recommending principled procedures for all the important processes involved in materials development.

We would like to end this section with a quote from Tomlinson (2012, p. 146), which we both endorse and which we are both encouraging our postgraduate students and our colleagues to respond to:

> The literature on materials development has moved a long way since the early focus on ways of selecting materials to the current focus on the application of theory to practice and practice to theory. But in my view there are certain aspects of materials development which have not yet received enough attention. I would like to read publications exploring the effects on the learners of different ways of using the same materials (for example, as a script versus as a resource; as a sequential course versus as a course for learner navigation; as a core component versus as a supplement). Most of all though I would like to read publications reporting and applying the results of longitudinal studies of the effects of materials on not just the attitudes, beliefs, engagement and motivation of learners but on their actual communicative effectiveness too. For the field of materials development to become more credible it needs to become more empirical. (Tomlinson, 2012, p. 146)

Materials Development Projects

Whilst innovation in materials development has been inevitably restricted by the understandable conservatism of commercial publishers, it has flourished on many national

and institutional materials development projects since the mid-1980s. We have both been involved in many such projects and have found them to be very exciting and stimulating both for those involved in developing materials and those involved in using them. Unfortunately, though, many of the products and other benefits of these projects have not survived after key personnel have moved on or after a Minister or director has changed and new (or old) directions have been determined. Very few of these projects have actually been reported on in accessible publications and important lessons have been forgotten. We were both in Indonesia in 2014 and Brian took the opportunity to check how much impact a project that he directed in the 1980s was still having on the schools and teachers of Indonesia. This was the PKG project (By the Teacher for the Teacher), which was innovative in that, in each secondary school, an experimental beginners' English class was taught by teachers who had been trained to teach English in English, to make use of TPR Plus, group work, extensive reading and discovery approaches, and to develop materials in local teams (Tomlinson, 1990). The approach was very popular with students (as evidenced by, for example, attendance records) and very successful (as shown, for example, by the dramatic success of the experimental students in end of the year examinations). But we could find no trace of the PKG in 2014 and neither its methodology nor its materials were being used. Instead teachers seemed to have gone back to lecturing to students about English in Bahasa Indonesia. Very disappointing but not unusual.

We have been involved together in numerous materials development projects. Some of them were aborted because the funds ran out or because of a change of personnel. For example, a very ambitious British Council project developing materials for "leaders" in sub-Saharan Africa got to a stage where materials were successfully trialed in Senegal but then the project was abandoned when British Council officers were transferred and replaced by people with different priorities. A project in Serbia and a very large project in Iran (involving replacing all the official English textbooks) were abandoned before they got going because elections were held and the Minister of Education was replaced. A promising project in Vietnam reached a stage where excellent local materials had been developed by Vietnamese university lecturers but then funds were unavailable to complete the project. And the same thing happened to a similar project to develop materials for English courses in Southeast Asian universities. Fortunately, some of the projects we have been involved in were completed and implemented. For example, in Namibia, 30 teachers from all over the country wrote a text-driven coursebook in 6 days for government secondary schools (Tomlinson, 2013b). We were both involved in a project in which local teachers developed a coursebook for secondary schools in Bulgaria, a project in which a large team from Leeds Metropolitan University and from the University College of St. Mark and St. John, Plymouth combined to develop language improvement courses for English teachers in Ethiopia, a project that developed primary and secondary school materials for China and a project that developed a secondary school course for Singapore. We know that all these materials were published and distributed and that the primary course in China and the secondary course in Singapore were extensively used but we have no idea how effective the materials have been. This is one of the frustrating aspects of being involved in innovative projects. You enjoy the freedom to innovate and you are rewarded by the enthusiasm, skill and increased self-esteem of the local participants but you rarely get a chance to find out what eventually becomes of the projects and are denied a chance to learn from the experience (though see Timmis, 2014 for reflections on his involvement in one of the Chinese projects mentioned above). Also,

until recently, it was rare for a rigorous longitudinal evaluation of the effects of materials development projects to be undertaken.

Despite our sometimes-frustrating experience of materials development projects, there is no doubt about it that teacher participation in materials development projects can be enriching both for the materials and for the teachers (Tomlinson, 2014b). There is also no doubt that much of the innovation in materials development has taken place on such projects sponsored by ministries or institutions dissatisfied with the suitability of what is being made available to them by commercial publishers. Unfortunately only a few of these projects have been written up and published. Some of the more innovative of these projects include:

- the CBSE-ELT Project in India in which the College of St. Mark and St. John in Plymouth assisted the Central Board of Secondary Education (CBSE) in facilitating the development of communicative and task-based textbooks;
- a secondary school coursebook in Namibia that was written by 30 teachers in 6 days, which made use of nationwide surveys of student and teacher needs and wants, which contained a number of normally taboo topics (e.g. drug abuse), and which was text driven (Tomlinson, 1995);
- a secondary school textbook project in Bulgaria in which two textbooks were developed by small teams of teachers and then one of them was chosen for publication (a book which focused on helping students to explain Bulgarian culture to overseas visitors) (Tomlinson, 1995);
- an extensive reading project for young learners developed in Hong Kong in 1995 and revised in 2004 (Arnold, 2010);
- an 8-year secondary school coursebook series in Romania written by a team of 14 teachers (Popovici & Bolitho, 2003);
- an institution-specific course developed by a large team of teachers at Bilkent University, Ankara (Lyons, 2003);
- a number of projects producing task-based language teaching materials for teaching Dutch in Belgium (Van den Branden, 2006);
- primary and secondary courses developed by large teams of teachers in Romania, Russia, Belarus, and Uzbekistan (Bolitho, 2008);
- a project in which a selected group of teachers produced materials for Sultan Qaboos University, Muscat to help EAP students develop writing skills through an innovative experiential approach which combined a text-driven approach, a discovery approach and a process approach (Al-Busaidi & Tindle, 2010);
- a project in Northern Arizona University that brought together experts in applied linguistics and chemistry to develop a textbook to help university students to develop discipline specific reading and writing skills (Stoller & Robinson, 2014);
- a British Council project in India (the ELTReP awards scheme) in which first-time researchers studied the effects of pedagogic approaches and materials in Indian schools (with 22 of the studies due to be published online in 2017).

Adapted and expanded from Tomlinson (2012), p. 167.

Currently we know of large-scale materials development projects being undertaken by foreign language resource centers in the United States (http://www.nflrc.org), for example COERLL's open educational resources, CARLA's materials for less-commonly taught languages and CASLS's work on materials creation. We also know that the British

Council and such institutions as NILE (the Norwich Institute for Language Education) are currently involved in materials development projects in such countries as Columbia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, and Russia. Let us hope that some of these projects are evaluated and the results published.

Conclusion

Materials development has come a long way in a comparatively short time and ahead lie exciting possibilities in the development of digital materials, of materials for blended learning, and of research into the actual effectiveness of different types of materials and into how to make the staple coursebook more flexible, more locally appropriate, and more effective in facilitating communicative competence.

This has been a sketch of what has happened in the field of materials development so far. What follows in the rest of this book is our attempt to provide more detail on the main processes and issues of materials as we have experienced them, as they have been reported in the literature and as we feel they can best be proceduralized.

What Do You Think?

1. a) What do you think will happen to the coursebook? Do you think it will continue to be the main way of delivering language courses to students? Do you think it will eventually be replaced by digital materials?
   b) Try to imagine what a coursebook will look like in 20 years' time. What do you think it will contain? Do you think it will be supplemented by extra course components or it will go back to being self-standing?
   c) What do you think are the advantages and disadvantages of replacing global coursebooks with locally produced materials?
2. a) What do you think are the main advantages and disadvantages of digital materials?
   b) What new developments can you envisage in the design and delivery of digital materials?
   c) Do you think most language courses are going to adopt a blended approach in the future? Why?
3. a) What do you think are the main advantages and disadvantages of including extensive reading as part of a language course?
   b) Do you think that published extensive readers should be graded and simplified according to the language level of the target learners?
4. a) What do you think is the most effective way of learning a language through self-access?
   b) Do you think self-access components should be integrated into taught language courses? If so what do you think is the best way of doing this?

Note that the "what do you think?" questions in this and other chapters in this book are obviously not intended as tests but rather as a stimulus to thought and discussion, both through inner speech self-discussions and through conversations with others face to face or via the Internet.

References

Al-Busaidi, S., & Tindle, K. (2010). Evaluating the impact of in-house materials on language learning. In B. Tomlinson & H. Masuhara (Eds.), *Research for materials development in language learning: Evidence for best practice* (pp. 137–149). London: Continuum.

Arnold, W. (2010). A longitudinal study of the effects of a graded reading scheme for young learners in Hong Kong. In B. Tomlinson & H. Masuhara (Eds.), *Research for materials development in language learning: Evidence for best practice* (pp. 37–49). London: Continuum.

Azarnoosh, M., Zeraatpishe, M., Faravani, A., & Kargozari, H. R. (Eds.). (2016). *Issues in materials development*. Rotterdam: Sense.

Barker, D. (2010). The role of unstructured learner interaction in the study of a foreign language. In S. Menon & J. Lourdunathan (Eds.), *Readings on ELT materials IV* (pp. 50–70). Petaling Jaya: Pearson Malaysia.

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

Bolitho, R. (2008). Materials used in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *English language teaching materials: A critical review*. London: Continuum.

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

British Council. (2008). *Teaching English. Course books*. London: Author.

Brown, H. D. (1995). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Byrd, P. (1995). *Materials writers guide*. Rowley, MA.: Newbury House.

Candlin, C. N., & Breen, M. (1980). Evaluating and designing language teaching materials. *Practical papers in English language education*. Vol. 2. Lancaster: Institute for English Language Education, University of Lancaster.

Chapelle, C. A. (1998). Multimedia CALL: Lessons to be learned from research on instructed SLA. *Language Learning and Technology, 2*(1), 22–34.

Chapelle, C. A. (2001). *Computer applications in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chapelle, C. A., & Jamieson, J. (2008). *Tips for teaching with CALL: Practical approaches to computer-assisted language learning*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Longman.

Chapelle, C. A., & Lui H. M. (2007). Theory and research: Investigation of "authentic" CALL tasks. In J. Egbert & E. Hanson-Smith (Eds.), *CALL environments* (2nd ed., pp. 111–130). Alexandria, VA: TESOL Publications.

Cooker, L. (2008). Self-access materials. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *English language learning materials: A critical review* (pp. 110–132). London: Continuum.

Cooker, L. (2010). Some self-access principles. *Studies in Self-Access Learning, 1*(1), 5–9.

Coyle, D., Hood, P., & D. Marsh (2010). *Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cunningsworth, A. (1984). *Evaluating and selecting EFL teaching material*. London: Heinemann.

Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing your coursebook*. Oxford: Heinemann.

Daoyi, L., & Zhaoyi, W. (Eds.). (2015). *English Language education in China: past and present*. Beijing: People's Education Press.

Darici, A., & Tomlinson, B. (2016). A case study of principled materials in action. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Second language acquisition research and materials development for language learning*. New York: Routledge.

Davies, C. (1995). Extensive reading: An expensive extravagance. *ELT Journal*, *49*(4), 329–336.

Day, R., & Bamford, J. (1998). *Extensive reading in the second language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Derewianka, B. (2003a). Developing electronic materials for language teaching. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp. 199–220). London: Continuum.

Derewianka, B. (2003b). Designing an on-line reference grammar for primary English teachers. In W. A. Renandya (Ed.), *Methodology and materials design in language teaching* (pp. 44–51). Singapore: SEAMEO.

Dubin, F., & Olshtain, E. (1986). *Course design*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Eastment, D. (1999). *The internet and ELT*. Oxford: Summertown Publishing.

Elley, W. B., & Mangubhai, F. (1981). *The impact of a book flood in Fiji primary schools*. Wellington and Suva: New Zealand Council for Educational Research and Institute of Education and University of the South Pacific.

Ellis, R. (2016). Language teaching materials as work plans: an SLA perspective. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *SLA research and materials development for language learning* (pp. 203–218). New York: Routledge.

Fenner, A., & Newby, D. (2000). *Approaches to materials design in European textbooks: Implementing principles of authenticity, learner autonomy, cultural awareness*. Graz: European Centre for Modern Languages.

Fenton-Smith, B. (2010). A debate on the desired effects of output activities for extensive reading. In B. Tomlinson & H. Masuhara (Eds.), *Research for materials development in language learning: Evidence for best practice* (pp. 50–61). London: Continuum.

Garton, S., & Graves, K. (Eds.). (2014). *International perspectives on materials in ELT*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gattegno, C. (1963). *Teaching foreign languages in schools: The silent way*. New York: Educational Solutions Worldwide.

Gilmore, A. (2009). Using online corpora to develop students' writing skills. *ELT Journal*, *63*(4), 363–372.

Grant, N. (1987). *Making the most of your textbook*. Harlow: Longman.

Graves, K. (1996). *Teachers as course developers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gray, J. (2010). *The construction of English: Culture, consumerism and promotion in the ELT coursebook*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hall, D. (1995). Materials production: Theory and practice. In A. C. Hidalgo. D. Hall & G. M. Jacobs (Eds.), *Getting started: Materials writers on materials writing* (pp. 8–24). Singapore: SEAMEO Language Centre.

Harwood, N. (Ed.). (2010a). *Materials in ELT: Theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harwood, N. (2010b). Issues in materials development and design. In N. Harwood (Ed.), *Materials in ELT: Theory and practice* (pp. 3–32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harwood, N. (Ed.). (2014). *English language teaching textbooks: Content, consumption, production*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hidalgo, A. C., Hall, D., & Jacobs, G. M. (Eds.). (1995). *Getting started: Materials writers on materials writing*. Singapore: SEAMEO Language Centre.

Hooper Hansen, G. (2011). Lozanov and the teaching text. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 403–413). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, K. (2003). *Designing language teaching tasks*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kervin, L., & Derewianka, B. (2011). New technologies to support language learning. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 328–351). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kiddle, T. (2013). Developing digital language learning materials. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language learning* (pp. 189–206). London: Bloomsbury.

Krashen, S. (2004). *The Power of reading: Insights from the research*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Kukulska-Hulme, A., Norris, L., & Donohue, J. (2015). *Mobile pedagogy for English language teaching: A guide for teachers*. London: British Council.

Levy, M. (2012). Technology in the classroom. In A. Burns & J. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to pedagogy and practice in second language teaching* (pp. 279–286). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, P. (2003). A practical experience of institutional textbook writing: product / process implications for materials development. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp. 490–504). London: Continuum.

Madsen, K. S., & Bowen, J. D. (1978). *Adaptation in language teaching*. Boston: Newbury House.

Maley, A. (2008). Extensive reading: maid in waiting. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *English language learning materials: A critical review* (pp. 133–156). London: Continuum.

Maley, A. (2011). Squaring the circle—reconciling materials as constraint with materials as empowerment. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd ed., pp, 379–402). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maley, A., Duff, A., & Grellet, F. (1981). *The mind's eye*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maley, A., & Tomlinson, B. (Eds.). (in press). *Authenticity in materials development for language learning*. Manuscript submitted for publication. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

Masuhara, H., Haan, M., Yi, Y., & Tomlinson, B. (2008). Adult EFL courses. *ELT Journal*, *62*(3), 294–312.

Masuhara, H., Mishan, F., & Tomlinson, B. (Eds.). (2017). *Practice and theory for materials development in L2 learning*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

McDonough, J., & Shaw, C. (2003). *Materials and methods in ELT: A teacher's guide* (2nd ed.). London: Blackwell.

McDonough, J., Shaw, C., & Masuhara, H. (2013). *Materials and methods in ELT: A teacher's guide* (3rd ed.). London: Blackwell.

McGrath, I. (2002). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

McGrath, I. (2013). *Teaching materials and the roles of EFL/ESL teachers: Practice and theory*. London: Bloomsbury.

McGrath, I. (2016). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Mishan, F. (2013). Studies of pedagogy. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Applied linguistics and materials development* (pp. 269–286). London: Bloomsbury.
Mishan, F. (2016). Comprehensibility and cognitive challenge in language learning materials. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *SLA research and materials development for language learning* (pp. 166–185). New York: Routledge.
Mishan, F., & Chambers, A. (Eds.). (2010). *Perspectives on language learning materials development*. Berne: Peter Lang.
Mishan, F., & Timmis, I. (2015). *Materials development for TESOL*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Moskowitch, G. (1978). *Curing and sharing in the foreign language class: A sourcebook on humanistic techniques*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
Motteram, G. (2011) Coursebooks and multi-media supplements. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 303–327). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Mukundan, J. (Ed.). (2003). *Readings on ELT material*. Sedang: Universiti Putra Malaysia Press.
Mukundan, J. (Ed.). (2006). *Focus on ELT materials*. Petaling Jaya: Pearson Malaysia.
Mukundan, J. (Ed.). (2008a). *Readings on ELT materials III*. Petaling Jaya: Pearson Malaysia.
Mukundan, J. (Ed.). (2008b). Multimedia materials in developing countries: The Malaysia experience. In Tomlinson, B. (Ed.), *English language teaching materials: A critical review* (pp. 100–109). London: Continuum.
Mukundan, J. (Ed.). (2009). *Readings on ELT materials III*. Petaling Jaya: Pearson Malaysia.
Murray, D. E. (2003). Materials for new technologies: Learning from research and practice. In W. A. Renandya (Ed.), *Methodology and materials design in language teaching* (pp. 30–43). Singapore: SEAMEO.
Parsons, J., & Williams, D. (2011). *Speakout*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
Pinnard, L. (2016). Looking outward: using learning materials to help learners harness out-of-class learning opportunities. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching* [Special issue, guest editor B. Tomlinson], *10*(2), 133–143.
Popovici, R., & Bolitho, R. (2003). Personal and professional development through writing: The Romanian textbook project. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp. 505–517). London: Continuum.
Porter Ladousse, G. (1983). *Speaking personally*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Prowse, P. (2011). How writers write: testimony from authors. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd ed., pp. 151–173). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Reinders, H., & White, C. (2010). The theory and practice of technology in materials development and task design. In N. Harwood (Ed.), *Materials in ELT: theory and practice* (pp. 58–80). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Renandya, W. A. (Ed.). (2003). *Methodology and materials design in language teaching: current perceptions and practises and their implications*. Singapore: RELC.
Richards, J. (1978). *Understanding second and foreign language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
Richards, J. (2001). *Curriculum development in language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Salaberry, M. R. (1996). A theoretical foundation for the development of pedagogical tasks in computer mediated communication. *CALICO Journal 14*(1). Retrieved from https://journals.equinoxpub.com/index.php/CALICO/article/view/23391/19396.

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3–32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sheldon, L. E. (Ed.). (1987). *ELT textbooks and materials: problems in evaluation and development. ELT documents 126*. London: Modern English Publications and the British Council.

Soars, L., & Soars, J. (2016). *New headway intermediate* (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stoller, F. L., & Robinson, M. S. (2014). An interdisciplinary textbook project: Charting the paths taken. In N. Harwood (Ed.), *English language teaching textbooks: Content, consumption, production* (pp. 262–298). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2005). The evolving sociopolitical context of immersion education in Canada: Some implications for program development. *The International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *15*(2), 169–186.

Thomas, M., & Reinders, H. (Eds.). (2015). *Contemporary task-based language teaching in Asia*. London: Bloomsbury.

Thornbury, S., & Meddings, L. (2001). Coursebooks: the roaring in the chimney. *Modern English Teacher*, *10*(3), 11–13.

Timmis, I. (2014). Writing materials for publication; questions raised and lessons learned. In N. Harwood (Ed.), *English language teaching textbooks; content, consumption, production* (pp. 241–261). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tomlinson, B. (Ed.). (1981). *Talking to learn*. Port Vila: Government of Vanuatu.

Tomlinson, B. (1990). Managing change in Indonesian high schools. *ELT Journal*, *44*(1), 25–37.

Tomlinson, B. (1994a). Materials for TPR. *Folio*, *1*(2), 8–10.

Tomlinson, B. (1994b). Pragmatic awareness activities. *Language Awareness*, *3*(3 & 4), 119–129.

Tomlinson, B. (1995). Work in progress: textbook projects. *Folio*, *2*(2), 26–31.

Tomlinson, B. (Ed.). (1998). *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tomlinson, B. (2001). Materials development. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to TESOL* (pp. 66–71). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tomlinson, B. (Ed.). (2003). *Developing materials for language teaching*. London: Continuum Press.

Tomlinson, B. (Ed.). (2007). *Language acquisition and development: Studies of first and other language learners*. London: Continuum.

Tomlinson, B. (Ed.). (2008). *English language teaching materials: a critical review*. London: Continuum.

Tomlinson, B. (2010a). Principles and procedures of materials development. In N. Harwood (Ed.), *Materials in ELT: Theory and practice* (pp. 81–108). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tomlinson, B. (2010b). What do teachers think about EFL coursebooks? *Modern English Teacher*, *19*(4), 5–9.

Tomlinson, B. (2010c). Principles and procedures for self-access materials. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal*, *1*(2), 72–86.

Tomlinson, B. (Ed.). (2011). *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tomlinson, B. (2011c). Access-self materials. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd ed., pp. 414–432). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tomlinson, B. (2012). Materials development for language learning and teaching. *Language Teaching: Surveys and Studies*, *45*(2), 143–179.

Tomlinson, B. (Ed.) (2013a). *Developing materials for language teaching* (2nd ed.). London: Continuum Press.

Tomlinson, B. (2013b). Developing principled frameworks for materials development. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (2nd ed., pp. 95–118). London: Continuum Press.

Tomlinson, B. (Ed.). (2013c). *Applied linguistics and materials development*. London: Continuum.

Tomlinson, B. (2014a). Looking out for English. *Folio*, *16*(1), 5–8.

Tomlinson, B. (2014b). Teacher growth through materials development. *The European Journal of Applied Linguistics and TEFL* [Special issue: A. Maley (Ed.)], *3*(2), 89–106.

Tomlinson, B. (2015). Developing principled materials for young learners of English as a foreign language. In Bland, J. (Ed.), *Teaching English to young learners—critical issues in language teaching with 3–12 year olds*. London: Bloomsbury.

Tomlinson, B. (Ed.). (2016a). *SLA research and materials development for language learning*. New York: Routledge.

Tomlinson, B. (Guest Ed.). (2016b). *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching (RILL)* [Special issue on materials development], *10*(2).

Tomlinson, B. (Guest Ed.). (2016c) *European Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL* [Special issue on materials development], *3*(2).

Tomlinson, B., Dat, B, Masuhara, H., & Rubdy, R. (2001). ELT courses for adults. *ELT Journal*, *55*(1), 80–101.

Tomlinson, B., & Masuhara, H. (2004). *Developing language course materials*. Singapore: RELC Portfolio Series.

Tomlinson, B., & Masuhara, H. (Eds.). (2010). *Research for materials development in language learning: evidence for best practice*. London: Continuum.

Tomlinson, B., & Masuhara, H. (2013). Review of adult ELT textbooks. *ELT Journal*, *67*(2), 233–249.

Tomlinson, B., & Whittaker, C. (2013). (Eds.). *Case studies of blended learning courses*. London: British Council.

Van den Branden, K. (2006). *Task-based language education: From theory to practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wolf, M. (2008). *Proust and the squid*. London: Icon Books.