By the book (or not):

A case study exploring the relationship between teacher cognition
and teaching materials and resources

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment for Masters of Arts in
Applied Linguistics and Discourse Studies

© Patricia Dawn Severenuk

Carleton University

October, 2016

Abstract

While various models of language teacher cognition (e.g. Borg, 2003, 2006; Woods, 1996) have focused on the internal factors (teacher beliefs and knowledge) of teacher decision-making and in-class practices, little research has zeroed in on the effects of external factors on these decisions. Contextual factors, such as student engagement, culture and learning materials, while acknowledged, have rarely been explored in depth. Existing research shows that contextual factors do have an effect on how teachers of English think, yet the effect that language learning materials and resources have on teacher cognition and behavior remains largely unexplored. ESL and EFL teachers, both in Canada and abroad, were asked to complete a questionnaire, then interviewed, to create a more complete picture of the influence that resources and learning materials (availability, quality, and how teachers create their own in the absence of suitable options) have on how teachers make decisions about teaching, both in and out of the classroom. Findings suggest that contextual issues such as employment contexts and working conditions, issues of control, and levels of established knowledge can significantly affect the decisions teachers make about classroom dynamics, the learning/teaching materials they choose to use, and the classroom culture they establish/promote. Though few differences were noted among teachers who identified themselves as teaching ESL or EFL, teaching environments played a role for many respondents.

Acknowledgements

One of the greatest things about graduate school hasn't just been having the opportunity to stand on the shoulders of giants, but to stand shoulder to shoulder *with* them and create knowledge and ideas, and maybe even share a few laughs along the way. There's no way that this thesis could have existed without the warm encouragement and intellectual challenges I have received from Eva Kartchava, my thesis advisor, who never hesitated to kick the can a little harder, just to see how much further the ideas could go. I owe a huge debt of gratitude to Janna Fox, who took a chance on me as a special student returning to school after a number of decades; and to Doug, my significant other, who never hesitated to motivate me using one of the most famous American sayings related to productivity: "Git 'er done!"

That said, this thesis would never have come about had it not been for the students, directors of study and educational liaison folks who, at times, made my sixteen years as an ELT instructor more difficult and frustrating (and, at times, infinitely more surreal) than it had to be. To those who "lost" their books or lost their tempers, to the directors of study who wanted to kick students out because the students, quite rightly, pointed out the inadequacies of the materials; or those who tried to oversell the students' potential in order to make a Euro or two (or, conversely, weren't the least bit interested in what the students did and gave me *carte blanche* to teach as I saw fit): I owe you all, perversely, a debt of gratitude, because all of the aggravation, heartbreak and frustration made me want to find a better way for everyone. *Gracias, a pesar de tó.*

Academic Integrity Statement

Academic Integrity Statement - Thesis Submission

(To be completed upon submission of Master and Ph.D. theses for examination) v1

Carleton University is committed to ensuring that all students conduct themselves in a manner consistent with the Carleton University Academic Integrity Policy. Recognizing that regulations and practices relating to academic integrity and intellectual property, as well as the culture related to their enforcement, vary substantially from place to place, all graduate students are required to review, comprehend and adhere to the Carleton University Academic Integrity Policy upon commencing graduate studies and upon submitting Masters and Ph.D. theses.

I am familiar with the Carleton University Academic Integrity Policy and I understand the potential consequences should my thesis be found to contain plagiarized content or violate this policy in any other way.

Name: PATRICIA DAWN SEJERENIUK Signature:

Date: 5 Nov 2016 (YYYY/MM/DD) Student Number:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Academic Integrity Statement	iv
List of Figures.....	vii
List of Tables	viii
List of Appendices.....	ix
Chapter 1: Teachers, textbooks, and the space between	9
<i>About this study</i>	<i>12</i>
Chapter 2: Literature review	14
<i>A short history of textbooks and materials</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Teacher cognition: A growing field.....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Language teacher cognition: An overview.....</i>	<i>21</i>
Woods: The teacher as decision-maker.....	22
The teacher as professional	25
Borg: Creating the model	26
Chapter 3: Methodology.....	33
<i>Participants</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Instruments</i>	<i>40</i>
The interviews.....	48
Procedure.....	50
<i>Data analysis</i>	<i>51</i>
<i>Summary.....</i>	<i>52</i>
Chapter 4: Results.....	53
<i>The data.....</i>	<i>53</i>
<i>Research Question 1: What are teachers' opinions about the three different types of materials</i> <i>(textbooks, resources, and self-made materials)?</i>	<i>56</i>
Materials: Textbooks and textbook-related products	56
Use of resources and technology.....	58
Self-made materials.....	61
Deciding to teach empty-handed.....	62
<i>Research Question 2: How do teachers make the decisions they do when it comes to materials,</i> <i>resources, and making their own materials?.....</i>	<i>65</i>
Who chooses what gets used?	71
Needs vs. Time.....	76
The War Chest.....	78

<i>Research Question 3: Does the teaching context (teaching English as a Second Language, versus teaching English as a Foreign Language) affect teachers' perceptions of materials and resources?</i>	80
Textbooks and materials.....	80
Other resources and technology	82
Using self-made materials.....	83
Teaching without materials	85
Chapter 5: Discussion	88
<i>Research Question 1: What are teachers' opinions about the three different types of materials (textbooks, resources, and self-made materials)?</i>	88
Teachers of English like books; but teachers don't live by them.	88
Teaching by going without.....	94
<i>Research Question 2: How do teachers make the decisions they do when it comes to materials, resources, and making their own materials?</i>	95
Control, being controlled, and constraints	95
Is the war chest predicated on teacher control or institutional need?	97
The language teacher as behavioral economist	104
<i>Research Question 3: Does the teaching context (teaching English as a Second Language, versus teaching English as a Foreign Language) affect teachers' perceptions of materials and resources?</i>	110
If ESL vs. EFL isn't a factor, what might be?	110
Professionalism vs. issues of control.....	111
Conclusion.....	120
Limitations of the research	120
Future research directions	123
References.....	127
Appendix A: Online Questionnaire	133
Appendix B: Interview Guide	139
Appendix C: Ethics Clearance.....	143

List of Figures

Figure 1. Clark and Peterson's (1984) model of teacher thought and action.....	20
Figure 2. Borg's 2003 model of teacher cognition	26
Figure 3. Borg's 2006 model of language teacher cognition	29
Figure 4. Most commonly-occurring codes identified during descriptive coding.....	67
Figure 5. Most commonly-occurring codes identified during process coding	69

List of Tables

Table 1. Demographic data of research participants	37
Table 2. Likert-scale statements used in questionnaire.....	41
Table 3. Open-ended questions used in the questionnaire	47
Table 4. Questionnaire results for Likert-scale questions	55
Table 5. Opinions about textbooks.....	56
Table 6. Opinions about other resources and technology	59
Table 7. Opinions about self-made materials.....	61
Table 8. Opinions about using own materials (or not using anything)	63
Table 9. Opinions about textbook materials (EFL vs. ESL)	82
Table 10 Opinions about resources and technology (ESL vs. EFL)	81
Table 11 Opinions about self-made materials (EFL vs. ESL).....	82
Table 12. Opinions about teaching without materials (EFL vs. ESL)	83

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Online Questionnaire.....	133
Appendix B: Interview Guide.....	139
Appendix C: Ethics Clearance	143

Chapter 1: Teachers, textbooks, and the space between

On the surface of it, this thesis is about teachers and textbooks. Textbooks serve as a kind of talisman for the classroom, in that it is difficult to imagine classes without them; yet teachers, as much as some want to declare their independence from the textbook, seem almost inextricably bound to it – for ease of use, for comfort, for its authority, for its usefulness as a prop. These lightweight, expensive, somewhat controversial collections of grammar rules and pictures and exercises bear the weight of a lot of expectations. This research will look into the history of textbooks and how a certain group of teachers uses them in their language classroom (or chooses to use other options to replace activities and exercises that are contained in textbooks). It will also take a look at who gets to choose which books are used and why, and what that means for teachers who teach English to non-native speakers. Textbooks may seem innocuous, on the surface, but textbooks can serve to reflect many issues relating to contextual factors both in and beyond the classroom, and may reveal a number of insights about the English language teaching (ELT) profession as a whole.

In the search to better understand how classroom dynamics work, and how the decisions that teachers make form part of the dynamics of classroom interaction and thinking, more and more researchers over the past thirty years have explored the myriad ways and factors which contribute to teacher cognition, such as when to use or abandon lesson plans, how to design tasks, or how to incorporate literature into classes among others that teachers make as they are teaching (e.g., Bailey, 1996; Ulichny 1996; Johnson, 2003; Richards, Gallo and Renandya, 1998). The relationships that teachers have with textbooks remains vastly unexplored, in spite of the perceived universality of textbook use among teachers, administrators, and students. Some research, such as Woods (1996) and Borg (2003, 2006/2015), have touched briefly on the use of

textbooks and ancillary materials (such as audio CDs and companion websites), such as photocopies of exercises, to address the larger issues of teacher cognition; yet a significant gap exists in understanding what role the availability, use and choice of textbooks (and ancillary materials), resources (which include classroom technology solutions such as interactive white boards and internet access) and self-made materials play in the way teachers of English make decisions about how to proceed in the classroom. As McGrath (2013) writes:

To judge by the available descriptive literature – which can only partly represent reality, of course – experienced teachers improvise in the way they use materials, but planned teacher adaptation is often limited to omitting certain exercises or activities and modifying procedures, and teacher supplementation to adding warm-up activities and the use of photocopied or downloaded exercises; textbook selection tends to be a largely intuitive process; and the potential contribution of learners is rarely exploited (p. 167).

McGrath (2013) informs us that although some literature does exist regarding specific foci of English-language textbooks, especially for English for Special Purposes and academic English (p. x), there is still much to learn about *how* and *why* teachers use textbooks. Research has been done into other aspects of textbook use in the classroom, such as the role that applied linguistics can play in informing the ways in which textbook material is created and tested (Tomlinson, 2011), developing frameworks that teachers can use to evaluate the suitability of a given title for use (Littlejohn, 1992 and 1998, among others), and providing insight into how the realities of the textbook publishing world have an impact on the way decisions are made to assemble and market textbooks (Littlejohn, 1992) and create materials, activities and exercises for inclusion in textbooks (Bell and Gower, 1998). Others, like Kramsch (1999) have questioned the use of the textbook as a means of propagating cultural values that may be seen as desirable, though not necessarily relevant to the day-to-day realities of the target audience. This means that while work has been done into *teacher cognition* (the ways in which teachers perceive issues and

problems, make decisions, and favor certain courses of action over others) and textbook creation and use, a significant gap exists exploring where those two topics meet.

This becomes problematic for language learning when, as McGrath (2013) says, the textbooks and the materials used to help teach the class can run the risk of transmitting Anglo-centric values to the point of subjugating and ignoring the cultural identities of the students, creating a type of “cultural imperialism” (p. 9). Even in situations where English is used as a *lingua franca*, McGrath argues, the textbook takes away from the immediacy of using English to describe the students’ own lives and experiences, creating an artificial delineation between the context in which English is used, and the possibilities that students have for using English in their day-to-day lives.

Though contextual factors have been explored in general education environments by researchers such as Little (1990), and a greater amount of literature exists that examines how decision within management and organizations affect workers (e.g., Mintzberg, 2004, 2009; Godin 2009), ignoring the voices and viewpoints of teachers does them a disservice by not finding commonalities in decision-making and ways of creating their own resources when the textbook fails them, and by showing them that the issues that they have with their employers may not be out of the ordinary. Like other types of workplaces, schools and educational institutions can be badly served by not examining how specific management decisions hobble an institution’s functioning by hurting its reputation and ability to hold on to experienced, effective teachers. Examples of these behaviors include exercising unreasonable degrees of control over decisions about how work gets done, undermining employment stability by treating teachers as if they are spare parts that can be swapped out at a moment’s notice, or not giving teachers platforms for sharing classroom activities. Mintzberg (2009) reminds us that when employees

(in this case, teachers) are conceived of as resources, that individual gets reduced to being a number subject to control, “deal[ing] with them as if they are information, not people: they get reduced to a narrow dimension of their whole selves” (p.61). To that end, Winograd (2003) also reminds us that a large part of teaching is emotional labor, and when teachers’ emotional labor involves internalizing negative emotions and anger, that internalization of both positive and negative emotions does not become a catalyst for change, and no one benefits.

The overwhelming focus of the work done to date on teacher cognition, both with teachers generally and teachers of languages (especially English) specifically, has primarily focused on what goes on inside a teacher’s head, so much so that the significant research gap for external factors (the issues and challenges that also influence the way teachers do things) leaves us with an incomplete picture of why teachers make the decisions they do, and the thinking that motivates these decisions, translating, in turn, into a significant gap for insight into issues that, on the surface of it, may not seem to have much to do with teaching, such as the power imbalances that language teachers face within educational organizations, or how teachers prepare themselves to adapt to new technologies for the classroom. As Crookes (1997) argues, if we want teachers to be better at their jobs, and to stay in the profession longer, we need to look at all kinds of factors, not just things that go on in the classroom by not paying closer attention to non-classroom-related issues that could end up making or breaking a career, including what to do when the textbook fails them. As such, one of the goals of this thesis is to answer Crookes’s call, and to shed some light on those factors.

About this study

Combining statistical analysis with qualitative research from an individualist perspective helps us move away from a prescriptive, “it’d be nice if teachers did this” point of view, to

getting a wider, richer view of what teachers actually think and do. That does not rule out a more socially-based, empirical perspective which might be better-suited to examining one school, one board of education, or one group of teachers. The global view of teachers examined by this research looks at each of the thirteen respondents as an individual case, most of whom have nothing in common except that they happen to teach English to non-native speakers, yet who share a number of similarities in the way that they use textbooks.

This thesis is broken down into five chapters. The literature review in Chapter 2 will examine how textbooks and materials, throughout history, have been used to codify information and transmit idealized behavior to students, using techniques that date back to the time of the ancient Greeks. It will also survey the evolution of the history of teacher cognition, from the 1960s, as behaviorist attitudes in classroom praxis were being left behind, and branched out into studies of language teacher cognitions, the challenges that research into language teacher cognition has faced, and address some of the gaps in that research, especially in terms of how it relates to how teachers decide to do the things they do in classroom. Chapter 3 (Methodology) will describe the sample and data collection tools that were used in the research, while Chapter 4 (Results) will go into detail about what each of those tools found. Chapter 5 (Discussion) will take a closer look at the results, explain how they fit into what is currently known about language teacher cognition, and examine the results through a new theoretical framework which is increasingly being used to examine thinking and decision-making in workplaces. The limitations of the research will also be described and new research directions proposed.

Chapter 2: Literature review

This chapter starts with a review of the history of textbooks, focusing on how the history of classroom learning and the use of materials as the embodiment of knowledge have been historically interrelated. After looking at how research into textbooks and materials has evolved in language teaching specifically, we will examine the most prevalent themes to emerge in research into language textbooks since the early 1990s. Next, we will examine how research done into topics related to the use of materials in the English as a Second Language (ESL) classroom has shared certain traits with the evolution of research into teacher cognition and language teacher cognition, looking at how those fields moved from a dynamic of looking at the interaction between students and subjects, to provide a more nuanced and detailed view of what can happen in the classroom, and how textbooks form part of that interaction. Finally, the research questions that guide this thesis will be presented.

A short history of textbooks and materials

Given how old the concept of classroom learning is (some scholars such as Wakefield, 1998, date the concept to be up to 2,500 years old), it has only been in the last eighty years or so that researchers have dedicated themselves to understanding how classroom dynamics work, what factors contribute to effective classroom praxis and, increasingly, how the decision-making processes of teachers influence what goes on in the classroom. Bierman, Massey and Manduca (2006), in their examination of the future of geology textbooks, identify three key functions of textbooks: (1) they gather and organize an established body of knowledge about the subject; (2) they provide a mechanism for initial learning, and can be used as a reference for the future; and (3) the textbook is, generally, a peer-reviewed body of knowledge that sets out what is “right” or “acceptable” in the field at a specific level. Unlike the study of chemistry and physics, the basic

knowledge of foreign languages changes little over decades: though the graphics and subjects of the reading texts might age, information contained in a language textbook printed in the 1970s will still be true today. Language textbooks, Wakefield (1998) notes, form part of a long-lasting yet highly flexible genre, one that dates back to the times of the ancient Greeks, when textbooks were originally used to teach reading and writing skills. The catechetical style of lessons, reportedly developed by Aelius Donatus around the fourth century A.D., provided lessons in the form of a question-and-answer loop, where teachers would read questions (contained in the text) out loud to the students, who would then recite the answers they had been given in their own textbooks. This format was not limited to learning in the earliest days of recorded history, as Noah Webster also favored this approach when writing his 1783 *Grammatical Institute of the English Language*. Webster made the decision to have all of the definitions of grammar in the question-and-answer format, which required rote memorization, though not necessarily comprehension, from the students. The approach may seem dull to modern eyes but it did have its uses, Wakefield (1998) writes:

What sustained the catechetical style into the nineteenth century, however, was probably not the absence of books, desks, paper or pens, but a lack of trained teachers. The lack of trained teachers was itself due to an absence of efficient means of training... If the goal were memorization, the catechetical style eliminated the need for either pedagogical knowledge or subject knowledge on the part of the teacher. The voice of the teacher and the textbook author were not only in agreement, they were the same! Not surprisingly, the role of the teacher was often reduced to that of an advanced student (pp. 4-5).

The shift from rote memorization to comprehension did not happen until the 1840s, when changes in educational theory, advances in teacher education, and the commercialization of textbooks all came together as factors to create a new paradigm of learning (Wakefield, 1998, p. 22). Education, as a science, evolved greatly during the 18th and 19th centuries, and part of that evolution, Wakefield (1998) argues, was the development of “normal” schools (i.e. teacher

training schools) to train teachers; by 1898, approximately 250 public and private normal schools were training around a quarter of the new teachers in the United States (Tyack, 1967, cited in Wakefield, 1998, p. 7). The move towards mandatory primary education in many jurisdictions in Canada and the United States between 1830 and 1870 increased the number of students who were in formal educational systems. This, in turn, meant developing literacy as the means for achieving two specific ends: first, for fomenting religious education; and, later for imparting moral standards and techniques for self-discipline, especially among boys (Wakefield, 1998, pp. 15-17). As Bolitho (1990) says, with textbooks, “the weight of tradition is heavy. Ever since the advent of the printed word in the Middle Ages, textbooks in education have represented knowledge” (p. 23).

However, upon examining the trajectory that research into language learning materials has undergone, one notices a distinct gap when it comes to how teachers of languages interact with materials that has only been addressed in the past three decades, McGrath (2013) tells us. Widespread inquiry into language learning textbooks, especially books designed to teach English to non-native speakers, has only taken place since the 1970s and 1980s, which was the era when researchers such as Richards and Nunan (1990) started looking at how textbooks were being used in classroom learning situations, especially as textbooks were meant to “put flesh on the bones” of a syllabus or learning plan (Nunan, 1991, cited in McGrath, 2013, p. x), especially English language teaching materials aimed for use in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) or English for Academic Purposes (EAP). However, McGrath (2013) argues, at that time, textbooks and learning materials were considered to be additions to the learning situation, not key parts of it, even though textbooks and the materials were, often, the means by which the focus and intensity of certain aspects of language learning, such as grammar, were encoded (pp.

viii-ix). The textbook seemed to be the nexus at which the students met and interacted with the language, with the teacher a distant, if not missing, piece of the picture. A significant research gap revealed the lack of knowledge about how teachers selected textbooks (if, indeed, the job of choosing the book to be used was theirs alone), how teachers interacted with the books, and how teachers made concrete decisions about what aspects of the books to use or not to use within their classrooms.

That gap began to close in the early to mid-1990s, as researchers such as Littlejohn 1992, Tomlinson (1998), and Bell and Gower (1998) began to delve deeper into the role of different stakeholders in the writing, production, choice and use of textbooks (and any associated pedagogical material) in the language learning classroom. Littlejohn's Ph.D. thesis (1992) was focused on the ways in which knowledge is constructed in English teaching textbooks; even nearly twenty-five years ago, Littlejohn recorded how "materials are...now taking on an increasingly significant role in the structuring of classroom time, claiming to provide not only the basis for the content for classroom work but also the manner in which teachers and learners are to interact" (p.1). In his work, Littlejohn has advocated for the use of frameworks for analyzing the suitability of content for textbooks and materials for classroom use, in order not to fall prey to making "general, impressionistic judgements on the materials, rather than examining in depth what the materials contain" (Littlejohn, cited in Tomlinson, 1998, p. 191).

Tomlinson (1998, 2011) has examined various aspects of materials and materials development for the English-language learning classroom, especially as it relates to research into second language acquisition (SLA), in order to apply SLA theory and research findings to the development of English language teaching materials. Bell and Gower (1998), speak about the pressures that textbook writers and publishers find themselves under to produce books that are

long (or short) enough that they can be covered in traditional academic units of time, by semesters or by academic years, and make sure that any ancillary material, such as workbooks, teachers' guides and audio recordings also work within those time frames (p.126). Course books, they argue, sometimes polarize the opinions of their target audience: some people see course books as a tool of institutional control, which dooms creativity, while other people are in favour of the variety of options that course books offers, providing teachers with tested activities and exercises that "allow teachers to spend their valuable time more on facilitating learning than materials production" (Bell & Gower, 1998, p. 116). Bell and Gower (1998) argue that, rather than damping creativity, textbooks and materials can encourage it; "[i]t all depends on the relationship that a use, in particular a teacher, has or is allowed to have with the material" (p.118).

To summarize, research into the role of textbooks within the language classroom is growing; yet, as McGrath (2013) reminds us, it still lags behind research into other areas of classroom practice (p. ix). Furthermore, within the research that has been done, many gaps still remain. Tomlinson (2011) suggests that there are still ways in which bridges can be built between academic research in applied linguistics theory and materials development practice, for teachers and for professional course book writers. Bell and Gower (1998) have provided insights into how some textbook writers balance the competing interests and tensions when creating textbooks for the ESL classrooms, yet we have little understanding of how ELT teachers' attitudes about textbooks and materials influence publishers' decision-making processes (if they do at all). Finally, as mobile technologies such as smart phones and tablet computers become more prevalent in our everyday lives, the future may hold many surprised about how (and if) the language textbook industry stands to be disrupted by technological solutions that may, one day,

provide things that textbooks cannot, such as more personalized learning support or classes that are specifically crafted to address an individual learner's problem areas.

Teacher cognition: A growing field

At the same time that research into materials in the English-language classroom was growing, research into the field of teacher cognition, which had started in the 1960s with the gradual downfall of behaviorism as the overreaching theoretical framework through which classrooms were observed and theorized. Categories connected to the kinds of thinking and cognitions teachers engaged in began to emerge in the late 1970s and early 1980s, and proposals for models for teacher cognition began to emerge, sometimes as a means of identifying specific theoretical models of teaching, and sometimes as a means of being able to identify, research and propose ways to improve specific aspects of teaching at all points of the teaching process.

In 1984, Clark and Peterson proposed a model of “teacher thought and action” that attempted to balance the thought processes of teachers with the “Action and Observable Events” that took place in the classroom. Clark and Peterson said that researchers who looked at teaching through a process-product lens “have typically assumed that causality is unidirectional, with teachers’ classroom behavior affecting students’ classroom behavior, which ultimately affects student achievement” (p. 14). Unless researchers looked at the global contexts of teaching, and looked at all of the factors inside and outside of the classroom, proposed models ran the risk of not capturing the cyclical and reciprocal nature of teaching, one that captured the nuances of teaching and how context played an important factor in examining how and what affected teachers and the decisions they made, especially since teaching can take place across a wide variety of social situations, with a number of different factors (relationships with students and/or principals, for example; or the level of responsibility provided to the teacher to come up with

pedagogical solutions; Clark & Peterson, 1984, p. 46). In much the same way that the components of a bicycle work together to create forward motion (and, in exceptional circumstances, backward motion, too), all of the elements in the model proposed by Clark and Peterson created a system whereby one element informed all of the others (Figure 1); nothing worked in isolation because one aspect of teacher cognition would inevitably have an knock-on effect on the others.

Figure 1. Clark and Peterson's (1984) model of teacher thought and action (p. 13)

Although the Clark and Peterson model covers many areas of cognition, the cognitive factors the model addresses focus on the interaction between the teacher and the students, and makes no accommodation for other areas of thought or outside influences experienced by the teacher. Each of the two circles show that thoughts within those circles do not exist independently, and can inform one another, yet it resembles a feedback loop, in that the model assumes that an aspect that exists in one of the circles could potentially have an effect on a factor

within the other circle. Looking at teacher thinking in such a symbiotic manner – that what teachers do affects students and vice versa – the model does not account for the existence of other factors, such as culture and employment conditions, that could potentially affect classroom praxis, for both teachers and students. This model would then go on to serve as one of the theoretical frameworks through which the research would then be extended to the study of cognition of language teachers, specifically.

Language teacher cognition: An overview

The existing research that has been done to date has argued that teacher cognition is not a fixed set of lists which all teachers adhere to or follow. Indeed, as Pajares (1992) stated, the concept of “teacher cognition” could be so broad as to be confusing and add little clarity to its understanding; this was not helped by having a plethora of descriptions of what beliefs were, and the definitions that attempted to contextualize those descriptions. In his 1992 analysis of the topic, Pajares listed 16 commonalities among the research that others had done on teacher cognition, which addressed the complexity of the construct. These included, but were not limited to, the idea that beliefs are formed early and tend to self-perpetuate; that a belief system has an adaptive function in helping individuals define and understand the world and themselves; that beliefs are prioritized according to their connections to other beliefs; and that beliefs are instrumental in choosing, planning and making decisions about what gets done (pp. 324-325).

Woods, who had worked for a number of years as a teacher-trainer, centered his doctoral study (1996) on gaining a deeper understanding of how the issues raised by Pajares might apply to teachers of English. Working with a team of eight teachers (seven women and one man), who were teaching English for Academic Purposes at that institution, Woods focused his research on how the beliefs, assumptions and knowledge that teachers brought with them into the classroom

influenced the decisions that teachers made before, during and after teaching classes. Woods noted that, previously, the focus of research had moved from how language teaching produced certain outcomes, to focusing more on the process of teaching, “analyzing the classroom interactions which lead to these outcomes” (p. 12), but that increasing acceptance of the influence of cognitive psychology meant that looking at discrete factors deprived researchers, and those interested in research into teacher cognition, of a larger view of how teacher thinking influenced what went on in the classroom. On the surface of it, Woods (1996) noted, teachers were doing the same things with their students within the classroom, but how language teachers, specifically, were *performing* teaching – how they were performing that teaching activity, and what thinking and decisions fuelled the thinking that the teachers brought into the classroom with them – could vary wildly from one teacher to the next: “...what seemed to me to be an implicit neglect and disregard for what the individual teacher brings to the learning experiences of the students in the field of second and foreign language teaching” (pp. 1-2).

Woods: The teacher as decision-maker

Woods opined that any study of teacher cognition had to include three essential, time-based elements: what is observable in the classroom at the present time; what was projected to happen in the classroom in the future; and looking backward to previous lessons and other relevant experiences, in order to understand how past events created motivations that could happen in present and future situations. Only then, he argued, could we have a more solid understanding of how rationales and ideas developed when teachers looked ahead to plan classes or planned classes as the classes were unfolding, when teachers actually taught classes, and when teachers reflected on past practice. Those elements, in turn, contribute to the development of the teacher’s *beliefs* – the formed ideas that teachers bring into the classroom with them, which form

the basis of their practice. Combined with *assumptions* (the heuristics, conceptions and understandings that teachers may have about what language is and what it consists of) and *knowledge* (points about language and practice that teachers could arguably demonstrate), in 1996 Woods proposed the notion of the BAK (beliefs, assumptions, knowledge) network, an intertwining demonstration of elements and relationships that do not “exist in the minds of the teachers as individual entities” but as factors which came into play when teachers were deciding what to do about certain things at certain times (pp. 195-197). The distinctions between the terms are not always entirely clear, and Woods noted that the terms that he used formed part of an established tradition of defining terms according to one’s interpretation of the situation. Furthermore, he warned that even when teachers express beliefs, the expressed beliefs should not necessarily be taken at face value as a comprehensive (compilation) of everything that a teacher believes:

...beliefs can only be hypothesized according to cues, and supported (but not confirmed) or contradicted by other cues. Even when the beliefs are overtly stated, they must not be taken as hypotheses, because they may or may not correspond with what the author or speaker really believes, but rather with what they would like the author to think that they believe (Woods, 1996, pp. 71-72).

Woods also mentioned that there was a difference between the *structure* of a course and the *structuring* of a course – how teachers decide on discrete elements when creating a course, and the product that eventually emerges as a result of those decisions related to creating courses. What a teacher decides, and the way in which the teacher comes to make that decision, in other words, can be vastly different from what the teacher ends up doing.

Although the responsibility for the structuring of the course lies, in most settings, partly with an education ministry, board or institution, partly with the textbooks or materials that are provided for the course, and partly (and ultimately) with the learners in using the course to activate their own learning, the teacher usually plays a particularly crucial role in determining what

happens on a moment-to-moment basis in the classroom implementation of the course (Woods, 1996, p. 13).

This is especially true when it comes to defining what it means to have a successful class, or being a successful teacher. The need to highlight the concept of success or failure may seem self-evident, but it matters on a number of fronts, not least of which is the need for teachers to be confident that their work is producing positive results, and to secure the trust of their students and their employer(s). The moment-to-moment decisions that teachers make may also have less to do with creating effective learning than with maintaining a positive atmosphere in the classroom, or addressing needs that arise that were not identified or foreseen during the course structuring at the higher levels that Woods cites.

To an outsider, it might seem that planning classes (an activity over which teachers would seem to exercise a considerable amount of control) and choosing which textbook to use or which sections of the textbook should be used in a particular class might be one component to a successful class. Woods found that some of his research participants did engage in planning while classes were going on, and between classes as well, especially when deciding how to prioritize classroom activities. Nevertheless, Woods found that the teachers' conception of planning was a multifaceted approach that combined weighing and selecting options, mapping how options would be used in the class, organizing and sequencing events in the class, and generating new options for classroom activities, should there be a perceived lack of suitable options (pp. 146-147). At the same time, none of the respondents in Woods' study reported planning the entire course content out before having the chance to meet and work with their students. Planning, therefore, was an iterative process for the teachers, and one that was carried out on a number of levels; even though the "chronological divisions of the course" (p. 135) like classes or semesters did play a part in how teachers made decisions about what should be done in

class, planning was continuous and recursive, and depended on perceptions of how things had gone so far, and what could be done to boost student outcomes at all stages.

The teacher as professional

A lack of direct influence between planning and execution might seem at best like carelessness and at worst like professional misconduct, yet the literature into professional knowledge and thinking has found this to be the case in many professions such as law or medicine, not just teaching. Schön (1983) referred to this as a “crisis of confidence in professional knowledge” and pointed out that, with professionals in many careers, it is not unusual to have a disconnect between what people say they do and what they actually do, and why it is hard for people working in a profession to explain why they make the decisions that they do:

Professionals have been disturbed to find that they cannot account for processes they have come to see as central to professional competence. It is difficult for them to imagine how to describe and teach what might be meant by making sense of uncertainty...when these processes seem mysterious in the light of the prevailing model of professional knowledge” (pp. 19-20).

The teachers with whom Woods spoke did attempt to contextualize the decisions they made within the context of the classroom situations they found themselves in at the time; but the various demands of the classroom interacted in such a way that it was also hard to put their cognitions, decisions and actions into clear categories. This was one of the key points that Borg raised when he first started writing about teacher cognition in the late 1990s and early 2000s (Borg, 2003). Borg pointed out that the research done to date has come up with a plethora of terms and concepts that aim to define what teacher cognition is, yet the vast array of terms and concepts risks, and what constitutes it that insights often get bogged down in overlapping terminology, adding to the confusion. In an attempt to organize the existing research and the

areas upon which it focused, he created his 2003 model (Figure 2), “a schematic conceptualization of teaching within which teacher cognition plays a pivotal role in teachers’ minds” (Borg, 2015, pp. 47-48). This model, based on Borg’s examination of studies which focused primarily on teacher cognition and specifically on language teacher cognition, attempted to situate the areas that previous research had investigated, and how the various elements related to one another.

Figure 2. Borg’s 2003 model of teacher cognition (Borg 2015, p. 47)

Borg: Creating the model

In 2006, Borg’s book *Teacher Cognition and Language Education* (Borg, 2006) provided readers with an overview of the research and material that had been published to date, focusing on what the existing research had revealed about teacher cognition as it related to new and

experienced teachers, and specific areas of language teaching, such as literacy instruction. Borg (2015) cites three factors that have changed the way people started looking at teacher cognition. Research and focus on learning has been largely student-centered, but by the late 1960s, he argues, more was understood, from the viewpoint of cognitive psychology, about how thinking influences behavior. This meant that if we wanted to know more about how teachers worked in the classroom, we might gain more insight by examining how teachers think and make decisions. Secondly, the teacher's central role in making learning happen in the classroom became more and more recognized, as time went on; but as that happened, researchers began to look at teacher thinking and teacher cognitions from a more well-rounded viewpoint, especially as researchers became increasingly aware that trying to establish models of teacher behavior could, in fact, be more limiting than enlightening (Borg, 20165, pp. 6-7). The real starting point of the tradition of conducting research into teacher cognition came in the mid-1970s, when the National Institute of Education held a conference focusing on defining an agenda for research on teaching; the idea behind this was that it is impossible to understand teaching unless one closely examined the processes that guided the way teachers thought about what they do and did not do (Borg, 2006, p. 7). Borg reminds us that even if the field of language teacher cognition may be populated by many overlapping terms, we do see that "teacher cognition has affirmed the active role which teachers play in shaping classroom events" and highlight "the complex nature of classroom decision-making (p. 46).

In creating his 2003 and 2006 models, Borg sought to show that cognition is not about sorting different factors into specific categories; like Woods, Borg also argues that the elements that make up teacher cognition interact, are prominent in some moments and in the background in others, and interact more with some elements than others. While many of the elements of

Borg's 2003 model were carried over to the new 2006 model (Figure 3), this new proposition of the model was, he said, a better reflection of teacher cognition in five separate ways: it more adequately represented the influence that adults had in the early life of a teacher; it positioned contextual factors in teaching around teaching practice, rather than treating them as separate entities; it shortened the list of constructs behind teacher cognition, while adding to the list of issues that teachers can have cognitions about; and it put language teacher cognition at the center of the model (rather than teacher cognition as a general construct, Borg, 2015, pp. 331-333). The intense focus that had previously been given to the role of grammar in examining teacher cognition, Borg argued, provided limited insight because it treated teachers as a variable that need to be controlled, not considering that that teachers themselves make decisions that can enrich or detract from language learning.

Figure 3. Borg's 2006 model of language teacher cognition (based on the 2003 model proposed by Borg); Borg 2015, p. 333.

The models of teacher cognition that had been proposed up until Borg's 2003 and 2006 models weighed heavily in favor of classroom-related matters, compared to other factors, such as employment conditions and teacher autonomy. For the most part, this was also the case with research into language teacher cognition, as well, though some non-classroom factors had been addressed by other researchers working in the field of teacher cognition, such as Little (1990). There are notable exceptions: Crookes (1997) chronicled the ways in which the social context of schools, especially interactions with administrators and the perceptions of teachers as being

lesser professionals, could have a negative effect on second-language teaching. In a similar vein, Crookes and Arakaki (1999) set out to study where teachers get their teaching ideas from and to what extent teachers were using academic journals as sources for what to do in the classroom, saying that “[m]any in the academic world of ESL might like to think that ideas come from research or research-based sources, but in the field of second and foreign language education, there is little evidence indicating whether such research is available” (p. 15)”. Working with a group of 20 highly educated teachers who were employed by a program located in Hawaii that Crookes and Arakaki were familiar with, the two quickly found out that burnout, unstable employment conditions and festering resentment among the teachers had pre-empted any desire to do more than the bare minimum.

Similarly, Johnson (2000) found similar mindsets in her research of Mexican teachers of English. After surveying the existing literature into teacher motivation, and seeing that much of the research identified three discrete areas where teachers felt influenced their motivation (curriculum, institution and classroom), Johnson sought to understand how curriculum changes brought about by changes in government policy after Mexico became a signatory to the North American Free Trade Agreement in December of 1993 (and the Mexican government replaced its grammar-based English-language teaching curriculum with one that was based on communicative language teaching). The 98 teachers (recruited at conferences and professional development events) who took part in the survey reported that raining in the new ways was offered to both private and public teachers but the workload on teachers increased dramatically, without a corresponding increase in the kinds of support (either resources or better salaries), resulting in higher rates of burnout. Those comments were hardly unique to the teachers Johnson

researched. Indeed, she noted that the comments made by the teachers she interviewed were, by and large, the same complaints that teachers in other countries make too.

These ideas harken back to the issues raised by Wakefield (1993), in his retelling of the relationship between teachers and texts throughout history: *Are teachers superseded by the book, or are they supported by it?* Since a considerable gap exists in the research done to date on how teachers work with and in spite of materials, and which contextual factors (Borg, 2006), such as teacher training or how amounts of on-the-job experience influence the way teachers approach textbook use (cf. Numrich, 1996), a closer look at contextual factors, using textbooks as a starting point, might provide us with more insight. This thesis will argue that, in many cases, teachers have been supported by books and materials (and have supported the use of books and materials, in turn). This may be the issue if the teacher might not have had enough experience on his or her own to build intimate knowledge of the subject being taught; or, conversely, if the support being provided comes from higher levels of administration or government, minimizing the amount of input that a teacher has on the curriculum (which, in turn, may mean that the teacher's skills become rusty, as Grimmett and Crehan, 1992, argue). However, the way in which teachers make decisions about what materials and resources to use in the classroom rarely falls on the teacher's shoulders alone. In some cases, these decisions appear to be a complex interplay of contextual, organizational and educational factors which prompt some teachers to make the decisions that they do. As such, this thesis set out to investigate the role and impact of teaching materials and resources on how language teachers view and go about delivering their lessons. To this end, the following research questions guided this inquiry:

1. What are teachers' opinions about the three different types of materials (textbooks, resources and self-made materials)?

2. How do teachers make the decisions they do when it comes to materials, resources, and making their own materials?

3. Does the teaching context (teaching English as a Second Language, versus teaching English as a Foreign Language) affect teachers' perceptions of materials and resources?

Few teachers have the luxury or the burden of being solely responsible for what goes on in their learning environments, and the activity of learning is almost always mitigated in one form or another by external controls that limit what the teachers are able to do with their students and, in turn, how much and what the students learn. This study aims to shed some light on how those factors come into play in the minds of the respondents.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Choosing one specific type of research methodology over another can significantly alter the kind of picture that one has, once the data has been analyzed and put into context. Having made the decision to work with an international pool of respondents, I was aware that the anticipated geographic diversity of the respondent base would, conversely, result in a reliance on self-reported attitudes and actions, since there would not be opportunity to observe the teachers in action. As enlightening as it would have been to have the opportunity to travel to different locations, to interview respondents, and to observe respondents' teaching first-hand, it would have been extremely time-consuming and expensive to do so, making direct observation of the respondents' actions logistically impossible. This chapter will explain how the research methodology was chosen among the different options that have been used to research language teacher cognition in the past, and how the chosen methodology aimed to provide rich detail, in spite of logistical concerns. I will describe the data collection tools used and how they were designed, the approaches that were used to recruit a wide range of respondents from around the world, and, finally, I will explain how the different data analysis tools were used to analyze data from both the questionnaire results and the interview transcripts, in order to contextualize the findings for Chapter 4, where the results will be discussed in more depth.

Both quantitative and qualitative research methods have been used in studies exploring teacher cognition, and researchers to date have made extensive use of qualitative research tools such as case study methodologies, diary studies, ethnographic studies and observation to investigate both for teachers generally and teachers of languages (Mackey & Gass, 2006, p.167). However, much of the research that has been done to date on language teacher cognition has been largely qualitative in nature, heavily favoring the case study approach (such as those listed

in Borg, 2003). At first glance, it is easy to understand why. Many of the studies focus on smaller groups of teachers working in discrete environments and, as such, come “ready made” and pre-grouped, which might make recruitment of participants more straightforward. It also may make it easier to examine one specific idea or aspect in great depth, within one specific context, such as cognitions and concerns of pre-service teachers collected through diary studies (e.g., Numrich, 1996). Qualitative research can take a deep, extended look into the activities of one teacher or a group of teachers (Li, 2013; Feryok, 2010) and lends itself naturally to longer studies, or studies where data collection may happen at more than one point since, as Dörnyei (2007) states, “data collection and analysis are circular and frequently overlap” (p. 124). Mackey & Gass (2012) claim that the task of creating research to examine a particular item or phenomenon “is made easier if one understands that research methods are not determined or decided upon devoid of context, research methods are dependent on the theories that they are designed to investigate” (p. 1). Duff (2012) says that case study research has the flexibility to evolve as the research progresses, and aims to “particularize and then yield insights of potentially wider relevance and theoretical significance (pp. 95-96). Case study research shows that “much can be learned by looking both holistically and in close detail at the behaviors, performance, knowledge or perspectives of just a few rather than many research subjects at one time” (Duff, 2012, cited in Mackey & Gass, 2012, p. 98).

That said, the highly-specialized nature of some qualitative research methods, such as case studies, presents one significant disadvantage: results cannot be extended to a wider body of potential research subjects, such as those other, non-researched teachers who might be working in the same environment. This is one of the advantages offered by quantitative research, which, in addition to being able to judge the extent to which one variable might affect another, can be

designed so that it can be used with a larger number of research subjects in more than one geographical location. However, for the researcher, this can mean having to make a decision between breadth and depth. As Dörnyei (2007) tells us, one of the issues with quantitative data collection tools such as questionnaires, “is that they inherently involve a somewhat superficial and relatively brief engagement with the topic on the part of the respondent” (p. 105). In designing the research tools to be used in this research, I was acutely aware that relying solely on numbers and statistics to tell the story, rather than considering the possible advantages that qualitative data might give us in telling the story the data offers, would mean not getting the depth of detail that would come from including interviews and having the research subjects speak for themselves. Dörnyei (2007) also asserts that questionnaires frame the concept in such a way that all respondents who do answer the question are doing so without using their own words or ways of expressing ideas. This gives the researcher baseline numbers about attitudes that are, to a certain extent, comparable, even if the contexts themselves are not (p. 105).

The key, then, was to find a research methodology that would take advantage of the strengths of quantitative research when it came to reaching a wider base of respondents, while incorporating the advantages that qualitative research offers for providing rich detail that tells the story more completely. We have seen that both qualitative and quantitative research methods have their strengths and weaknesses; as such, having a research methodology that can take advantages of the strengths of both would be a useful tool in understanding more facets of the story. This is where mixed-methods methodology presents an interesting alternative to solely relying on one option or the other. Although the results and insights that are found using mixed-methods research are not always applicable to every language teacher in every language teaching situation, it does give the researcher the opportunity to explore one particular phenomenon or

one particular research subject in depth. Observations and insights are limited to the kinds of details that the research subjects are willing to share, but the data collection tools can be designed in such a way that the researcher can approach data collection in a variety of ways, including diary studies, ethnographic research, and interviews with the research subjects. Given the variety of approaches that are available to examine different facets of the concept, it was determined that a mixed-methods approach that used a questionnaire to collect baseline data about attitudes and perspectives would be a useful tool to establish baseline data on specific attitudes and beliefs about pedagogy and classroom praxis, which would then serve as the background for interviews that would explore those attitudes, perspectives and beliefs in more detail. As enlightening as it would have been to have the participants engage in other qualitative data-gathering methods such as focus groups (which would have allowed the participants to share insights among themselves, not just with the researcher), individual interviews allowed for more agile data collection.

Participants

Nineteen teacher-volunteers from seven different countries (Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, Spain, China, and the United Arab Emirates) volunteered to take part in the quantitative part of the research (i.e., the questionnaire); these participants were mainly recruited through three social media platforms: Facebook, LinkedIn, and Twitter. Of those nineteen, fourteen respondents went on to take part in the second part of the research, the interview stage. In order to focus on the complete picture that the respondents had to tell, only the questionnaire results and interview responses of those people who did both parts of the research are included here ($n=13$; due to poor sound quality of one interview, one participant's

data had to be eliminated from the pool of respondents.). Table 1 contains demographic information that respondents provided about themselves.

Table 1.

Demographic data of research participants

Respondent	EFL/ ESL?	Location	Teaching Environment	ELT Teaching certification
Rosa	EFL	Madrid, Spain	Companies (self-employed)	None
Lee	EFL	Nantong, China	Post-secondary	None
Robin	EFL	San Francisco, CA	Private classes	CTESL & M.A.
Jan	EFL	Rhineland, Germany	State school	M.A.
Tracey	ESL	Ottawa, ON, Canada	Post-secondary	TESL
Carley	ESL	Ottawa, ON, Canada	Post-secondary	TESL course, <40 hrs
Kris	ESL	Toronto, Canada	Post-secondary	DELTA
Robbie	ESL	Ottawa, ON, Canada	Post-secondary	CELTA
Danny	ESL	Edmonton, AB, Canada	Post-secondary	B.TESL & M.A.
Shaun	ESL	Ottawa, ON, Canada	Private company	B.A with B.Ed. courses
Maria	ESL	Ottawa, ON, Canada	Companies and private classes	M.A.
Andrea	ESL	Ottawa, ON, Canada	Private company	TESL course, <40 hrs
Alex	ESL	Ottawa, ON, Canada	Private company	TESL course, <40 hrs

As Table 1 shows, four of the respondents were men, and nine were women. Rosa, Lee, Robin and Jan identified themselves as teachers of English as a Foreign Language; the others identified themselves as teachers of English as a Second Language. Over half of the teachers ($n=8$) reported having had more than five years of teaching experience; three of those respondents had taught for over ten years. At the time of data collection, four of the thirteen respondents had received M.A. degrees in the field of English language teaching, while another three (Lee, Carley and Robin) were in the process of finishing Masters' degrees in applied linguistics and/or

English language teaching. All of the other respondents, except for Rosa, had done some kind of certification course to become an ESL teacher. While levels of training have been identified as one of the possible contextual factors in language teacher cognition, most of the research has focused on the cognitions and beliefs of *pre-service* teachers (e.g., Richards, Ho, & Giblin 1996; Sendan & Roberts, 1998; Cabaroglu & Roberts, 2000, as cited in Borg, 2003). Comparatively fewer studies, such as Freeman's (1998) study of the attitudes of in-service teachers who are undergoing further training or Valeo and Faez's (2014) examination of attrition among ESL teachers in Ontario, examine attitudes and changes in cognitions of teachers who are already employed or have been working for some time. This is relevant to this present research, since none of the respondents were pre-service teachers and, in contrast, had a considerable amount of experience among them; some had been teaching for over twenty years.

For the purposes of the questionnaire used in this particular study, the conceptual definition of whether a teacher taught ESL or EFL was taken from the end use that the *students* have for the language. Gideon (2012) says that, when designing questionnaires, a good part of making sure that questions are valid comes from ensuring that the concepts behind the terminology are clear for respondents to understand, and that *conceptual definitions* are clear within the terms of the survey, even if they may be understandable in different ways in other contexts (p. 92). One of the first issues to be decided on when the questionnaire was created, and the questions regarding demographic data were being written, was how to handle any possible issues regarding teachers identifying themselves as ESL teachers or EFL teachers. The comparative merits of where to draw the line between the two has been debated at length in other papers over the past thirty years. Some of the practitioners who have examined this topic include Valeo and Faez (2014), who address the dichotomy in Canada between ESL as a general topic

and Language Instruction to New Canadians as a program, and Nayar (1997), who provides ample detail about how the development of both linguistics and immigration to English-speaking countries created an arguably false dichotomy between the two. One argument for the division that Nayar makes among all of the terminology is to see who the students are and what their motivations are for learning (such as acquiring enough language and fluency to be able to integrate into English-speaking communities). This idea was extended to the definition used in this study to mark the difference between the two. For the purposes of this study, if teachers taught English to students who needed English to survive in their everyday lives, they were considered to be “ESL teachers”, while “EFL teachers” was the label used for teachers working with students who did not require English to survive in their everyday lives (e.g. exam preparation, or learning English to travel). Widdowson (1997) says that most learners of the language have specific aims in mind: “to learn a language which enables them to become members of expert communities and to communicate with other members wherever they may be and whatever primary culture they come from” (p. 144).

Finally, although this information is not included in Table 1, it should be noted that three of the respondents (Lee, from China; Jan, from Germany; and Maria, from Ukraine) were non-native speakers of English who started learning English during primary school in their respective countries. While this research did not directly aim to examine the cognitions of native speakers of English versus non-native speakers of English, having respondents from a variety of countries meant having the possibility of engaging a wider range of respondents, with a variety of linguistic teaching profiles, and that the possibility might arise that cultural aspects of teaching English might possibly provide insights into how materials were used or perceived in different countries or areas.

Instruments

Data collection took place in two phases, using two different instruments: a questionnaire, and a semi-structured interview. Both of these tools were developed over the course of four months. The questionnaire underwent revision several times and was piloted with two ex-ESL teachers, who provided feedback on the wording and order of some of the questions in the first draft. Changes were made to the order of the questions, and, once finalized, the questionnaire was launched in an online format, offered through the FluidSurveys online survey website. FluidSurveys was chosen for the location of its servers, which, at the time of the research, were located in Canada and not subject to issues with privacy laws which could have mitigated the security of the response data.

The final version of the questionnaire (Appendix A) contained 34 questions, divided into three sections. The introductory section (Part 1) was designed to collect demographic data, while the second (Part 2) contained a series of 21 Likert-scale questions, and Part 3 ended with two open-ended questions. The first part contained eleven questions that asked respondents for basic demographic information: gender, age, and years of experience teaching English to non-native speakers, whether they speak English as a first language, and what ELT qualifications they had, if any. Some contextual factors (such as teacher training and previous experience learning languages) have been shown in past research to have an effect on the way that teachers thought about their teaching. However, since that aspect of teacher cognition has been addressed by a number of researchers, such as Borg (2015) and Numrich (1996), the decision was made to have a more intense focus more on the contextual factors that could be directly related to the use of textbooks in the language teaching classroom, and leave the demographic questions to provide contextual background, rather than being one of the main foci of the research.

The second part of the questionnaire asked teachers to provide responses on a scale of one (completely disagree) to five (completely agree) to twenty-one statements related to teaching languages and the use of learning materials and resources in the language classrooms, and drew on ideas and concepts that had been brought up in previous research into both teacher cognition and using textbooks and materials in the classroom. (The entire questionnaire is included in Appendix A.) Likert-scale questions are particularly useful instruments to use in cases where researchers want to gauge the extent to which respondents adhere or believe in certain behaviors, beliefs and knowledge, or which tend to be true in their particular cases, especially when researchers are comparing and contrasting those attitudes among a variety of respondents and cannot observe respondent behavior first-hand (Morse, 2014).

Table 2.

Likert-scale statements used in questionnaire

Q.	Question Wording
Q. 11	I believe that textbooks make it easier for teachers to plan classes and courses.
Q. 12	The school/company I work for provides me with all the teaching materials I need, for free.
Q. 13	I'm the only one responsible for choosing which textbooks and learning materials I use with my classes.
Q. 14	In addition to textbooks that are supplied to me, I buy English-language textbooks for my own use.
Q. 15	The way that information is presented in the textbook informs the way I teach.
Q. 16	I use activities and exercises taken from more than one textbook.
Q. 17	I have access to audio-visual equipment (such as DVD players or interactive white boards) that I can use in class.
Q. 18	I incorporate tech-based activities (such as computer-assisted language learning or internet-based activities) into my classes at least once a month.
Q. 19	I encourage my students to use outside materials and resources, such as dictionaries and English-language websites, when they practice English outside of class.
Q. 20	There are materials and/or resources that I would like to use with the students when I teach, but I don't have access to them.

Q.	Question Wording
Q. 21	The school/company I teach for encourages teachers to use mobile technologies, such as smartphones, in the classroom.
Q. 22	I'd like to learn more about how to use computers and mobile technologies to facilitate language learning.
Q. 23	I supplement textbook activities with activities or exercises I make myself.
Q. 24	I have re-worked or modified a textbook activity at least once in the past year.
Q. 25	In the past year, I have taught at least one class without using any printed material (e.g. textbook/photocopies) at all.
Q. 26	I create new class exercises and new activities that are NOT connected to the textbook at least once a month.
Q. 27	I supplement class activities using activities or resources (such as YouTube videos).
Q. 28	I exchange activities that I've made with other teachers that I work with.
Q. 29	I don't do any planning at all – I improvise every class I teach.
Q. 30	The school/company I work with actively seeks teachers' opinions about where to invest money in resources/materials.
Q. 31	I could teach an entire course without using any materials or resources (textbooks or technology) at all.

Several statements were composed so that overlapping topics and issues, such as textbook selection and institutional control, could be triangulated with other questions. Aside from the demographic questions that populated the first part of the questionnaire, the other questions were based on statements about textbooks that had come from a variety of sources, including statements about textbooks cited by Woods and Numrich. Woods (1996) found that textbooks formed part of the dichotomy between resources (things teachers had collected personally, like books and materials, as well as other tools and items that could be used in language teaching) and constraints (“factors which narrow, limit or decrease the number of possibilities or options to a teacher”, as well as prior decisions made), where an excess of one would lead to an increase of the other (p. 171). In Numrich's (1996) study, several of the teachers she worked with expressed concerns about finding a balance with the amount and

intensity of textbook use in their teaching, as well as knowing how to pick a textbook well. Borg (2015) cites studies into the interference that textbooks can cause in the language classrooms with a focus on communicative language teaching (Sato & Kleinsasser, 1999; Richards & Pennington, 1993). Finally, the statements are also based on conversations I had had with other teachers during my teaching career, especially when the textbooks had been pre-chosen for use. The questionnaire was created in tandem with the interview guide (Appendix B) that would be used with all participants, so that the themes and topics of one could provide more insight for the other. The statements used in the Likert-scale questions (outlined in Table 2, above) fell into three main categories: (1) questions about textbooks, (2) questions about resources, and (3) questions about self-created/developed materials.

Questions about textbooks. Questions 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 24 directly addressed issues around how teachers used textbooks in the classroom. Given that textbooks (and ancillary related materials such as workbooks and audio CDs) are one of the most ubiquitous forms of teaching materials that one sees in a classroom, and may even serve as the curriculum in many language-learning contexts such as test preparation classes and classes in English for specific purposes, language textbooks were proportionately given the greatest representation within the statements in the Likert-scale questions. These questions were designed to provide insight and data to answer the first and second research questions, as well as to gather information about how textbooks formed part of the classroom practice of the respondents.

Questions about technology and resources. Questions 17, 18, 19, 21, 22 and 27 directly addressed issues about using resources to either complement or carry out textbook activities in the classroom. Questions about resources were included to learn more about if and how teachers were using items such as DVD players and exercises downloaded from the internet, where

available, and to gain a better understanding into the environments in which teachers were teaching, especially if they were teaching in companies or in other non-traditional learning environments. These questions were designed to provide insight and data to answer the first and second research questions, as well as to gather information about how textbooks formed part of the classroom practice of the respondents, and were also meant to gauge opinions about how teachers perceived the use of technology in the classroom, relative to attitudes about textbooks.

Questions about exercises and activities that respondents made themselves. McGrath (2013) argues that some teachers may place a good deal of faith in the materials they are using and not see the value in re-making anything that already exists (p. 182); alternately, he says that teachers may not have enough faith in their own pedagogical abilities to create something that improves on what is offered in the textbook (p. 179). Since a significant gap exists in research about teachers what motivates teachers to create their own materials, and whether that desire to create came exclusively from a lack of viable alternatives within textbooks, or simply from a desire to create made-to-measure learning solutions for students, four questions (Q. 23, Q. 24, Q. 26 and Q. 28) about making materials were also included, to judge the extent to which teachers used existing materials to create their own, what their motivations were for doing so, and if/how they shared their creations with their co-workers. As with the first two categories of questions, these questions were designed to provide insight and data to answer the first and second research questions, but they were also included to learn more about how teachers might use the information and exercises in textbooks as a starting point for made-to-measure solutions,.

The statements used in the Likert-scale questions were chosen because of the degree to which they would manifest action and choices in the classroom. Having a simple set of questions such as “I like/I don’t like textbooks because...” would not have provided much insight into the

classroom praxis of the teachers, and could have run the risk of generating more complaints than usable insight. Also, Likert-scale questions, when written in a straightforward, uncomplicated manner, do not require a great deal of second-guessing on the respondent's behalf; respondents simply have to indicate the degree to which their views align with those presented in the question. The questions were also composed in such a way that they could also provide insight into other aspects of teachers and teaching, such as who gets to choose the materials and items used with specific groups. McGrath (2013) points out that the wide variety of language learning materials available on the market does not necessarily mean that teachers have control over what materials are chosen to use in the classroom (p. 13).

However, the degree to which teachers are permitted to eliminate textbooks altogether from their classroom practice, or the extent to which teachers are permitted to create their own materials to replace textbook exercises and activities to supplant textbooks has yet to be determined. As such, questions 13, 20, 25, 28 and 31 touch on issues of who chooses the materials to be used in the classroom, and the extent to which the teacher is in control of the classroom or if there are other parties whose interests and influence are reflected in the choice and use of specific kinds of material and resources. Teachers who are employed directly by boards of education may see themselves constrained to using specific, board-approved textbooks which, as McGrath (2013) points out, means that the teacher has abdicated from a decision-making role, and "there is now a real danger that it is the textbook which determines course aims, language content and what will be assessed" (p. 13). Self-employed teachers, in contrast, may have more flexibility in being able to design made-to-measure learning solutions for their client-students and may, if circumstances such as Wi-Fi availability permit, be more open to using technology-based solutions such as creating exercises and activities for use on

laptops/tablet computers, or starting their own wikis (online encyclopedia) to address students' questions and concerns. Asking questions about this aspect of language teaching might provide more insight into textbooks by learning more about when and why teachers forgo textbooks, and if teachers choose to only use the textbook or textbooks in specific situations, or completely leave them out of their teaching.

The third part of the questionnaire consisted of three open-ended questions, designed to get the teachers thinking ahead to the interview part of the research, and to provide a starting point for discussions during the interview phase. Since Likert-scale questions are designed in such a way that the respondent cannot provide feedback beyond a numerical ranking to the statement being presented, it was felt that having three open-ended questions at the end of the questionnaire would give respondents a chance to put forth some ideas of their own about the role that teaching materials and resources play in the classroom. The open-ended questions (listed in Table 3) also contextualize the respondents' own experiences of using materials and resources in different situations, in their own words, without relying too much on the researcher's pre-conceived notions being the only means of defining ideas worthy of discussion.

Table 3.

Open-ended questions used in the questionnaire

Q. 32	<p>Now I'd like to ask you to think back to a recent class that you taught which went well, and where you used some kind of materials and/or resources with the students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why did you choose to use the materials/resources that you did? • In the end, did you use all of the materials/resources that you had previously chosen? Why or why not? <p>Feel free to provide as much information as you'd like!</p>
Q. 33	<p>Now I'd like to ask you to think back to a recent class that you taught which <u>didn't go well</u>, and where you used some kind of materials and/or resources with the students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why did you choose to use the materials/resources that you did? • In the end, did you use all of the materials/resources that you had previously chosen? Why or why not? <p>Feel free to provide as much information as you'd like!</p>
Q. 34	<p>Are there any other ideas, opinions or thoughts that you'd like to add about materials and/or resources that were <u>not</u> addressed in the questionnaire?</p>

The three open-ended questions were designed to prompt teachers into thinking about their conceptualizations of what a successful or unsuccessful class could be, and provide some insight into the way teachers visualized both the usefulness of textbooks and resources in creating certain affective states in the classroom. Using open-ended questions in this way was meant to allow respondents to bring their own nuances to the questionnaire data without, as Fang (1996) states, putting respondents “in the position of choosing one statement or the other...when such dichotomies do not in fact exist in their belief systems” (p. 55). Dörnyei (2007) also points out that having open-ended questions at the end of the questionnaire helps evade the risk that any negative feelings generated by the creation of the answers might influence the respondent’s other answers (p. 112).

The interviews

Development of the interview guide (Appendix B) took place at the same time that the questionnaire was being developed. The interview guide, which was used for all respondents, was a six-page document designed to guide the interviewer through the conversations with the respondents, and contained the interview questions and prompts for the respondents, with room for notes and comments that the interviewer could make while speaking with each individual respondent. Care was taken in creating both documents, to ensure that there were enough questions to allow proper triangulation of data, without having so many questions that respondents would terminate their participation before completing both parts of the research. The goal of the semi-structured interviews was to give respondents a chance to expand on the responses they provided in the online questionnaire. Dörnyei (2007) says that, in addition to providing a bigger picture to explain the phenomenon, and allowing for triangulation of data using different instruments, mixed methods research also helps to tell the story in a way that makes it more “approachable to audiences who may not be sympathetic to one of the approaches if applied alone” (p. 164).

The average response time to set up an interview was less than one day, and most of the attrition rate between data collection on the questionnaire and setting up the interview was due to non-response from questionnaire respondents, either because respondents possibly mistyped their e-mail addresses, or because they did not reply to the researcher’s requests to set up an interview. Interviews were set up and recorded within a five-week period. Once the respondents had filled out the questionnaire (and indicated if they wished to be contacted for the interview phase by e-mail, or by using voice over internet programs such as Google Hangouts or by Skype), interviews were set up for each respondent. Each respondent interview consisted of two parts:

the verbal recitation of the ethics clearance (to ensure that respondents were willingly providing their consent to participating in both the questionnaire and the interview phase of the research,) and the interview itself. Interviews were conducted either face-to-face (n=4), for those respondents living in the Ottawa area, or via Skype (n=9), for respondents living in other parts of Canada, or those respondents living in other countries. Interviews were recorded simultaneously using Audacity voice recording software on a MacBook Pro, and a Sony digital voice recorder was also used, to serve as a backup for any possible issues that may have arisen with the voice recording software. All of the interviews were transcribed in their entirety, using NCH's ExpressDictate sound processing software. A copy of the interview guide (contained in Appendix B) was used with all participants, and notes and observations about the interview was written down in each respondent's copy of the guide.

In preparation for each interview, and to personalize the photocopy of each individual respondent's interview guide, the respondent's questionnaire results were surveyed, and notes were made in the photocopy of the interview guide used for each respondent, as a prompt for the interview to remember what the respondent's answers had been on the questionnaire. The interviews varied greatly in length, ranging from 22 minutes in length to nearly an hour and a half long: some teachers who had taught longer tended to speak for longer periods of time and provide more data. This was not universally the case, however; a couple of the respondents who had taught for more than ten years provided answers that were short and lacking in extensive detail and reflection. However, as Woods (1996) asserts, short answers to the cues given in the interview questions do not necessarily mean that the respondents were inexperienced or lack insight. Those particular respondents may simply have not thought of the interview questions as

prompts to reflect on their practice and beliefs, and simply given straightforward answers without taking the chance to think in more detail about their responses.

Procedure

When data collection began, snowball sampling was launched through a social media campaign, in order to extend the reach of recruitment as far as possible, and to recruit respondents from as diverse a pool of respondents as possible. Snowball recruitment, according to Dörnyei (2007), occurs when a researcher approaches potential participants who meet the criteria of participant sought for the study, then asks those participants if they know others, like them, who fit the same participation criteria, who might also wish to take part (p. 98). Links were posted to private and public pages on Facebook and LinkedIn, and the link to the questionnaire was also shared on the researcher's Twitter feed, with the hopes of maximizing the audience of potential respondents. E-mails were also sent to international teaching organizations such as the British Council to ask for their help in recruiting participants.

During the interview phase, respondents were informed that they would be asked a series of questions that explored the answers and ideas that they had previously provided on the questionnaire, but that they were free to provide as much detail or as many ideas, insights, complaints, and thoughts as they wanted to. If clarification or explanation was required, or the respondents provided answers with little to no detail, the interviewer did not hesitate to ask supplementary questions to elicit more detail (such as, "What prompted you to do that?", or "Can you tell me a bit more about how that works?"). As was the case with the questionnaire, respondents were at the end of the interview asked if they had anything else to add, or if they thought that there should have been a question about the topic that should have been asked, but had not been asked.

Data analysis

When the data collection period ended, all of the questionnaire results were copied into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet from FluidSurvey's website. The data were examined in two separate phases: first, the questionnaire results for those respondents who did not participate in interviews were eliminated from the overall results, and the remaining responses were checked against the responses contained on the website, to guarantee statistical accuracy. The Excel spreadsheet containing the questionnaire results of the thirteen participants who had completed both parts of the interview was then formatted to include a table of the mean, median, mode, variance and standard deviation for each of the 21 Likert-scale questions from the questionnaire. Since the pool of questionnaire respondents was relatively small (and, as we shall see, the questionnaire responses did not show great amounts of variation), median and mode were calculated to pinpoint any statistical particularities that may not have been obvious by glancing at the questionnaire results.

For the second part of the research, the interviews were coded shortly after transcription, and subjected to two different types of coding: descriptive coding and process/concept coding. A code, according to Saldaña (2013), is "most often a word or phrase that symbolically assigns a summative essence-capturing and/or evocative attribute" to data (p.3). As Mackey and Gass (2012) say, citing Révész (2011), there are two major risks associated with coding interview data. The first is the danger that the coding will be too narrow in scope and fail to capture elements of the data that are relevant to the issue at hand. The second is that, when coding is performed, variables might be identified as important when they do not actually reveal any pertinent insights about the issue (p. 204). To prevent either of those two situations from taking place, and in order to provide richer contexts and interpretation of how the respondents viewed textbooks and

materials within their own teaching, a decision was made to contextualize the interview data using two different yet complimentary coding processes: *descriptive coding* and *process (or action)* coding. Descriptive coding (which examines how a piece of information fits holistically into the respondents' experiences) and process coding (which assigns gerunds to describe what respondents are doing or thinking within their descriptions) are complementary means of parsing the data, to look for patterns and tendencies among all of the interview answers given by the respondents. Saldaña (2013) says that though there are many ways of coding qualitative data, no one coding method is perfect; and, citing Sipe and Ghiso (2004), reminds us that all coding will, to some extent, be a "judgment call" seen through the filters of the researcher's own attitudes, personalities and idiosyncratic way of seeing the world (p.8). The results of the coding processes are discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.

Summary

In this chapter, we have examined how the choice was made to use a mixed-methods research approach. We have also examined the two tools that were used in data collection, the online questionnaire and the semi-structured interview, how those tools were developed, and how the data collected using those tools were analyzed. In the next chapter, we will examine the results in more detail, comparing and contrasting the insights coming from both data collection methods.

Chapter 4: Results

This chapter will examine the results from the quantitative data (questionnaire) and juxtapose it with the interview data (qualitative) as the results of each one of the three research questions in the “Discussion” chapter are reviewed in turn. The three research questions asked in this study were:

1. What are teachers’ opinions about the three different types of materials (textbooks, resources, technology, and self-made materials)?
2. How do teachers make the decisions they do when it comes to materials, resources, and making their own materials?
3. Does the teaching context (teaching English as a Second Language versus teaching English as a Foreign Language) affect teachers’ perceptions of materials and resources?

For each of these questions, I will examine the results of the questionnaire and the interview data as they relate to a) textbooks and related materials, such as title-specific DVDs and audio material (which, on the questionnaire, includes questions 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 24); b) resources, such as DVD players, interactive white boards, computer access, and technology (questionnaire questions 17, 18, 19, 21, 22 and 27), c) materials that teachers make themselves (questionnaire questions 23, 24, 26, and 28). Additionally, for Research Question 2, the results for questions for when teachers choose to use or not to use materials in the classroom (Questions 20, 25, 29, 30 and 31) will be considered.

The data

As previously stated, the data collection tools used in this mixed-methods research consisted of an online questionnaire which asked respondents for basic demographic data, then moved on to a series of Likert-scale questions consisting of statements about the use of materials,

resources and technology in the classroom, as well as when teachers choose not to use them. Respondents were asked to score their opinions on a scale of 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree). Once the questionnaire results were received from the respondents (n=13), respondents were contacted to organize interviews, to further explore the responses they had given in the questionnaire. Table 4, on the next page, provides a general overview of all of the questionnaire responses and data (provided by the thirteen respondents who took part in both the quantitative and qualitative parts of the research). In this chapter, that data will be further analyzed according to research question and context.

Table 4.

Questionnaire results for Likert-scale questions

Respondent	Location	EFL/ ESL?	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20	Q21	Q22	Q23	Q24	Q25	Q26	Q27	Q28	Q29	Q30	Q31
Rosa	Madrid, Spain	EFL	4	3	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	3	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	2	3	1
Lee	Nantong, China	EFL	4	5	1	5	3	5	5	5	5	4	2	5	3	5	1	4	5	2	1	2	1
Robin	California, USA	EFL	4	1	5	4	2	5	4	3	5	4	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	5
Jan	Rhineland, Germany	EFL	5	2	2	5	3	5	4	4	5	3	3	1	5	5	1	4	4	5	1	5	4
Tracey	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	4	2	1	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	2	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	2	1	1
Carley	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	4	4	1	4	4	4	5	5	5	2	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	2	1	2	1
Kris	Toronto, Canada	ESL	5	4	3	2	2	2	5	2	5	4	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	2	5	5
Robbie	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	4	3	5	3	1	4	4	5	5	3	3	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	1	1	4
Danny	Edmonton, Canada	ESL	4	5	1	4	1	5	5	4	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	1	1	1
Shaun	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	4	4	3	4	2	4	4	5	5	4	3	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	2	2	2
Maria	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	3	2	4	4	1	5	4	5	5	1	1	4	5	5	5	5	5	3	1	2	4
Andrea	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	4	5	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	1	3	2
Alex	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	4	4	1	5	4	5	5	5	5	3	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	2	1	4	1
Mean			4.077	3.385	2.769	4.514	2.692	4.538	4.614	4.462	5.000	3.385	2.923	4.231	4.846	5.000	4.308	4.538	4.923	4.154	1.538	2.615	2.462

Research Question 1: What are teachers' opinions about the three different types of materials (textbooks, resources, and self-made materials)?

Materials: Textbooks and textbook-related products

Results for the Likert-scale questions revealed that respondents do use and rely on textbooks and materials in the classroom. As Table 5 and Table 6 show, respondents showed high levels of agreement with the statements about textbooks and textbook-related products (Questions 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16) and unanimously indicated that they completely agree with the statement in Question 24 ("I have re-worked or modified a textbook activity at least once in the past year"). The means for these questions are displayed in Table 5.

Table 5.

Opinions about textbooks

Respondent	Location	EFL/ ESL?	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q24
Rosa	Madrid, Spain	EFL	4	3	5	5	3	5	5
Lee	Nantong, China	EFL	4	5	1	5	3	5	5
Robin	California, USA	EFL	4	1	5	4	2	5	5
Jan	Rhineland, Germany	EFL	5	2	2	5	3	5	5
Tracey	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	4	2	1	4	5	5	5
Carley	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	4	4	1	4	4	4	5
Kris	Toronto, Canada	ESL	5	4	3	2	2	2	5
Robbie	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	4	3	5	3	1	4	5
Danny	Edmonton, Canada	ESL	4	5	1	4	1	5	5
Shaun	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	4	4	3	4	2	4	5
Maria	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	3	2	4	4	1	5	5
Andrea	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	4	5	4	5	4	5	5
Alex	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	4	4	1	5	4	5	5
<i>Mean</i>			4.077	3.385	2.769	4.514	2.692	4.538	5.000

The particularly strong questionnaire results for this subset of questions (especially Question 11, mean=4.077, Question 13, mean=4.514 and Question 24, mean=5.000) seem to indicate that teachers showed generally positive attitudes about the usefulness of textbooks in their language teaching practice. Interview answers helped contextualize the information that was presented in the questionnaire and in interviews, respondents indicated that they agreed with the idea that textbooks and learning materials made their jobs easier, especially in terms of the way that the material has been pre-decided and pre-designed, ready-made for the teachers' use. Respondents indicated that not only was the pre-determined organization of topics and grammar useful as a time-saving measure, it could also help teachers who needed more assistance organizing class content.

...you can at least use a textbook just as something that can guide you, give you some ideas; it's not like you're facing a blank screen. (Maria)

Say with a reading textbook, there are already readings there, so I don't have to spend amounts of time, be it a short amount or longer amount, trying to find appropriate-level material online...you've already got level-appropriate material at hand and students have already paid for it, so it's good to try to at least use some of those materials as much as possible. (Andrea)

I'm talking about teachers who are relatively new or relatively lazy because a good book, most course books are basically a lesson plan. If there's a reading, for example, there may something to activate the students or prepare discussions before the reading takes place, and so for teachers who are fairly new at it, it's great because they just follow the book. And as they become better at doing that and understand a bit more about teaching, they can start seeing the shortcomings of the book, and then supplement it with activities, such as material that's more useful for the students for whatever reason. Or they can adapt the activities in the book. But it's a starting point. (Kris)

For questions such as Question 13 (*"I'm the only one responsible for choosing which textbooks and materials I have in my class"*) and Question 15 (*"The way that information is presented in the book informs the way I teach"*), interviews helped provide some more context to

the wide variety of answers that appeared in the questionnaire data. Several of the respondents (including Tracey, Carley, Shaun and Andrea) reported that the institutions they worked for required teachers to teach to a pre-set program. Jan, who teaches EFL in Germany, said that while she can choose how to pace the class within the boundaries of the textbook, decisions about approved textbooks are first made by the regional educational authority, and specific books are chosen by teacher committees at the school level. This means that, in Jan's educational environment, she has the freedom to program individual lessons and activities, but cannot go beyond that if it means that the approved textbooks are not used in class.

For Question 15, regarding the relationship between textbook order and the order of presentation in class, many respondents, such as Robbie, pointed out that the organization of textbooks help save teachers time by establishing learning outcomes, if none are supplied by the institution that the teacher is working for. This is especially valuable for ELT neophytes, or people who are new to a particular teaching context, such as teaching in a new country.

In China, the first time we got there, you've got five classes of sixty students and they give you textbooks because otherwise, I would have to come up with everything. And the problem is that you don't know the program, you don't know the expectations, they don't give you any of that. They just give you a textbook. So in that case, the textbook is not only the textbook, the textbook is also the course outline, the learning expectations, the learning outcomes, everything. (Robbie)

Use of resources and technology

As Table 6 shows, the teachers who took part in the research also reported relying on the Internet for materials and ideas (mean=4.923) and claim to incorporate internet-based activities into their teaching at least once a month (mean=4.462). Though respondents generally agreed with the statement *"In the past year, I have taught at least one class without using any printed material (e.g. textbook/ photocopies) at all"* (mean=4.308), they are not fans of going into

classrooms empty-handed: only five of the 13 respondents stated that they would be willing to teach without any materials whatsoever.

Table 6.

Opinions about other resources and technology

Respondent	Location	EFL/ESL?	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q21	Q22	Q.27
Rosa	Madrid, Spain	EFL	5	5	5	3	4	5
Lee	Nantong, China	EFL	5	5	5	2	5	5
Robin	California, USA	EFL	4	3	5	3	4	5
Jan	Rhineland, Germany	EFL	4	4	5	3	1	4
Tracey	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	5	5	5	2	5	5
Carley	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	5	5	5	2	5	5
Kris	Toronto, Canada	ESL	5	2	5	3	4	5
Robbie	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	4	5	5	3	5	5
Danny	Edmonton, Canada	ESL	5	4	5	3	5	5
Shaun	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	4	5	5	3	4	5
Maria	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	4	5	5	1	4	5
Andrea	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	5	5	5	5	5	5
Alex	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	5	5	5	5	4	5
<i>Mean</i>			4.614	4.462	5.000	2.923	4.231	4.923

Both the questionnaire data and interview responses seem to suggest that technology was not as much of a priority for the respondents as textbooks and materials were. For Question 17, all of the teachers indicated that they usually have access to audio-visual equipment in the teaching environments where they work (mean=4.615). For Question 18 (“*I incorporate tech-based activities (such as computer-assisted language learning or internet-based activities)*” into my classes at least once a month”), there were some discrepancies between questionnaire results and behaviours reported during the interview. Kris, for example, only answered 2 (“Somewhat Disagree”) on a scale of 5 for Question 18, even though he said in his interview that he regularly

uses videos of TED Talks in his classes and promotes the use of corpus linguistics websites such as the BYU Corpus in his classes. Conversely, Jan answered 4 (“somewhat agree”) for Question 18, but then went on to say two factors generally dissuaded her from using computer-assisted language learning or internet-based activities in the classroom: not being able to access the school’s computer room without “a great effort of arrangement [that] has to be made, and the positive attitudes that her students showed towards the textbook, favouring the use of the “material at hand, to learn.”

Both groups were equally enthusiastic about using online resources, such as YouTube videos, to supplement class activities, especially when it came to listening practice. Kris, who teaches for a post-secondary institution in central Canada, for example, mentioned that a fair amount of the listening practice done by teachers at the institutions where he has worked took the form of videos for TED Talks lectures (eighteen to twenty-minute recordings of subject matter experts who focus on one specific topic related to current affairs or a global issue such as global warming).

I taught a low-level listening course two years ago, it was pre-intermediate levels, and I took a look at the materials, and I thought, *I can't do this*. I was asked to teach it, it was the first time and I went to the director, and I said, *I don't wanna use these materials, can I use something else?* And she said, *Yeah! Use whatever what you want*. And you know what I used? I used TED Talks with pre-intermediate students, and they loved it. (Kris)

This finding is in line with the earlier finding that teachers find textbooks and materials useful for class, and, as Andrea mentioned, internet content tends to be used to round out class content, especially when the respondents found that the content of the textbooks being was not enough to address certain pedagogical areas, such as developing listening skills. Respondents reported finding that websites with podcasts and downloadable exercises are helpful in providing

other alternatives for classroom activity, especially since students can access those websites once class is over and listen to them again, if they wish.

Right now, for example, I'm teaching a listening and speaking course and the students are at a lower level, so when I'm giving them websites and putting it onto our website that they use, comprehension is a big thing, so that's important for them to be able to go back and listen. There's some listening in class but if we have a six-hour class every week, that's half of what they need or even less, so they need to have other resources that they can go and look at and listen to. (Alex)

Self-made materials

Questions about teachers' creating their own activities for classroom use garnered some interesting results. As Table 7 shows, all but one of the respondents indicated that that they completely agree with the statement in Question 23 that they supplement textbook activities with activities or exercises that they make themselves (mean=4.846). Only one respondent, Lee, from China, neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement, giving the statement a 3 ("Neither agree nor disagree"). The rest of the responses for questions regarding self-made materials were very much in line with one another.

Table 7.

Opinions about self-made materials

Respondent	Location	EFL/ ESL?	Q23	Q24	Q26	Q28
Rosa	Madrid, Spain	EFL	5	5	5	5
Lee	Nantong, China	EFL	3	5	4	2
Robin	California, USA	EFL	5	5	5	5
Jan	Rhineland, Germany	EFL	5	5	4	5
Tracey	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	5	5	4	5
Carley	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	5	5	5	2
Kris	Toronto, Canada	ESL	5	5	5	5
Robbie	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	5	5	4	5

Respondent	Location	EFL/ ESL?	Q23	Q24	Q26	Q28
Danny	Edmonton, Canada	ESL	5	5	4	5
Shaun	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	5	5	4	5
Maria	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	5	5	5	3
Andrea	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	5	5	5	5
Alex	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	5	5	5	2
<i>Mean</i>			4.846	5.000	4.538	4.154

During the interviews, respondents reported that they usually created new exercises in response to textbook exercises or activities that they felt were deficient or did not explain the salient points in a manner that would guarantee uptake by the students, “when [the textbook] doesn’t do a sufficient job with what needs to be taught, then other activities need to be built around it.”, as Andrea stated. Tracey also observed:

If I notice that the textbook isn’t covering material that is in tests coming up, then I know that I need to get on some activities that check off those items that are coming on the test, but that aren’t directly in the textbook, or there aren’t enough of them in the textbook.

Deciding to teach empty-handed

The means of the answers for those questions relating to not using any materials or resources at all (Table 8) showed some of the lowest means of the Likert-scale questions asked. There are especially low means for Question 29 (improvising every class; mean=1.538), with a wide range of responses for both Question 30 (schools actively soliciting the opinions of teachers about materials; mean=2.583); and Question 31 (the perceived ability to teach empty-handed; mean=2.462).

Table 8.

Opinions about using own materials (or not using anything)

Respondent	Location	EFL/ ESL?	Q20	Q25	Q29	30	Q31
Rosa	Madrid, Spain	EFL	3	5	2	3	1
Lee	Nantong, China	EFL	4	1	1	2	1
Robin	California, USA	EFL	4	5	4	3	5
Jan	Rhineland, Germany	EFL	3	1	1	5	4
Tracey	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	4	5	2	1	1
Carley	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	2	5	1	2	1
Kris	Toronto, Canada	ESL	4	5	2	5	5
Robbie	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	3	4	1	1	4
Danny	Edmonton, Canada	ESL	5	5	1	1	1
Shaun	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	4	5	2	2	2
Maria	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	1	5	1	2	4
Andrea	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	4	5	1	3	2
Alex	Ottawa, Canada	ESL	3	5	1	4	1
<i>Mean</i>			3.385	4.308	1.538	2.583	2.462

The questions of why, when and how teachers teach English classes without using any materials at all provided an interesting range of insights. The overall mean for responses to Question 25, where teachers were asked if they had taught a class in the past year using no resources or materials, was relatively high (mean=4.308). Conversely, respondents indicated that they would not be comfortable teaching a class completely empty-handed, and having to improvise the entire class (Question 29; mean=1.538). Yet, when asked about it in the interviews, only two respondents said they would not be able to do it. The other eleven

respondents said that due to either past experience or the ability to recycle activities and exercises that had previously been done, they would not be without options.

I can use the knowledge in my head and if I wanted to make it simple, I could just give them a topic and say, “My Dream” and get each one of the students to prepare a speech about “My Dream” and say if there are 30 students in the class; that would be about forty minutes. So it’s a class, right. *(Lee)*

I have a grab bag of things that I go to, but it’s really nothing. It’s just things that I have in my mind, then I would have students do something like an oral storytelling, or discussing personal details about their lives...I could give them an oral prompt or on the board, like “Write a paragraph about A, B, C, or whatever, if I wanted them to do a cause-and-effect essay. *(Shaun)*

Danny, who taught ESL in a number of environments, said that he sometimes decided to teach without materials or resources just to test his teaching mettle.

Danny: It was mostly on the diagnostic end. You always use materials – it’s always, like, what are your materials, like little pieces of paper floating around here and there, but obviously it’s always very orally-based, so doing different kinds of oral things, or getting people to interact, getting to them to know one another, things like that.

Interviewer: Is that something that you would typically do, or just a one-off in emergencies?

Danny: No, I do it sometimes. It’s fun to do. It makes people realize how reliant, including myself, how much we rely on materials, so it’s good to take that and it’s fun – maybe I’m thinking more about this now than I have in the past – it’s fun or more interesting to have people realize that in real life, they never use resources when they use a language. Like, they are almost never given a sheet before they have to use a language in real life.

To sum up the results for Research Question 1, both the interview data and the questionnaire results indicate that the teachers who participated in this research do, fundamentally appreciate the help and organization that textbooks provide, although none of the respondents indicated that they used textbooks without questioning their content and usefulness. Furthermore, though some of the respondents said that there were particular textbooks they did

not find useful in the classes they taught, none of the respondents was fundamentally opposed to having or using textbooks or resources in the classroom. Most respondents agreed that textbooks made a teacher's life easier; that they had access to resources to complement the textbooks that they used (and that internet-based resources, especially downloadable exercises and TED Talks, helped round out their lessons nicely); that they were ready to make their own activities and exercises when they felt that the contents of the textbook would not work do for a particular purpose or lesson; and that they think technology, including resources available through the internet, is a useful tool for the classroom.

Research Question 2: How do teachers make the decisions they do when it comes to materials, resources, and making their own materials?

Both the questionnaire data and the interview data were fundamental in understanding what motivated the respondents to make the decisions that they do in choosing which materials and resources to use, and when to forgo existing solutions and to create their own. As mentioned in the Methodology section, the questionnaire data served as the starting point for insights for the interviews. The two-step coding process revealed various themes which show us that the teachers who took part in this research are working in tandem with issues regarding control and being controlled as they endeavor to perform their jobs. These issues involve creating and connecting with students, at the same time that they are working within certain limitations (institutional, with resources). As we have seen with the data that helped answer Research Question 1, teachers may like and rely on textbooks, resources and their own creations to meet the needs of their students. However, the data suggest that none of the respondents consider any of the three types of materials/resources on their own to be a perfect solution for all teaching situations; and teachers juggle various contextual factors, such as limitations on available

materials and resources, institutional requirements, and their own capabilities, when they are deciding on the most appropriate mix of materials and resources to use in the classroom.

As previously mentioned in the “Methodology” chapter, analysis of the interview data was done in two phases, using *descriptive coding* and *process* (or *action*) coding. Saldaña (2013) describes *descriptive coding* as summarizing “in a word or phrase – most often as a noun – the basic topic of a passage of qualitative data” (p. 88). Descriptive coding permits the researcher to parse ideas that emerge within the overall narrative of a respondent’s answers, and look for patterns within the topics or themes that the researcher detects within said qualitative data. Though descriptive coding is highly subjective (two researchers coding the same interview might come up with radically different interpretations and codes), expanding the codes used from a single noun to noun phrase or simile can help the researcher to capture recurrent themes and ideas that the research subjects themselves might not be able to parse and identify within their own thoughts. A total of 508 descriptive codes were identified in the thirteen transcribed interviews; a chart with the five most common codes (and number of mentions) appears in Figure 4. Even though over 500 codes were identified, five codes that appeared most often, relative to all the other codes in the descriptive coding provided interesting insights when compared/contrasted with the process codes.

Figure 4. Most commonly-occurring codes identified during descriptive coding.

The top five descriptive codes (“the war chest”, “institutional control”, “teacher as judge/guide”, “I don’t know” and “teacher control”) seem to form two main streams of thought: that of control and that of knowledge. The knowledge stream (which includes “the war chest”, “teacher as judge/guide” and “I don’t know”) is based on perceptions of how mental capabilities and past experiences contribute to classroom praxis (what Woods, 1996, would have referred to as “knowledge” in his BAK model of language teacher cognition.). The control stream, in contrast, reflects understandings and restrictions that lie within the social realities of being a teacher, and may provide a more in-depth reflection of the social realities within which teachers are expected to do their jobs.

The second round of coding performed (i.e., process coding, the results of which are shown in Figure 5) aimed to capture the real-life and conceptual actions that teachers indicated in their interview responses. Since the subjectivity of descriptive coding can sometimes seem like

an arbitrary imposition of the researcher's viewpoint on the interview data, *process coding* was also used. *Process coding* (also called *action coding*) relies on *-ing* phrases to concentrate on what people do, rather than what people think, or the experiences that they go through (Saldaña, 2013, p. 119). This type of coding proved to be valuable for gaining insight into all manifestations of teacher cognition, both conscious and unconscious, but it was especially valuable for the shorter interviews, where respondents provided short, succinct answers that did not go into a lot of detail or provide a great deal of reflection. It is worth noting that the codes used came from the researcher's personal interpretation of the action being manifested through the decision-making processes the respondents recounted, and not necessarily the gerund which the respondent specifically *said*, to identify what was going on. A total of 259 process codes were identified. However, because process coding relies on verb constructions to identify ideas, and those verb constructions that were based on transitive verbs could also contain direct objects or dependent prepositions that could alter the basic meaning of the verb (such as "ELIMINATE" for "COUNT OUT") the decision was made to further analyze those codes to see how many of them might contain more than one key concept. (The code "CHOOSING TEXTBOOK", for example, would have relevance for the key concepts of "CHOOSE" and "BOOK", or textbook); otherwise, by eliminating the words and ideas which gave full meaning to the verb, the possibility existed that the codes would be incomplete. As such, all of the process codes were entered into an Excel spreadsheet, and a separate set of tags for any direct objects were created as a sub-set to the main set of codes. Once that was done, the COUNTIF formula function was employed to see how often the various verbs and relevant direct objects appeared in the process codes. A total of 333 mentions were identified of *-ing* verbs and direct objects from the 259 process codes that appeared in the interview data. In the final calculations of the process coding,

five codes appeared more frequently than the others, which only had a maximum of four mentions each. These five codes are detailed in Figure 5.

Figure 5. Most commonly-occurring codes identified during process coding.

Process coding revealed that the most commonly-occurring code, *satisficing*, is almost the polar opposite of the second most-common process code, *planning*. *Satisficing*, a term borrowed from the field of behavioral economics (Simon, 1951, 1959) refers to a cognitive heuristic that describes the practice of maximizing whatever resources or tools one has at hand, in order to create the best possible outcome for that situation. It focuses on the utilization of whatever resources a person has on hand to meet demands and come up with an adequate (not perfect, and not comprehensive) solution for a problem; those demands can either be externally defined or internalized by the person in question. One example of this is if a teacher hears a student having problems saying the *-ed* endings used with regular past simple, the teacher may decide to refer the student to a website focusing on English pronunciation, rather than disrupt the

flow of the class to address the needs of one individual. As Tracey put it, when asked if she created exercises and activities for classes with the idea of being able to use them again in the future, “I try to, but I tend to get fairly involved in what I’m doing at the time.” Carley’s response to the same question was, “I just do it for the present because it’s not applicable any more [once completed]. How do I use the same exercise from 2013? That makes it a past tense.”

Testing was used by many respondents to refer to the respondents’ own experimentation within the classroom, such as seeing if a new exercise, a new resource, or a different approach to an exercise, would work with a particular group of students. Lee, for example, said that if he were to propose a new textbook or dictionary to be used in his classrooms in China, he would have to conduct some kind of experiment (“we make a pilot program to test the applicability”), before it could be accepted by school management and government authorities. As Jan talked about how she decided whether she could use exercises and materials from one year to the next, she spoke about working with the material as a constant process of testing and refining activities and exercises with her students: “...it’s a work in progress”. However, some respondents, especially those working in post-secondary environments, also spoke about “teaching to the test”, a situation where teachers base their course content on the items and contexts that will be used in tests and exams that students are subjected to, and not necessarily on the problems or mistakes that are causing the largest issues in communication. As Tracey said:

I learned pretty quickly to reference the tests, to take a look at what the assessments were, coming up, what evaluations were coming up, and to make sure that the textbook covered what was going to be coming up on the upcoming texts, and realizing that, often, there were a few gaps in terms of grammar, or, like, vocabulary, that should be covered in the book, it was assigned, then technically it should add up to the test, right? But I quickly found out, after my students didn’t do very well on the very test, I looked more closely at the test and that’s when I realized, we didn’t really cover that enough, or at all! I learned to take a look at the curriculum, week by week, in line with what we’re supposed to cover, then look at the test and make sure that

they add up with the same things, and then I'd have to supplement if I noted that there were gaps in the content, versus the test.

Finally, what is interesting about *creating*, as a code, is that it was often (but not exclusively) used in relation to creating solutions, such as coming up with activities that were more in line with the students' grammatical shortcomings or needs. Alex, who taught English for Academic Purposes, said: "...it's nice to be able to teach the same things many times over, but that doesn't always happen, so development, for me, is a way to enhance and enrich the learning of the students." *Creating* was not just about creating new materials for the classroom, but also, with certain respondents, it could mean that teachers were attempting to create communication between different organizational levels and creating alliances with the students, or indicate a lack of such communication. As Robin said of one teaching post she held in Spain, where the owner of the school had created his own teaching methodology and the teaching materials to go along with it:

We were rebel teachers. We were doing kinda what we weren't supposed to be doing, which was bringing in extra [materials] in class and telling the students to keep it between us which, actually, is a tactic that works quite well because then students become your allies, and you feel like you're in it to win it together.

Next, the three main points arising from results of the coding of the interview responses - a) who chooses what gets used; b) needs versus time; and c) the war chest – will be addressed.

Who chooses what gets used?

Respondents' interview data was key in developing a deeper understanding of the factors which played a role in choosing which textbooks or resources to use in the classroom, and how those factors were influenced by issues of institutional control and teacher control (especially in terms of the respondents seeing themselves as "running the ship" of their classes). Though

existing research has examined the role that certain in-class elements play in helping teachers decide how and what to teach, the data for this research indicates that there are a number of contextual factors outside the classroom that teachers must account for when creating learning situations and solutions.

One of the most relevant contextual factors to emerge from the data is the larger educational context in which the language learning is taking place. For some respondents, the context in which they were teaching was relatively concentrated within their workplaces. For other respondents, like Jan, who teaches at a trade school in Germany, responsibility for choosing the text lies with the regional government, which gives permission to committees of language teachers at each school decide which book will be used, from a pre-approved list of available textbooks.

Jan: ...the state makes the choice for us, so we sit around with all of our colleagues and decide from a variety of books which ones are the best ones. When I entered the school I'm at now, they already chose the books for the specific classes that I'm teaching right now.

Interviewer: So you don't have a say in which core textbooks get used?

Jan: Exactly.

At the other end of the spectrum is Kris, the most veteran of all the respondents. Kris returned to Canada to teach after a long career teaching ESL and EFL in Eastern Europe. Like Tracey, Carley and Shaun, Kris is also employed by a post-secondary educational institution in central Canada. The institution he works for took something of a do-it-yourself approach when they started their English language teaching program a few years ago...but that does not mean that the teachers necessarily adhered to it!

Kris: They have a text that they compiled themselves out of bits and pieces of other texts all by the same publisher, and I think that they're from about 4 or 5 different texts and the publisher agreed to repackage this book. It's huge – it's

about an inch and a half thick and we don't use it much because we don't like it. (*Laughs.*) What they were using before they compiled this book is that they had – this is what a lot of organizations do – is they just have a resource center-slash-library of different course books and you just select material from the books that kind of matches the theme of the unit. And they wanted to standardize and they wanted to save the teachers all this work of searching through course books. But we're back to that, basically. And that was a choice made by the teachers because we basically plan our – we plan the curriculum ourselves. ...It's set in that you only have themes, there are modules, for example, any semester you have three four-week modules, each module has a theme and we basically create the curriculum around the themes.

Indeed, the issue of control, whether it be institutional control or teacher control, featured prominently in both the process coding and the descriptive coding, within the tags of “institutional control”, “I run this show”, “teacher control” and “teacher as judge/guide”. “I run this show”, “teacher control” and “teacher as judge/guide” applied to the different situations in which respondents indicated that they either had, or acted on, a sense of responsibility for the way in which classroom activities or action were unfolding (for example, the need to create a fun learning environment for the students). “Institutional control” is straightforward: it refers to instances where teachers are required to follow specific rules and regulations as part of their jobs, such as the list of textbooks, set by the regional government, from which Jan and her colleagues are required to choose which books are used as the main texts in English classes. Most of the respondents reported that the institutions for which they worked, or had worked for in the past, assumed the responsibility for selecting the textbooks and materials to be used in the language teaching classroom. At the same time, respondents reported assuming the responsibility for finding and deploying additional material, especially if it came from the internet. For Tracey, Carley and Shaun, the materials chosen came as part of a pre-designed course that they were expected to teach to different groups:

[The course content] was established by [the college]. They have a very strict curriculum that they follow that's been designed by the permanent teachers

there, and yeah...you're basically given a time line, *X* number of weeks to teach, and you cover *X* chapter each week....yep. It's very set. (*Tracey*)

Yeah, the curriculum is quite structured there, so even though they update materials a lot, sometimes they'll order books and then completely change their minds, so it's a total waste. (*Laughs.*) But they do give you the books, and it does link pretty directly to the curriculum, so...even though I try to be eclectic it would be super-boring just to use those textbooks and resources, I do find that I don't have much freedom in choosing the books that we use. (*Carley*) In terms of the curriculum, it's very prescribed, so we use the same textbooks that I did at the previous one, but they tell you all the stuff to teach and which lessons to do during which weeks, so we do our daily planning, but we do our weekly planning, too, to make sure that all of the sections of the same level are on the same track at the same time. (*Shaun*)

Andrea, Alex and Danny worked for a different for-profit language academy that was roughly affiliated with a post-secondary educational institution in central Canada and unless the students that they worked with were engaged in some kind of independent project, the academy expected the teachers to use the same suite of EAP textbooks that it had selected for use. Similarly, when Robbie was working in China, he was required to use a specific textbook that had been chosen by his employer.

"I run this show" is the fulcrum between "teacher control" and "institutional control", especially when teachers were required to make on-the-spot decisions about how the class flowed. Of the thirteen respondents, only Rosa, Robin, Kris and Maria reported being in total control of what was used in the classroom. It is worth noting that, at the time of the interviews, Rosa and Maria were working as freelance teachers, while Kris was working for a post-secondary institution with an EAP program that was relatively new (it had only been created three years earlier) and which gave its instructors a wide degree of latitude in creating courses and helping teachers.

In some cases, respondents found themselves in teaching situations where they had no control of the content at all, as Robin said as she recounted her first and longest English-teaching

job, in Europe. Hired by a language academy whose founder had created his own language learning methodology, Robin and other potential teachers were expected to become adept at the academy's unique method of imparting classes before they began to teach. Potential teachers were also expected to leave behind any pedagogical knowledge they had previously acquired, if they had any; in fact, the academy's policy was to hire potential teachers who had not been exposed to other language-teaching methodologies. While Robin admits that the method was useful to teachers who had no previous experience teaching English, the rigidity of the method was not without its disadvantages.

Robin: [The academy] was created by [founder], an American who'd been living in Spain for many decades, even at the time that he wrote the books, about fifteen years ago, and he created a series of texts which were devoid of photos, or other more user-friendly things that make a text appealing to an ESL student. These texts were designed to be used primarily by the teacher to lead the class, and there were supplemental texts given to students that were based on sort of like the translation method, reverse translation method, and there was a lot of audio-lingual methodology mixed in with that, so it was up to the teacher to use these texts, which were spiral-bound, text only, on white paper, uh...volumes. I wouldn't call it books because they weren't bound like books...And they presented English in a chronological ...I think that's called "spiraling" in ESL lingo, I can't remember, but where you just build on each previous chapter's point while reinforcing it with repeating it. I mean, I didn't say that right but you know...you would repeat the last lesson's grammar point, for instance, and then present a new one, and each day would go like that. Um...I don't have copies of those texts any more, but they were very strange and frankly, none of the teachers liked using them.

Interviewer: Why not?

Robin: Because they were difficult to figure out how to use, which was part of [founder]'s plan, I think – he wanted something that was corrupt-free from other academies, he wanted something that was really original, and you actually had to take a training class, which lasted a month, to learn how to use the texts to present the material. It was very complex and frankly, needlessly so, and we thought that at the time. I'm not saying that looking back in retrospect, I'm saying that at the time, we were, like, "What the hell?" But I have to say that they were useful: they did serve a purpose because they helped keep the teacher on track, and you could always refer back to it during class if you got stuck, and it did offer a lot of examples for questions and things like

that. But they weren't very much fun to use because there wasn't a lot of flexibility.

These findings suggest the possibility that institutional control, and the freedom that teachers have in choosing their own materials, may be closely linked to the kind of organization that a teacher works for.

Needs vs. Time

The respondents who took part in this study indicated that they want to meet students' needs, but doing so is often mitigated by questions of time and organizational control. As the information relating to Research Question 1 has argued, though the respondents' questionnaire responses indicated that they find textbooks useful, and the interview data suggests that respondents understand that textbooks alone cannot solve all of their problems or give them everything they need to make a class function, respondents also indicated that a balance must be reached between the amount of time teachers have to find solutions to the problems that they perceive that students have. In that sense, then, time becomes a resource that must also be accounted for and allotted, especially for teachers whose compensation does not cover preparation time. As Carley said:

I think that without [textbooks], unless you're getting paid a lot for prep, it's really difficult not to have any guidance because if you had no required textbook for the course, then you would be building it from scratch, which is exciting, but time-consuming. ... I think that if I was given no required resource, and no time to develop my own syllabus, I would be pretty pissed.

Some respondents reported getting around this problem by simply reusing exercises and activities that they had done before, or using online materials that they or others had perceived would be useful for pedagogical purposes. Rosa, for example, estimated that, from year-to-year, half of the exercises that she used with her learners had been taken from classes given in years

past. Rosa also reported using some online content, such as radio stories from National Public Radio in the United States, which come with their own transcripts. This approach provided her with listening exercises that contained both “contemporary terminology that was interesting for more advanced groups”, as well as real-life examples of targeted vocabulary that would be relevant to the learners’ own personal situation.

Lee pointed out that, in the Chinese system, where he began teaching, a special committee was responsible for choosing the English-language textbooks to be used. To get around that rule, he said, “I always go to the Internet and find *proper* learning materials for the students” [emphasis mine]. He also spoke about the ease with which he could recycle materials, year after year:

...teaching English is like the same thing, so if you’re lazy, you can use the same material year after year. And it’s not required to update these learning materials, unless you feel like it and if you find that these materials didn’t work out for your students.

This issue of striking a balance between what the students need, and the amount of time, money and energy that teachers have available to invest in finding solutions for students within the constraints set by institutional demands, ties into the idea of satisficing that arose in the process coding. A teacher may feel the burden for being solely responsible for making sure the students learn; yet no teacher has an endless supply of hours within a given month or semester to make sure each student has the solutions and practice needed to reach the goals of the class. This information suggests that one of the contextual factors that teachers of English face is the conflict that arises from meeting student needs with the resources and time that teachers have available to them.

The War Chest

The *war chest*, described by Robbie as the internalized list of skills, knowledge, activities and techniques that help a teacher know how to do his or her job (what Woods, 1996, would have categorized as “knowledge”) was an oft-cited part of teaching that could potentially include creating, controlling, examining, improvising, making and learning. Some examples of the war chest include books that teachers had previously acquired (either through inheriting materials from teachers leaving the school or profession, or books that they had bought themselves), leftover photocopies of activities and exercises that teachers had collected, or activities that teachers had used in the past and remembered for future use. Most teachers said that they had spent some amount of money in the past to acquire books that they could use themselves. Jan reported spending the most money (€300-500, or approximately \$440-740 Canadian per year, she estimated), while some teachers like Carley and Alex reported spending as little as \$30 Canadian per year. Several teachers, such as Rosa, Robbie and Danny said that they kept active filing systems of extra photocopies that they could use whenever the needs arose. Robbie, who teaches English for Academic Purposes at a Canadian university, described how he learned to hang onto everything, especially materials:

One of the first things I was told was that every handout, every article you choose, everything you do...file it away. Keep them. And now, if somebody says, “Oh, I need something on reflexive verbs”, *hup!* I’ve got something that at least, if I can’t use it, I can adapt it.

Some respondents, such as Shaun, used computer systems to organize the war chest:

I always keep all of my lesson plans and everything, so if I get something from the Internet, I keep it on my computer, and I have a folder with supplementary activities that I can pull up at any time.

The value of the war chest lies in its immediacy. None of the thirteen respondents reporting using the war chest for long-term planning; rather, the war chest appeared to be something to be called upon when classroom time ran longer than planned activities did, or the respondents perceived that the material to be done was not a good fit with that particular class.

In some cases, however, respondents found themselves using the war chest as more than a stopgap measure, especially if they were unable to access any materials and resources whatsoever. Robin shared one example of a private language academy that hired her to teach a summer session, but denied her use of their holdings of materials and resources.

This was a mixed class of mostly Spanish teenagers, ranging in age from twelve to seventeen. And there were no materials. I raided the library of this school. I wasn't supposed to, but I did it anyway... they had a decent library, and I had no text, I had NOTHING. The school didn't give me anything, and I expect that they thought that I'd be bringing it with me in my suitcase on the airplane. So I went down to the library and I found a bunch of those DK books, Dorton Kindersley or something? ... And so I thought, "Well, I'm gonna try to get as many of these books on different subjects as I can, these DK books, cause I like being cohesive," like one type of book, and broke them into groups of two or three and I gave each one a book, and said, "All right, I want you to prepare a ten-minute presentation," whatever it was. One of the books was about seashells, one of the books was about whales – you know how these books are. And that worked pretty well. And I did supplement from a text, but I had to actually go on a hunt to find them. Other times during that month, I didn't have materials, or I couldn't have access to the library anymore because they'd found out what I'd done, and I'd gotten in trouble, ooh!

The data suggest that the response for Research Question #2, then, was that teachers make the decisions they do based on several factors: the amount of institutional control that they feel they are subjected to (if any), the quantity of knowledge, previously-used materials, and the amount of time that they have to solve pedagogical issues that arise in the classroom. In line with Woods' (1996) findings, we see that teachers make decisions about issues such as planning remembering that there could be a number of issues that arise. At the same time, the data seem to suggest that teachers are investing their own time, money and decision-making force in order

to make learning happen in spite of the constraints and limitations that their teaching contexts impose on them.

Research Question 3: Does the teaching context (teaching English as a Second Language, versus teaching English as a Foreign Language) affect teachers' perceptions of materials and resources?

Findings suggest that respondents who identified themselves as EFL teachers are more likely to agree with those statements that pertain to textbooks, while respondents who identified themselves as ESL teachers indicated that they were more receptive to using technology in the classroom and technology-based solutions. Results indicated that there were no noticeable differences in opinion between the groups regarding teaching with no materials at all. The lack of large differences between the two groups may be due to the previously-cited issues of creating clear delineations between EFL and ESL, as identified previously in Widdowson (1997) and Nayar (1999). Furthermore, it should be stated that, due to the relatively small number of respondents who identified themselves as EFL teachers (four, compared to the nine respondents who identified themselves as teachers of ESL), there are limits to just how generalizable these results may be to the larger field of English-language teaching.

Textbooks and materials

With the exception of two questions, the averages for questionnaire responses for those who identified themselves as ESL teachers and those who identified themselves as EFL teachers regarding textbooks and textbook-related materials were remarkably similar, as Tables 9 through 12 (below) demonstrate. As we previously saw in Table 5, for example, the mean of responses for Question 12 about being supplied materials at no cost was higher for ESL teachers (mean=3.667) than it was for EFL teachers (mean=2.750). As Table 6 also previously

demonstrated, respondents who identified themselves as EFL teachers unanimously agreed that they use material from more than one textbook (mean=5.000).

In contrast, when the results of the questionnaire data are re-aligned according to teaching contexts, the results for Question 12 indicate that ESL teachers tended to agree with the statement, but not as strongly as EFL teachers (mean=4.333). EFL teachers were also more likely to agree with the statement that they purchase their own materials than ESL teachers were (EFL=4.750; ESL=2.667). This finding follows logically with the points raised in the response for Research Question 2: if certain respondents reported that the materials they have been required to use in their language classrooms are pre-ordained by the institutions they are working for, one would expect that the teachers would be given access at no cost to those materials.

Table 9

Opinions about textbook materials (EFL vs. ESL)

Question	EFL mean (n=4)	ESL mean (n=9)
11. I believe that textbooks make it easier for teachers to plan classes and courses.	4.250	4.000
12. The school/company I work for provides me with all the teaching materials I need for free.	2.750	3.667
13. I'm the only one responsible for choosing which textbooks and learning materials I use in my class.	3.250	2.556
14. In addition to textbooks that are supplied to me, I buy English-language textbooks for my own use.	4.750	3.889
15. The way that information is presented in the textbook informs the way I teach.	2.750	2.667
16. I use activities and exercises taken from more than one textbook.	5.000	4.333
24. I have re-worked or modified a textbook activity at least once in the past year.	5.000	5.000

Other resources and technology

Similarly, Table 10 does not show great discrepancies in the level of agreement reported by the respondents as they responded to questions relating to using other resources and technology in the classroom. Respondents who identified themselves as ESL teachers reported a higher level of agreement with Question 21 (*"The school/company I teach for encourages students and teachers to use mobile technologies, such as smartphones, in the classroom"*, EFL mean =2.750, ESL mean 3.500). Otherwise, the results for both groups of respondents were very similar, especially in terms of the availability of resources for classroom use (Question 17), the use of tech-based activities in the English-language classroom (Question 18) and the desire to learn more about how to incorporate more technology into English language teaching environments (Question 22). Only one of the four EFL respondents answered "completely disagree" to Question 22: Jan, from Germany, indicated that a lack of available computer room resources in the institution where she teaches prevented her from using computer-based solutions

as a regular feature of her English-language teaching practice, and made her less motivated to learn more about the topic. Conversely, only one respondent (Tracey) reported that she had actively promoted the use of a mobile phone/tablet app to her students, to help them master phrasal verbs more effectively (Question 19).

Table 10

Opinions about resources and technology (ESL vs. EFL)

Question	EFL mean (<i>n</i> =4)	ESL mean (<i>n</i> =9)
17. I have access to audio-visual equipment (such as DVD players or interactive white boards) that I can use in class.	4.500	4.667
18. I incorporate tech-based activities (such as computer-assisted language learning or internet-based activities) into my classes at least once a month.	4.250	4.556
19. I encourage my students to use outside materials and resources, such as dictionaries and English-language websites, when they practice English outside of class.	5.000	5.000
21. The school/company I teach for encourages students and teachers to use mobile technologies, such as smartphones, in the classroom.	2.750	3.500
22. I'd like to learn more about how to use computers and mobile technologies to facilitate language learning.	4.500	5.000

Using self-made materials

The questions relating to self-made materials brought up an interesting disconnect between the questionnaire results for questions relating to using materials that respondents had made themselves, and what the interview data revealed about the nature of those materials. As Table 11 shows, respondents indicated strong agreement with the statements in questions relating to how often (EFL= 4.500, ESL 5.000) and to what extent they made their own materials for classroom use (EFL=4.500; ESL=4.500).

Table 11

Opinions about self-made materials (EFL vs. ESL)

Question	EFL mean (<i>n</i> =4)	ESL mean (<i>n</i> =9)
23. I create new class exercises and new activities that are NOT connected to the textbook at least once a month.	4.500	5.000
24. I have re-worked or modified a textbook activity at least once in the past year.	5.000	5.000
26. I create new class exercises and new activities that are NOT connected to the textbook at least once a month.	4.500	4.556
28. I exchange activities that I've made with other teachers I work with.	4.250	4.111

When asked for details about these activities, many respondents reported that those re-worked exercises that they created and used were, for the most part, writing or speaking exercises that were either adaptations of writing and speaking prompts that their current or previous textbooks contained. Very few respondents reported creating completely new exercises that had not been influenced by some kind of exercise or activity that they had done in the past. Furthermore, those writing and speaking exercises that teachers reported making were only rarely subjected to any kind of evaluation or correction once the students had completed them, either by the teacher him/herself or the other students in the class. That finding was also present for both the questionnaire responses and the interview data for Questions 29 and 31, which formed part of the block of questions relating to choosing to use (or not to use) materials in the English-language classroom. (The mean for all responses pertaining to those statements is included in Table 11.)

Teaching without materials

Table 12 shows that although respondents indicated on the questionnaire that they had, in the past year, taught at least one class without using any printed material at all (overall=4.308: EFL=3.000, ESL=4.889), respondents generally provided the same response in the interviews—that they would simply re-use a writing or speaking exercise that had been done previously, either by changing the wording of the prompt used to spark the exercise, or by using an exercise that had been done with another group of students.

Table 12.

Opinions about teaching without materials (EFL vs. ESL)

Question	EFL mean (n=4)	ESL mean (n=9)
20. There are materials and/or resources that I would like to use with the students I teach, but I don't have access to them.	3.500	3.333
25. In the past year, I have taught at least one class without using any printed material (e.g. textbook/photocopies) at all.	3.000	4.889
29. I don't do any planning at all – I improvise every class I teach.	2.000	1.333
30. The school/company I work for actively seeks teachers' opinions about where to invest money in resources/materials.	3.250	2.333
31. I could teach an entire course without using any materials or resources (textbooks or technology) at all.	2.750	2.333

In the interviews, Kris (ESL) was the only respondent who indicated that he had a series of exercises that he had created that relied on the students to provide the content and the checks for accuracy that were independent of any other books that he had used in the past. Otherwise, most respondents reported in the interviews that they would rely on their war chests for ideas of things to do. Though the average response for ESL teachers was remarkably high for Question 25 (mean=4.889), this figure may be echoed in the previous point that when teachers say they do

not use any materials, it does not necessarily mean that the task or activity that is used is completely original, or did not come from a book or source that the teacher had used previously.

The results from both the questionnaire data and the interviews suggest that, with a few small exceptions, there are no great differences that exist between the findings for respondents who identified themselves as EFL teachers, and those respondents who identified themselves as ESL teachers. With the exception of a few questions, the questionnaire results and interview data revealed few differences in thinking between the respondents who identified themselves as EFL teachers, and those who identified themselves as ESL teachers. Given that the division of definitions that separate ESL from EFL have always somewhat contentious and context-bound through the students' perceptions, rather than those of the teachers' (Nayar, 1997; Valeo & Faez, 2014; Widdowson, 1997), it is perhaps not surprising that the answers to the Likert-scale questions were, for the most part, rather uniform, since the teachers themselves were not asked to consider their own place in the ESL vs. EFL dichotomy as they answered the questions. For example, Rosa, in Spain, identified herself as an EFL teacher based on the definition provided on the questionnaire yet her students at the media company where she taught used English as their second language in their jobs. Not all of Rosa's students spoke English on a daily basis, nor were most of them in situations where they had to use English manage their day-to-day living; however, they perceived English to be sufficiently important to their everyday lives that they invested time in learning and perfecting the language; as such, they could claim English to be their Second Language, in terms of importance to their lives.

To summarize, the answer to Research Question 3 is that there are no indications that the cognitions of English language teachers in one group vary significantly from those of the other group, though there may be some small differences between how teachers of EFL and how

teachers of ESL think about and decide on what materials to use in their teaching. However, it is not immediately clear if those differences are due to the EFL/ESL dichotomy, or if there are other factors, such as employment conditions or level of teacher education, at play.

In conclusion, we see that the results coming from the data collection have pinpointed a number of issues surrounding the contextual factors that come with textbooks, such as the role of evaluating possibilities when making decisions; issues of control both inside and outside of the classroom; and how teachers make decisions to use (or not use, depending on the school and the teacher) textbooks, materials, resources and technology-based solutions. Some of these issues, such as decision-making relative to institutional control, have been addressed by previous researchers (Crookes and Arakaki, 1999; Grimmett and Crehan, 1992; Little, 1990). Others hint at the tantalizing possibility that other disciplines, such as behavioral economics, might be able to provide a new point of view in examining how contextual factors affect teacher cognition. In the next chapter, we will discuss some of the issues that have been brought up by this research, look at how the findings relate to other research which has been done in the past, and the future directions that may prove to be promising, in light of the insights gained in this research.

Chapter 5: Discussion

This chapter will highlight the findings of this investigation and will explain them in light of the existing research on teacher cognition and materials development/use. This will be followed by a discussion of the implications and the limitations of this research. The chapter will conclude with a discussion of future research in the area.

Research Question 1: What are teachers' opinions about the three different types of materials (textbooks, resources, and self-made materials)?

Teachers of English like books; but teachers don't live by them.

Both the quantitative and qualitative data generated by this study suggest that teachers do hold positive opinions about textbooks and associated language learning materials, such as audio CDs and workbooks. The teachers who took part in this study indicated that they value textbooks and associated materials for their ease of use and the potential that those materials offer for saving preparation time. The findings for this research also suggested that teachers are highly unlikely to stick to using just one textbook, and, when possible, supplement with exercises or activities that are taken from other books, adapted by the teacher from existing books, or made by the teachers themselves. This may be due to a perception that the exercises and activities provided in one particular textbook do not always fit the needs of the students in the class, or the focus of the language learning.

This finding is supported by Harmer (2001, cited in McGrath, 2013) who points out that language textbooks are “proposals for action, not instructions of use”, and that many teachers “make changes to coursebook materials based on their beliefs or experiences, and engaged teachers may simply use the materials as a springboard” (p.14). For the teachers who took part in this research, the textbook may have set the order of topics to be covered in the language

classes that some of the respondents taught, yet respondents indicated that they did not let the textbook be the sole authority in dictating the direction taken in class. Even if there was some degree of institutional control over the direction of the courses, teachers were not afraid to supplement from other sources (such as additional books that they owned, or exercises downloaded from the internet), or use textbooks as a starting point for creating educational solutions of their own, based on their own experiences, knowledge about teaching English, and understanding of the dynamics of the classes they were working with.

Woods (1996) proposed the idea that teachers make decisions within a hypothetical construct which he called BAK (beliefs, assumptions, knowledge), which includes the elements that contribute to decision-making and the relationships (both personal relationships and relationships with ideas) that motivate teachers to make the decisions that they do (p. 196). BAK, Woods argued, is not a set system of statements that “exist[s] in the minds of teachers as particular entities” (p. 197); rather, they are propositions, observations, thoughts and experiences which work together, in varying quantities, depending on the situation that the teacher finds himself or herself in (p. 199). The teachers who took part in this study echo those who took part in the research conducted by Woods (1996), in that they seemed to have engaged their beliefs, assumptions and knowledge when they used textbooks and associated materials in the classroom. As we previously saw in the “Results” chapter, the respondents indicated that they were in strong agreement with the statement that textbooks can help with organization and class management, and provide structure where none may exist until the teacher (or the institution’s managers, in the case of the institution where Tracey, Carley and Shaun teach) creates one. Kris’s point (cited in the Results chapter) that textbooks form a kind of lesson plan might be considered a significant advantage is echoed in Richards’s (1993) observation that “[a] textbook...because it is based on

sound theories and organized along scientific principles, provides a system...and can therefore compensate for the variations that are found in individual teaching skill in the real world” (p. 5). Several respondents indicated that they felt textbooks had inherent advantages for them and the students.

It’s an easy way for the students to see where things are going. (Danny)

I’m not a very good grammar teacher, so I like texts where the grammar is presented in the way that I can comprehend it so that I can figure out, as I’m looking at it, okay, I think I can teach it this way, and this will help me. (Robin)

I have my own strengths and textbooks, some of them at least, have been built with different strengths in mind, so it sometimes helps to strengthen and complement different things a bit. (Andrea)

The respondents also indicated that they believe that textbooks are not the only solution for things to do in their English language classroom. Some respondents also indicated that textbook materials (original to the book, or reworked by the teacher himself or herself) formed part of their personal *war chest* for use in the language teaching classroom. As previously seen, Robbie explained the idea of the war chest as the skills, knowledge, activities and techniques that help a teacher know how to do his or her work. Materials that might be included in the war chest could include textbooks that the respondent had been previously been given, or had purchased; accumulations of extra photocopies gathered from previous classes; or even a mental compendium of discussion/writing prompts that had been used in the past with some degree of success. At first glance, having a war chest might seem like a manifestation of teacher control, somewhat akin to hoarding in that things were being retained for future use in some theoretical point in the future. However, not everything was saved: most respondents reported that exercises, activities and books are not saved if they have not produced successful outcomes in the past, or might not be useful in producing successful outcomes in the future. This,

interestingly, is at odds with a claim made by Prowse (2011, cited in McGrath, 2013), who claimed that, in the age where Google is a widely accepted verb, “[t]he days of the files and boxes full of yellowing newspaper articles and magazines saved for future use are over” (pp. 32-33).

While the teachers who took part in this research were supportive of the idea of using textbooks in the classroom, there was less unanimity when the issue of using mobile technology in the classroom came up. Questionnaire results indicated that many of the teachers harbored positive attitudes towards online technology, and even a few of the teachers were teaching in online environments, especially as it could fit within existing classroom learning solutions. While Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL) has been an option for language learning for several decades now, the use of mobile technology (on tablets and smartphones) may still have a way to go before it is as common a feature in the language learning classroom as textbooks are. Mobile technologies and the knowledge of how to use them in the classroom may, one day, become a fundamental resource in a teacher’s war chest, but the pedagogical potential of the technology has yet to be maximized for language classroom use. This is because of a number of issues that have been previously identified in the literature: Garrison & Vaughan (2013), for example, cite the need for institutions to address issues related to policy, resources, action plans and support issues, to increase the chances that technology (in this case, blended learning solutions used in post-secondary institutions) will gain greater traction and better acceptance (p. 25). Similarly, O’Dowd (2013) has argued that uptake and development of telecommunications-based learning is helped by building and strengthening partnerships among stakeholders, raising awareness of the activity (not just in the eyes of the participants, but also to

garner more prestige of this sort of initiative among stakeholders and within communities), and especially among the students who took part in the initiative (pp. 4-6).

Research into how present or aspiring tech-savvy teachers take steps to make mobile technologies a more consistent, productive part of their classroom is starting to emerge; we may gain some insight by looking at the results that Pennington (1995) found when working with teachers of English in Hong Kong. Schoolteachers in Hong Kong, Pennington writes, have heavy teaching loads, are expected to use a lot of their personal time for professional tasks, and have to attend workshops and professional development sessions on their own time. The teachers Pennington worked with had to make decisions about where to allocate their own time, attention and efforts. Pennington worked with eight Hong Kong teachers of English who had previously attended training on conducting process writing in their classrooms, to help them develop their knowledge and productively introduce process writing in their classrooms, and through diary keeping Pennington saw how the teachers' focus moved from "How do I do this?" to "How can I make this work for the students' long-term learning?"

Because the progression from one stage to the next is cumulative, it would seem that in the present project, the teachers evolved a changed conception of teaching both from a deeper understanding of the techniques and procedures of the process approach and from a new view of roles and responsibilities of teachers and students attendant on that approach. Likewise, they evolved a higher level of conceptual skill – for example, for planning and for integrating theory and practice – on a basis of procedural and interpersonal expertise. As they moved through these three stages of their adoption of process writing, the teachers responded to the innovation in terms of their behaviour, affect and cognition, and were able to gradually integrate their knowledge, skills, and practice in each of these dimensions. These dimensions, taken together, embody a full human response and commitment to the innovation.” (Pennington, 1995, p. 720.)

Working for a state-run or state-governed educational institution is no guarantee that technology use will be maximized in the language learning classroom, if it is used at all. In her

comparative study of educational experiences (including technology) in public and private schools in Brazil, Miccoli (2008) found that while the use of technology in English-language education in Brazil is permitted, the respondents she worked with reported that both private and public schools do sometimes have technological resources (such as audio-visual equipment). While respondents reported that technological resources were more readily available in private schools, teachers in both contexts were reluctant to use them because they never knew if they could count on the resources being consistently available or if the resources would work when the teachers needed them. As Pennington (1995) says, it is hard to commit to the development and mastery of an innovation if it is not readily available.

More recently, Kartchava and Chung (2015) found that both pre-service and in-service language teachers generally harbour positive attitudes towards the use of technology, albeit with some contextual factors also playing a part. Kartchava and Chung's mixed-methods research sought to gain insight into the attitudes that pre-service teachers and in-service teachers shared about technology in three converging categories: experiences with technology, using technology in the classroom, and contextual issues relating to technology in the classroom, such as availability of technology and institutional attitudes about technology. All of the respondents who took part in the research had first-hand experience using mobile technology in their everyday lives and reported having positive opinions about the use of technology in the classroom. In-service teachers were found to have incorporated technology more in their classroom praxis, and reported having more positive attitudes about the use of technology in the classroom even if they had occasional issues with technology, such as having opportunities for training that would overcome perceived needs with technology. Participants from both groups in the study also reported that contextual factors such as institutional support, teachers and students

played a role in the way they made decisions. Technology, however, was not seen as an ideal solution, because of the limitations inherent in some technology platforms (such as a limited field of vision, using Skype with a computer's camera), and the danger of losing the person-to-person feel generated in classroom environments.

Teaching by going without

If published materials are onerous due to the restrictive, artificial nature of their tasks, foci and costs (especially investing in all of the ancillary materials that can come packaged with one textbook, such as workbooks, teachers' books and audio CDs) and access to technological solutions is not universally guaranteed, is teaching completely empty-handed an option as well? Though the teachers who took part in this research by and large preferred to teach with some kind of materials (for both pedagogical and affective reasons), some teachers, such as Kris, have chosen to let a learner-centered focus guide their teaching, letting the learners be the source of the class material and provide solutions for one another, an over-reliance of items imported into the classroom is shed, in order to make learning happen. Thornbury (2013) says that this point of view is hardly new; Allwright, he argues, was making the same point in the early 1980s (p. 2). Thornbury (2013) has argued that if movement to get teachers to lessen their need for textbooks has attracted attention, it has more to do with dissatisfaction that teachers have felt towards textbooks and course plans, and a need for students to "complexify their mental grammar and to extend their mental lexicon" beyond the endless recycling of topics and grammar in textbooks, which presents "a danger that learners remain forever in a state of suspended animation" (p. 3).

Thornbury's position is echoed by Kuramavadivelu (2003), who argues that, instead of putting teachers in a role of being "passive technicians who learn a battery of content knowledge

generally agreed upon in the field and pass it on to successive generations of students,” (p. 8), teaching should adopt a position of “postmethod pedagogy” (p. 23) which does three things. First, it means looking for an alternative to methodologies by looking at “bottom-up” alternatives that put the student first, and “refigure the relationship between the theorizer and the practitioner of language teaching” (pp. 32-33). Secondly, it works to give teachers autonomy. Finally, it “focuses on how classroom learning can be shaped and reshaped by teachers as a result of self-observation, self-analysis, and self-evaluation” (p.33). By undermining the supposed hegemony of the textbook and learning materials in the classroom, Thornbury and Kuramavadivelu argue, language learning can be better oriented towards the needs of the people who make the learning happen: the learners, whose needs drive the focus of the class, and the teachers who help the learners, who are not needlessly bound to materials which are not responsive, flexible or real enough to provide the input and guidance that makes significant learning happen.

Research Question 2: How do teachers make the decisions they do when it comes to materials, resources, and making their own materials?

Control, being controlled, and constraints

Successful teaching does not rely solely on the availability of materials, resources and internet access. Other factors can test how well teachers are able to do their jobs. As respondent Robin reported, there can be teaching contexts in which teachers are not provided with the tools and materials they need to do their jobs. While one hopes that the situation Robin describes is not normally the process that private or public educational institutions follow when assigning materials for teachers to use, it does demonstrate the degree to which schools and academies can make decisions that influence the way teachers do their jobs, and may be an indication of how the teachers are perceived of as a resource, in turn. It also provides an interesting meeting point

with Woods' (1996) concept of "knowledge" in the BAK model, and "institutional control", which arose from the one of the two methods of coding that were applied to the respondents' interview data. Although it is beyond the scope of this research to ascertain why, exactly, a school could justify not giving one of its teachers access to its library, we see here that Robin met the challenge of being denied access to pedagogical materials with her own knowledge. Her previous experience with teaching English to young adults, combined with her understanding of how teaching materials can be designed, what Woods would have referred to as "knowledge", seemed to have helped her in this situation.

Robin's understanding of how her personal choices functioned within the wider educational context of the institution she was working for can also be reflected upon using the theory of Leung (2009, cited in Liu & Berger, 2015). Leung has proposed that attitudes and actions related to professionalism in second language teaching may fall under two different categories: sponsored and independent second language teacher professionalism. *Sponsored* second language teacher professionalism, where frameworks and demands external to the teacher are imposed on the teacher by the keepers of the institutional framework, and used to make those external demands explicitly known. In contrast, the area of *independent* second language teacher professionalism brings the focus of professionalism through the viewpoint of the teacher, when, as Liu and Berger (2015) say, the individual teacher "reflects critically on her own beliefs and on the regulatory requirements handed down to her before making principled decisions that reflect her individual values and the social, political and pedagogical impact of her actions" (p.38). This second conception of language teacher professionalism, Liu and Berger argue, is the aspect that keeps teachers from being "mere implementers of teaching techniques prescribed by researchers" (PAGE?); and it is also the viewpoint from which, arguably, teachers become better armed to

deal with the varying demands of the profession (reflected, in part, by the large variety of codes that emerged from the process coding of the interview data). This, Leung (2013) argues in a later paper, forms a significant work the language teaching profession as a whole, since language teachers simultaneously draw on the knowledge from a number of fields when they teach, including branches of applied linguistics, formal linguistics, functional linguistics, sociolinguistics, (psychological and social) theories of knowing and learning, as well as literary studies concerned with genre, rhetoric and stylistics” (p. 15). In much the same way that Woods argued that beliefs, assumptions and knowledge were intertwining, interactive aspects of teacher cognition that often overlapped, and both of Borg’s model (2003 and 2006) illustrate that while certain tendencies may be more predominant but never isolated from other tendencies, Leung (2013) reminds us that “collective professional experience suggests that teachers tend to adopt strategies and techniques that are likely to work in practice” (p. 17) and that being professional means being able to understand and respond to a number of demands from a wide variety of stakeholders, not all of whom may have the teachers’ best interests in mind. Not only does this mean that teachers need to have or gain insight on how to maximize the effects of textbooks, materials and resources with their students, they also need to understand how to balance the possibilities of the textbooks with the needs of the students, and the exigencies of the educational frameworks in which both teachers and learning materials are employed.

Is the war chest predicated on teacher control or institutional need?

The teachers who took part in this research indicated that, either physically or mentally, they maintained a “war chest” that helped them bridge short-term gaps or needs in the language classroom. One question that arises when looking at the issues of the war chest is the extent to which teachers consciously or unconsciously limit what is included in the war chest, and what

keeps them from seeking out new sources. We have seen, in the interview data, that when respondents talked about their war chests, none retained everything that had been previously used in class; there was some discretion shown about the criteria by which teachers decided what would be kept, especially if exercises had not been successful in the past. The contexts of the war chest met the issues of control in that teachers also did not generally consider their *students* to be part of the war chest, either, even though their students might have had considerable experience learning languages themselves, or possessed solid knowledge of certain areas of grammar and vocabulary that could have potentially been useful for both the teacher and their classmates. The sole exception to this was Kris, who reported having a series of exercises and activities which put the responsibility for creating content on the students. The respondents who took part in this study indicated that, for the most part, their war chests were an internal library of experiences and ideas, but in many cases it was only internal. Furthermore, only one respondent implied that consulting other teachers she worked with formed part of the arsenal of her war chest. There may be several reasons for this. Little (1990) argues that one of the problems that teachers (of all subjects, not just ESL or EFL) face is that they remain behind the classroom door because they can be certain of controlling the work that goes on in that domain. Teachers, in essence, choose to close themselves off to others in the school not only because they can control what happens in the classroom and the kinds of learning that takes place, but also to establish a wall that stops anything that could hamper learning from taking place too.

Additionally, most of the respondents reported that their decision-making was dictated by their knowledge of contextual and pedagogical realities that were key to the kinds of employment situations they found themselves in. Lee, who taught at a private language academy

for sailors in the Chinese merchant marine, located in northern China, spoke about the degree of control that he had to work under:

Interviewer: So in a typical year, how many English textbooks would you use?

Lee: Two.

Interviewer: Just two? No supplementary books or anything like that?

Lee: No supplementary books, but I always go to the Internet and find proper learning materials for the students.

Interviewer: But you had to finish the book. There was no choice.

Lee: It was mandatory. I didn't have the freedom to choose the textbook that I wanted.

In a later part of the interview, Lee also mentioned that, had he not used the books that had been chosen by the authorities, it could have meant disciplinary action, or even dismissal:

Lee: Yes, but I wouldn't use the whole textbook from that [language school]. I'd only use several exercises or several contexts from these textbooks because otherwise, my supervisors would know that I am not using the assigned textbooks.

Interviewer: And then what would happen?

Lee: They would not be happy, depends on their mood, right? Maybe they wouldn't pay me or maybe I'd get fired. It's all about discipline, and when it comes to discipline, it's everything.

Lest this seem like an intercultural anomaly of English-teaching in China, Carley shared a similar fear about her Canadian employment situation. As a contract instructor at a community college in eastern Canada, Carley (and her colleagues, Tracey and Shaun) were expected to teach to a pre-established curriculum created by one of the senior, full-time teachers employed by the college. Carley indicated that she felt that her status as a part-time, contract instructor precluded any rights that she had to demand specific materials, or suggest additions to the materials and

resources available to the teacher (note the use of mitigating auxiliary verbs like *might* and *could*, which indicate the hesitation):

Carley: If I wanted [materials] that they didn't have? I would probably talk to the program coordinator and see if there was something that could be done. If they refused to provide the resource, I might run an idea past them of how I could get around it, what I might do differently in the class. In my case, it's a little bit touch and go if the person refused – I don't know if I would be strong-willed enough in terms of getting a future contract or losing my job to really say, "Well, this is ridiculous! I need this piece of material!"

On the one hand, it is easy to understand why, for budgetary reasons, language teaching institutions may not want their teachers to have free rein over buying pedagogical materials and resources. At the same time, Carley is an experienced teacher. At the time of the writing of this thesis, she had just completed an M.A. with a focus in second language acquisition. Most importantly, she is the person working with the students on a day-to-day basis, which would seemingly place her in the ideal position to evaluate how well the materials and resources are helping students meet the pedagogical goals which have been set out by the institution, and to suggest pedagogically sound alternatives if the materials being currently used are not satisfactory or effective. Why, then, would an experienced, educated teacher feel that making suggestions, especially suggestions that would improve teaching practice and possibly result in better student outcomes, might cause her to lose her job?

This kind of subtle and not-so-subtle threat, used to limit the kinds of action people take in accordance with where their position lies within an organization, is what Graeber (2012, 2015) has called "structural violence" (borrowing the term from Norwegian philosopher Johan Galtung). Graeber (2012) argues that structural violence is, to one extent or another, a key factor in making any bureaucracy work because it coerces the participants within a system to

participate, sometimes against their will, and sometimes when participants knew that what was being asked of them was wrong.

Galtung felt the term “exploitation” was too loaded, owing to its identification with Marxism, and proposed as an alternative “structural violence”—i.e., any institutional arrangement that, by its very operation, regularly causes physical or psychological harm to a certain portion of the population, *or imposes limits on their freedom* (emphasis mine). Structural violence could thus be distinguished from both “personal violence” (violence by an identifiable human agent) and “cultural violence” (those beliefs and assumptions about the world that justify the infliction of harm) (p. 113).

Anyone who participates in any kind of social situation, especially those related to work, understands that there are certain procedures that must be followed in order to keep the structure functioning, and, as with other forms of social organization, penalties ensue for those who break the norms. The difference between structural violence and structures *of* violence (such as open warfare), Graeber argues, is that the violence takes place in the form of non-action, or even boredom: doing nothing can cause just as much harm as taking anger out on someone. You don’t punish someone by doing something *to* them; you punish them by doing *nothing* to them, and making sure that everyone else acts in the same way towards the individual being punished.

Most acts of terrorism are also...acts of terrorism. But I would also insist that focusing on these most dramatic aspects of violence makes it easy to ignore the fact that *one of the salient features of violence, and of situations that it creates, is that it is very boring* (emphasis mine). In American prisons, which are extraordinary violent places, the most vicious form of punishment is simply to lock a person in an empty room with absolutely nothing to do. This emptying of any possibility of communication or meaning is the real essence of what violence really is and does. Yes, sending someone into solitary is a way of sending a message to them, and to other prisoners. But the act consists largely of stifling out the possibility of sending any further messages of any kind. (Graeber, 2015, p. 102).

Argyris (1992) argued that this kind of conflict is not new within organizations of any sort, nor will it disappear any time soon:

Built into any organization is the age-old dilemma of autonomy versus control...The point is not to get rid of the dilemma. That will never occur... The point is how to deal with it effectively (p. 41).

The issue of institutional control and teacher control, which arose in the descriptive coding of the interview data, also gives rise to questions of how teachers relate to one another within their relative teaching environments. Although the questionnaire did not contain questions that expressly asked about how teachers related to their coworkers (if they had any: Rosa, for example, was the sole instructor within her organization), many of the respondents' answers to questionnaire and interview questions regarding the sharing of materials provided insight into the kinds of environments in which they work, and some hints at how teachers are employed and perceived within their educational organizations. One example of this is the interview question that asks respondents about how often they exchange materials with other teachers they worked with. Only one of the respondents (Andrea) indicated that the institution she works for has a feature in its online learning management system that allows teachers to upload and share materials. Exchanging materials and ideas indicates a certain level of trust and of interaction among teachers, and could potentially be a labour-saving device for instructional staff, especially if the institution that they work for has a system in place that allows teachers to share what they have previously created. Some respondents reported that informal exchange systems existed within their institutions; but, like the war chest, use of these exchange systems were prompted by immediate, time-sensitive needs arising out of classes, not as a key feature of extended planning by the respondents.

I work with some fabulous colleagues, they're around to brainstorm ideas off of, sometimes they've taught a course before that I'm teaching for the first time and they'll have an activity that they've used that is really helpful and useful and sometimes I've taught a course that somebody else hasn't taught yet, and they're teaching for the first time and I might have something of use to them,

and there's a lot of collaboration and discussion around different ideas.
(Andrea)

With this group of respondents, the types of environments in which teachers taught seemed to play a role in how the informal exchange of materials and exercises was conducted. Respondents who taught in online environments did not speak of exchanging materials, perhaps because they had so little interaction with anyone who was not a student. Respondents who had worked in larger teams of teachers, whose working environments helped them congregate and have face-to-face contact with each other, were able to use each other's knowledge as a complement to their own war chests:

In Colombia we had a very open, very collaborative environment, and I'm not sure if that was a cultural thing versus an institutional thing, but teachers were very on board with trying to help – they had a system where they had these folders for every class, and people would go by and put photocopies in the folder, but it was very much word-of-mouth – mostly word of mouth, asking if people had something for X or Y, what have you used.. I think that what facilitated that more than anything was having a teacher's room that was very, very large, had computers that worked, and enough of them, and each teacher was given a locker, and inside the locker people always had folders, different activities that they'd done, and now that I think of it, that really facilitated it because if you asked somebody, "What did you do for Course 4?" and they'd say, "Oh, I did this but it's on my e-mail, I'll e-mail it to you later," it's not going to be as easy as someone reaching inside their locker and giving it to you in your hand that you can photocopy or create a PDF, or whatever. (Danny)

The lack of a formal, centrally-located system, such as a library or database that teachers can use to exchange exercises, ideas and techniques might simply be an oversight on the part of the school's administration. In cases where teachers are not physically present within the school environment (for example, for teachers whose online teaching allows them to work from home), that isolation runs the risk of creating silos of knowledge and experience, as Little (1990) describes, which means have fewer opportunities to learn from their co-workers, especially from more experienced teachers, who can possibly help them out. It may also be a sign that teachers,

even those who are not self-employed, have to become educational entrepreneurs of a sort, taking initiative to create solutions of their own for their “clients” (i.e., the students), using self-made materials as a kind of made-to-measure product that does not typically get shared with other groups of students, and which the teacher feels imposed on to prepare, because neither the school administration, nor the textbook being used, can be counted on to provide adequate help for the teacher and/or the student(s). Finally, as Little (1990) argues, the lack of interaction and exchanging of materials between teachers may be the biggest sign that teachers simply do not perceive themselves as belonging to a larger system of learning:

My basic argument here is that teachers’ main motivation and reward for involvement with one another will be found in the work of teaching. This is not to say that teachers do not have other motives for seeking one another out, but to argue that they are unlikely to sustain a pattern of significant out-of-classroom involvement in the absence of interdependent work-related interests. To the extent that teachers find themselves truly dependent on one another to manage the tasks and reap the rewards of teaching, joint participation will be worth the investment of time and other resources. To the extent that teachers’ success and satisfaction can be achieved independently, the motivations to participate are weakened. At one extreme, teachers conduct their work as fully as independent entrepreneurs (Little, 1990, p. 523).

The language teacher as behavioral economist

Finally, when looking at the responses provided in the interviews, one thing that stands out is the degree to which teachers are having to make decisions about how to best invest time, money, attention and effort in order to make learning happen. In the questionnaire, the respondents almost universally agreed that textbooks saved them time and trouble when it came to preparing classes; and during the interviews, respondents also talked about how textbooks saved them time. Even in cases where respondents had to work with textbooks that were pre-chosen for use, respondents acknowledged that the work they had to do to prepare was far less than if they had had to create everything from scratch. When asked about the amount of money

that they were willing to spend on textbooks, none of the respondents said that they would spend whatever amount of money needed to get the job done; the internet, for many, became the place they would go to find something if they could not get what they needed for a class or group.

On the surface of it, this may not seem like the most rational way to react. If someone higher up in management establishes a set course of study for the students to follow, yet hires a teacher to teach that course, why should the teacher take it upon him or herself to go the extra mile and break away from a set textbook and curriculum, creating more exercises and activities to use in addition to what's already been set out, thereby creating more work for him or herself? Another potential question might be: why would a teacher who claims to have the students' best interests at heart opt for downloading an exercise from the internet, rather than spending hours on crafting an exercise which can then be used again with a similar group in the future? Are the teachers not being totally honest about how much work they actually want to do? Or are they trying to find a solution within the confines of time and energy that they have?

Few people would argue that there are no incentives for teachers of English *not* to work: teachers get paid and teachers get to do work that they enjoy. However, traditional economic models that only examine the push-and-pull of supply and demand fail to take into account that there are other factors that could influence the willingness to supply, or the arbitrary nature of demand. Teachers who do not spend hours creating made-to-measure exercises or learning solutions are not necessarily depriving their students of learning: rather, a lot of the time, those teachers are doing the best they can with the limits they have with their time, attention, and energy. In short, the respondents are *satisficing* (a portmanteau combining the verbs *satisfy* and *suffice*), a term coined by economist Herbert Simon in the 1950s. (We have already been

introduced to the concept, as it was one of the strongest descriptive codes to emerge from the interview data.)

Simon, a professor of public administration at what was the Carnegie Institute of Technology (known today as Carnegie Mellon University), wanted to see where and to what extent psychology could be observed to influence economics, and vice-versa. These days, the heuristic of satisficing is used to contextualize many aspects of life, such as how teenagers decide how worthy a website is of their attention (Agosto, 2001), and the extent to which post-secondary students trust articles posted on the Wikipedia website (Lim & Simon, 2011). Simon's (1959?) first attempts at contextualizing the heuristic in the 1950s was meant to examine how people made decisions within the workplace. Traditional economics, Simon wrote, tended to look at things on either a macro (big picture) or micro (individual) scale, in an attempt to explain economic behavior, guide decisions at the level of public policy, or at the level of the individual consumer or business person (p.254). If one were simply working on creating large-scale economic policies, that amount of information was enough; however, looking at economics through a largely normative lens, Simon argued, invoked a certain amount of blindness regarding how human behavior influenced economic outcomes, unless that behavior cemented the foundation for big-picture outcomes. Microeconomists were more concerned about "how people *ought* to behave, not how they *do* behave", while macroeconomists were not concerned about human behavior, because they assumed all economic actors were acting in a rational manner, and that competition formed a key part of the economic actor's behavior (Simon, 1959, p.254). In many areas, such as labor economics or economic development, the complexity and instability of the environment being examined meant that economic actors could not always be counted on to act rationally, since there were so many other factors that could come into play and influence, or

even obliterate, the limits and definitions of rational action. The growth of privately-owned companies was one example cited by Simon: owners may be motivated to maximize profits, but that does not guarantee that employees share the same motivation for profit maximization, and employees might have other things that motivate them to do what they do (enjoying the job, feeling as if they're making a valuable contribution). The owner of the company might not be motivated to provide all of the information possible about what's going on to an employee, such as possible layoffs; and the employee, who knows that she may not have all the information that could help her make an informed decision to guarantee an optimal outcome, tries to make the best decision she can with what she *does* know, so that she can try to do whatever is best, most sensible, or fixes the problem or lack as quickly as possible to avoid problems in the future – because, as Simon wrote, “[w]hile the future cannot enter into the determination of the present, expectations about the future can and do” (Simon, 1959, p. 267.)

This gives us another interesting meeting point between Simon's heuristic of satisficing, the assumptions previously cited by Woods in his BAK model, and the gap cited by Borg (2015) about the issues that contextual factors that are yet to be determined, but which could still play a role in the kinds of decisions that language teachers make in the classroom. It also raises the tantalizing possibility, perhaps for future research, that the economic factors driving public-sector and private-sector language education are different enough to affect how teachers are managed and, therefore, teacher cognition.

Crookes and Arakaki (1999) stumbled upon the importance of satisficing in teacher decision-making when they set out to study where teachers get their teaching ideas from. Although they originally wanted to find out to what extent teachers were using academic journals as sources for what to do in the classroom, they quickly found out that the teachers they

interviewed were not looking for extra ideas anywhere – not in journals, not among their co-workers – simply because there was no incentive to do so. Their working conditions were less than optimal (low wages, no job stability) and, on average, they were working fifty hours per week, with no paid preparation time. Experience did not matter: though many of the teachers were experienced, they reported that they were just as disposable as the newcomers, since all of the teachers were working on casual contracts and knew that they could be replaced quite easily. This, then, answered Crookes and Arakaki's original question: teachers were not particularly interested in seeking out new teaching ideas, since doing so would have meant more work for which they would not be paid and not recognized for, and would not go towards creating a more stable work environment for them personally. Armed with what they knew about the program, their students, and their employment prospects, Crookes and Arakaki's study subjects were simply doing the best with what they had, especially since they knew that increased effort today was highly unlikely to translate into better working conditions in the future at that particular educational institution.

However, as both Crookes (1997) and Littlejohn (1992) point out, teachers are not the only ones doing the satisficing. Administrators, whose days are largely taken up by “just a minute of your time” transactions (Gronn, 1993, cited in Crookes, 1997, p. 70), have to find solutions that are good enough, too. The institutions that pre-set their curricula and chose their textbooks before the course had even started and the teachers had had a chance to meet the students and understand their needs may have done so because of the administrative pressures that they themselves were under: the need for the English teaching program to break even, or to maintain a positive reputation in the eyes of language learners interested in attending the program. Littlejohn (1992) also acknowledges that publishing houses engage in some degree of

satisficing when they set out to create new textbooks on many points, including market suitability and quality control (p. 217), a point that was previously underlined by Bell and Gower (1998), who acknowledge that it is impossible to create a textbook that will please everyone. This means that while teacher satisficing will be most evident in the decision-making in the classroom, it is hardly the sole providence of teachers alone.

Another side effect of satisficing, Crookes (1997) also points out, is a paucity of energy and/or interest in developing a career path available to ESL and EFL teachers within the profession, aside from possibly moving up into the role of program director or senior teacher, without the corresponding training or experience in management or team leadership. That not only runs the risk of putting people in positions of responsibility when they are still learning how to be managers (“playing at management”, as Mintzberg, 2004, calls it), it not only presents a risk of further fomenting the silo mentality cited by Little (1990); it curtails effective knowledge transfer between more experienced teachers and newcomers to the profession because becoming a manager solely on the basis of experience does not guarantee that managers can distill their knowledge and experience into a workable format for staff, so that best practices are continued. It also means that human resources knowledge and (techniques) that are used in other kinds of learning environments, and other kinds of companies, may not be used in the most productive manner, if they’re used at all:

However, throughout most of even those countries which have well-developed infrastructures and devote a respectable part of their national budget to education, schools (and language departments) are generally not seen as sites of knowledge creation; they are not learning organizations...and teachers are not supported in professional development activities that will truly result in professional development (Crookes, 1997, p. 71.)

Satisficing, however, is not necessarily a bad thing: it might be a way of resolving one’s aspirations and wish to do an excellent job with the reality that no one can all do the work that he

or she dreams of doing, to the extent that it could be done in a perfect world. Brunsson (1993) argues that our capacity for thinking of all the things that we would like to do will always be more ample than the time and resources we have to make those things a reality:

...broadly speaking some of the main reasons for things being said but not done are economic; they are associated with limitations in knowledge, resources and opportunities for control. A limited supply of these factors makes it difficult to move from an idea to action. By creating a specific arena for discussion which is disengaged from action, we encourage ideas of little feasibility; room is provided for plenty of wishes, ambitions, visions and contradictory ideas, all of which are difficult to convert into action (p. 491.)

Research Question 3: Does the teaching context (teaching English as a Second Language, versus teaching English as a Foreign Language) affect teachers' perceptions of materials and resources

If ESL vs. EFL isn't a factor, what might be?

The results generated by this research did not succeed in showing that teaching context (teaching EFL compared to teaching ESL) played a noteworthy role in the way that teachers of English thought about, and made decisions regarding textbooks, resources and making their own materials. However, the results of the research did hint at one other contextual factor that might have a greater influence in the way teachers of English made the decisions that they did, and that is the issue of employment contexts. Teachers working in secondary or post-secondary environments may have better institutional frameworks for obtaining materials, sharing activities and knowledge, but have more issues of control, an issue that arose in the descriptive coding of the interview data. Other research conducted in the past (Crookes & Arakaki, 1999; McGrath, 2012; Richards, 1993; Valeo & Faez, 2014) has examined how employment contexts, and issues surrounding employment, may influence the way teachers go about making decisions.

Professionalism vs. issues of control

The ideas which emerged through the coding of the interview revealed that issues of control, both in terms of the teachers exercising control within the classroom and the control that teachers are submitted to as employees, played a role in the way that teachers made decisions. While the classroom ramifications have been examined, it is worth examining what this means in terms of teachers as part of the larger social system which is the educational context. Breshears (2004) starts her reflection on the nature of professionalism and professionalization in ESL teacher with an anecdote about delivering a speech at a conference where the presenter referred to ESL teachers as “the lowest of the low” in terms of working conditions. While none of the respondents in this study made a direct allusion to the status of English language teachers within their communities, their comments about lack of responsibility for determining curriculum or not being paid adequately for preparation time is worth examining within the larger context of what it means to be a teacher, generally, and specifically an ESL teacher.

Professionalism and professionalization, Breshears (2004) writes, are related social constructions which describe attitudes that are validated internally (in the case of professionalism) and externally (for professionalization) for how work and jobs are held in esteem, either by the individual himself, or by the group that the individual works for. Working conditions, she argues, form part of the cycle that can prevent fields of work from being professionalized:

...there seems to be a cycle of interaction...poor working conditions and low pay hinder good professionalism, which in turn hinders the professionalization process, and as a result a lack of professional status prevents the procurement of good materials benefits. The cycle repeats from here. Viewed in this way, it appears unreasonable to expect teachers simply to start becoming professional when outside forces determine their positions (Breshears, 2004, p. 25).

Grimmett and Crehan (1992) argue that the push for professionalism in the teaching profession as a whole (and, to a certain extent, within language teaching too) has affected the way that cultures are created within educational institutions (p. 58). The creation of school culture, which can be supported by cultures and sub-cultures among teachers, also fosters the creation of priorities within schools and while schools may wish to foster a culture of professionalism among the teachers, the existence of cultures within schools does not guarantee that that will happen simply because the links and cultures may be weak (Grimmett & Crehan, 1992, p. 59). A language learning organization can become a “cellular organization”, where teachers are reluctant to “intrude” on one another’s turf because the teaching culture has not been contextualized as being one that encourages and rewards sharing and openness:

In other words, teacher autonomy is not regarded as something to be exercised in a context of ‘rich professional dialogue about a plethora of challenging educational alternatives... rather, it is seen as a surrogate for teacher seclusion and secrecy. This preference for privacy over responsible autonomy breeds norms of reticence and isolationism. When teachers are reticent to provide feedback to one another and prefer to act as ‘gatekeepers’ to their isolated ‘kingdoms’ rather than as professional colleagues, the prospects for positive educational change are reduced (Grimmett & Crehan, cited in Fullan & Hargreaves, 1992, p. 62)

Thus, the war chest becomes a double-edged sword. While a war chest may help teachers deal with issues in the short term, it may end up providing them with a false sense of security, and a dislike for approaching co-workers and even students to help them find solutions for more effective learning, as if one type of self-centered knowledge prevents educators from accessing other types of wider, community-based knowledge. One interpretation of this comes from Tricot and Sweller (2013), who explain how the lack of interaction between two types of knowledge (domain-general cognitive knowledge versus domain-specific cognitive knowledge) can cause breakdowns in action. *Domain-general cognitive knowledge* is similar to the concept in biology

of primary knowledge, which is “acquired easily, unconsciously, and without explicit tuition” (such as knowing how to speak, to breathe, or to recognize faces; as per Geary, 2008 and 2012, cited in Tricot & Sweller, 2013, p. 266). Acquisition of *domain-specific cognitive knowledge* (which, like biologically secondary knowledge, is entirely dependent on the acquisition of the primary knowledge), is not possible if the person lacks the domain-specific knowledge. A person who lacks the domain-specific knowledge, such as being able to recognize peoples’ different faces, will have great difficulty applying that knowledge to domain-specific knowledge, such as being able to remember the roles that different people play in an organization. Extended to the teaching domain, this could indicate that a teacher who has domain-general cognitive knowledge (*How can I demonstrate why some regular past-tense verbs don’t have –ed as a separate syllable?*) is not the same as biologically secondary knowledge (*How do I tell my co-workers that I need an exercise for pronouncing –ed endings for regular past tense verbs, because mine aren’t working?*). Having the primary knowledge of why something is, how something works, or how something should be done is important, but it does not guarantee that the person will be able to conduct biologically secondary knowledge, and, “[s]econdary knowledge is acquired consciously, with active mental effort and facilitated by explicit instruction” (Tricot & Sweller, 2013, p. 267). This provides an interesting interpretation to Woods’ concept of knowledge within the BAK model: successful teaching may rely on a hierarchy of knowledge, where each level informs the level above it, making the function of knowledge within the domain of teacher cognition reliant on understanding that different levels of knowledge exist. As Tricot and Sweller (2013) comment, “...competence in any area requires knowledge of the problem states that can be found in an area along with the best moves associated with those states” (p. 275).

This point of view has been argued in research into the role knowledge plays in other professions. Previous research conducted in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s (e.g., Yntema & Mueser, 1960 & 1962; Piaget, 1972, Ericsson & Charness, 1994, cited in Tricot & Sweller, 2013) found that some people with extensive areas of knowledge, such as computer programmers, chess masters and air traffic controllers, do not become good at what they do thanks to domain-general knowledge alone. They become good after learning the basics, thinking about how the basics are applicable in other situations aside from the most typical ones, and then putting the pieces together to think about how the basics can be used in combination in a variety of outcomes. Also, as Ericsson (2016) points out, achieving high levels of expertise is not a matter of just doing any related sub-activity over and over again (what he refers to as “naïve practice”): expertise comes from purposeful practice that is focused, has well-defined goals, involves feedback, and “requires getting out of one’s comfort zone” (pp. 14-17).

The basic expert-novice result, that experts’ knowledge is represented at a “deep” level (however one characterizes “deep”) while novices’ knowledge is represented at a more concrete level, has been replicated in many domains, ranging from knowledge possessed by scientists to taxi drivers (Chi, 1993, cited in Tricot & Sweller, 2013, p. 267). Although the goal of this research was not to find a connection between teacher cognition and levels of education in experienced teachers (whether that be in teacher certification programs or through ongoing professional development), it might be one reason why the teachers who took part in this study, 62% of whom (regardless of them teaching in the ESL/EFL contexts) had been teaching for five years or more, reported being able to access and use the war chest. Teachers who are more experienced may, by virtue of having more time in the classroom, have more domain-specific knowledge, observation, exposure to previously-used materials, and an understanding of how to

apply areas of knowledge, such as grammar or study skills, among different teaching contexts (especially if they have used textbooks for a while and understand how something like production exercises are set out and executed in textbooks).

Taken to extremes, when teaching is standardized to the point where little to no creativity is required from the teacher because all of the decisions have been made beforehand, one could understand why teachers would choose to “silo” themselves from others in their educational environments if it means maintaining some kind of autonomy over and pride in the work that they do. Apple and Jungck (1990) point to two consequences of deskilling (a term first coined by Shannon, 1987, to describe the ways in which commercial materials ran the risk of supplanting the knowledge of teachers to impart reading skills to students). The first consequence is that the conception of teaching becomes divorced from the execution of teaching, whereby the person doing the job loses sight of the whole process and loses control over the work being performed because an outside party has greater control over planning and what happens inside the classroom. Next, Apple and Jungck (1990) argue, the employees lose control over their labor and the skills that they have built up over their professional trajectories start to atrophy, which makes it easier for management to control the job because the skills and planning that a worker needs to do the job are no longer available (p. 230). Richards (1993) points out two specific downsides to deskilling in the language classroom: a reduction in the teacher’s role in the classroom (where teaching becomes an activity stream that is pre-programmed by others, and “the teacher’s role is trivialized and marginalized to that of little more than a technician”), resulting in a reduction in the quality of teachers’ decision-making and pedagogical skills (pp. 230-231). For the language teacher, this could potentially mean that there is a risk that a study plan or syllabus which must be followed to the letter could deprive the teacher of the flexibility to deviate from the plan, even

if doing so could address problems that keep the learner(s) from making progress. It could also send a message that the institution or educational authority considers the experience and knowledge of the teacher to be inferior from whatever knowledge is encoded in the learning materials. Situations such as these might support the argument that a teacher's war chest, no matter how robust, cannot offset the influence of other issues that lie within the boundaries of Borg's (2006) "contextual factors", and that the working environment must be considered as one of those contextual factors. Valeo and Faez (2014), in their exploration of ELT teacher attrition in the province of Ontario, cite various pieces of research (e.g., Borman & Dowling, 2008; Breshears, 2004; Maley, 1992) that have examined how working conditions and the kinds of employment contexts in which teachers are employed affect teachers' long-term dedication to the teaching profession. Valeo and Faez (2014) found that even if ESL teachers who took part in their study were "well-educated, second-career professionals" (p. 14), those teachers were also working in an employment context with high turnover, had more than one job at a time due to a lack of stable, full-time positions, and "continuous change and movement from one position to another creates a constant state of 'under-employment', which is difficult to document but eventually promotes attrition" (ibid, pp. 14-15).

This deskilling is, arguably, what happened to Robin, Tracey, Carley, Shaun and Alex. With class content pre-established at such a comprehensive level by someone with whom they had no contact, the four respondents are no longer teaching so much as they are trying to make learning happen for the students, removing the responsibility for learning from the teachers' hands. Responsibility for making learning happen for the students has been taken from them. To make matters worse, both Tracey and Carley expressed concern that if they spoke up to try to gain control over their classes and better serve their students, their professional futures could be

put in jeopardy. In the end, the ability of both the teachers and the institutions to provide feedback is severely hampered, and may possibly have an effect on the learning experiences of the students. Conversely, Kris and Robbie are employed in educational contexts where they can actively fight against de-skilling: neither of them has been obligated to use a specific textbook in the classroom, and both of them (like the teachers who took part in the Woods study), are engaged in continual re-assessment, planning, evaluating and judging, to achieve better student outcomes.

It could also be argued that learning how to use a textbook is, in and of itself, a skill, one that has been made easier by the standardization of the way information is presented in ESL/EFL textbooks. As Bierman, Massey and Manduca (2006) write, "...the textbook in whatever form is only part of the equation for positive change, faculty and student acceptance of any new learning paradigm is critical" (p. 307); or, as Edge and Wharton (1998) argue, "If we are living in the materials world, we must speak materials" (p. 300). Kris pointed out that, *in theory*, publishers may want to have books that are different from what's already on the market but may not want to take on the financial risk implicit in designing something that's different from what's been published before. Kris shared a story of being hired to write a textbook, only to find that what the publisher wanted was not innovation:

Kris: Here's a story, because I actually got to write a textbook, a course book, in about 2007. I co-wrote a book for a European publisher. And there were three of us that were supposed to work together. It turned out that there were only two in the end that worked on this particular course book, and they got us together, they flew us over, we had a meeting and we had all these ideas and the publishers just kept shaking their heads, the editors, and said, No, no, no...we can't have anything new. They said, the course book's got to be the same, but different. And the example used was a book, you may know it, it's called *Innovations*.

Interviewer: Oh, I don't know that one.

Kris: Oh, yeah – it's a great book. It came out...God, I don't know...maybe around 2000? Hugh Dellar wrote it, who is basically a disciple of Michael Lewis, and it was very much implementing the lexical approach, it was radically different. It's a great book – you can't find it in North America, you can probably order it and have it shipped from England...and it was by one of the major publishers, I can't remember...Oxford or Cambridge, I can't remember which one...and they were very excited about it, and it was the latest methodology, very different from anything out there, and apparently, teachers took one look at it and said, *"I don't know how to use this, this is not what I'm used to, where's my 'activate schemata' and my comprehension questions and my gap-fill exercises?"* So teachers complained because it was like learning to teach all over again for them, and this is what the publishers said. So the schools stopped ordering them because the teachers were complaining that it was too much work to learn how to use how to use this radically different book. And the book didn't sell very well. So the publishers, according to this particular publisher, the publisher said that they don't want to take that chance again. They want something that's the same, but different.

To summarize, this study aimed to learn more about the opinions of teachers of English regarding textbooks, materials and resources, and why teachers decide to create and use materials of their own. It also sought to learn more about how teachers make the decisions they do about what to use in the classroom, and if there was a noticeable difference between teachers who identify as being teachers English as a Foreign Language and English as a Second Language. While no discernable difference was observed in terms of the EFL/ESL dichotomy, contextual factors such as issues of control (both the control that teachers find themselves subjected to within the organizations where they teach, and the control which they exercise in planning, organizing and running classes), balancing the various demands on their time, influence and productive capacity within organizations, do play a role in the cognitions of the teachers of English who took part in this research. This research may potentially have effects in the way that teachers, administrators and materials writers approach textbooks and the overall learning experience for all stakeholders. Teachers, for example, may wish to reflect on how they use textbooks, and approach the way they create their own materials for classroom use by

learning from the limitations that professional materials writers find themselves under.

Administrators and directors of study working in language training programs may wish to get their teachers and instructors more involved in the selection of materials, and encourage means by which everyone in the institution shares tasks, ideas and lesson plans. Students may be encouraged to approach the learning materials that are used in the classroom in a more critical manner – not by complaining about the price of the book or that the book is not engaging them, but in a way that encourages them to look beyond the pages of the textbook to round out their own knowledge. Finally, both professional and aspiring materials writers may find it more rewarding, both professionally and economically, by exploring alternatives to traditional textbook publishing, (such as developing online learning solutions like mobile applications, or investigating new models for developing and selling their work). Harkening back to the 1984 model that was proposed by Clark and Peterson, we see that, for progress to take place, the teacher may be central to the process, and it may be the teacher's decisions that help the class move ahead, but under no circumstances is the teacher working entirely on his or her own. It may be, then, that the models that were proposed by Borg in 2003 and 2006 need to be remodeled in order to better demonstrate how many, and to what extent, contextual factors vary, and how there can be relationships between those contextual factors, themselves. The possibility also exists that, if models of teacher cognition are elaborated based solely on the research that has been done to date, other issues that have yet to be identified, or which had already been assigned to another part of the model (such as foreign language anxiety or culture) may not be recognized as having aspects which involve contextual factors, too (such as the role that culture plays in delivering oral corrective feedback in language learning environments).

Conclusion

Teaching, by its nature, is social. Even if the teaching situation is a one-on-one activity, there is some kind of social interaction taking place, and that interaction can be altered or influenced by a number of factors, not all of which are immediately obvious to the observer. Woods reminds us that learners might be responsible for deciding when and where to study, if and how often to interact with native speakers, what materials they can use and give importance to, but students also frequently engage the help of teachers and educational bodies to “aid in the management” of learning. One of the resulting issues of that social nature is that teaching also largely takes place in hierarchies of one sort or another, which come complete with sets of responsibilities that must be met, both towards the students and towards the administrative structure that makes teaching possible. The classroom is not hermetically sealed off from what goes on in the lives of everyone in a learning environment, and especially not that of the teacher. Having a clearer understanding of how those contextual factors influence what teachers do, in turn, may give us insight into factors affecting teachers of languages and what it means to be a language teacher, not just inside the class, but globally.

Limitations of the research

This study has a number of limitations, not least of which is the relatively low number of respondents who contributed to the data. While thirteen respondents did take part, which is a larger pool of respondents than most studies into teacher cognition have, a larger group of respondents might have produced much richer data. Although the aim was to recruit twenty participants in total (ten who identified themselves as ESL teachers, and 10 EFL teachers), a relatively short data collection period (ten weeks, at the end of the year) seems to have limited the reach of the internet-based recruitment process. Future researchers may wish to extend the

data collection period, especially if using word-of-mouth among potential participants.

Similarly, while social media was extremely useful for the purposes of this research, it still has the same limitations that traditional recruitments methods suffer from: letting people know about research is not the same as getting them to take part. This, in turn, means that recruitment to and participation of people in this study was essentially limited to people who had computers and access to the internet, also limiting the generalizability of these results.

Additionally, having a data collection period that took place over such a short period of time precluded the possibility of conducting longitudinal research. To date, little research that has been done has taken a protracted view of how and why language teacher cognitions change over the course of a teacher's career. Researchers wishing to explore this topic might find richer data and more nuanced reflections by engaging in long-term research, especially by following the careers of pre-service teachers. This would be especially useful for those researchers who want to learn more about why teachers choose the English-language teaching profession, how long they stay in the job, and what prompts them to move onto other careers, if, as Valeo and Faez (2014) found, teachers decided to leave the profession and choose not to teach long-term. Not only would learning these things help reduce turnover in the profession, it might better arm pre-service teachers with professional knowledge that would keep them in the profession longer and provide school administrators with more insight about how to motivate and retain their teaching staff.

While using internet tools provided the opportunity to expand the recruitment of respondents to this research, it also prevented the ability to directly observe how the teachers interacted with their students in their classrooms or online learning environments. This was one huge advantage that Woods (1996) had: by working and studying in the same university as his

respondents did, he had a much better grasp of the kinds of realities his research subjects lived with – institutional demands, the employment conditions under which the instructors were working (including the kinds of materials and resources they had at their disposal). Case study of this sort is extremely time-consuming, and its intensive nature in terms of time and resources needed to carry out the research, favors working with small, pre-formed groups of teachers who are already working together, rather than extending geographical reach to include teachers working in schools and language teaching companies around the world. That said, if a researcher (or group of researchers) who is able to put together the resources to carry out such research, a project of this nature would provide even richer information and detail that could shed even more light on the connection between learning materials, resources, and how teachers decide to use them.

Finally, the world of economics and the world of language teaching have very rarely crossed, with the notable exception of the work of Grin (1995, 2001, and 2010) , who has examined this crossroads from the viewpoint of language learners, including the intersectionality of language policies and economic factors (2010), how much learning having a mastery of English can affect a person's earning potential (2001) and the economics of foreign language mastery in Switzerland (1995). Relatively little is known, however, about the economics of teaching languages from the viewpoints of teachers, and though several respondents hinted in their interviews that part of the satisficing they did involved a rough estimate of effort compared to wages, it was beyond the purview of this study to explore how compensation affects the way teacher decide to allot their time, planning, and attention.

Future research directions

One potentially interesting field of study, especially for those interested in critical discourse analysis, would be to examine textbooks from the last few decades and analyze what specific issues provoke distrust and annoyance among teachers. While most of the respondents in this research accepted that textbooks did serve a purpose in the English language classroom, several of them did have a significant aversion to the concept of textbooks as a whole, and one respondent (Shaun) was not shy about using the word “hate” to describe how she felt about a book that she had been assigned to use in the classroom. Was that strong reaction provoked by the simple lack of a specific type of exercise, or could it be attributed to something else about the book, such as the choice of texts being used, the layout or design of the book, or something else? At first glance, this matter would seem to be the purview of the marketing departments of the various publishing companies, and it was beyond the scope of this research to work with a specific title of book or books focusing on a specific angle of English learning, such as English for Academic Purposes or business English. However, longitudinal research could give researchers the chance to look at the long-term relationship that teachers have with the textbooks and materials, especially the point at which the textbooks, materials and resources are not included in a teacher’s war chest, and why.

As previously mentioned, expanding research of this sort into longitudinal studies that take place over longer periods of time would also provide greater insight into how teachers promote the use of mobile technologies in classroom use, and if how many of the textbook features technology is able to replace, or maybe even do better, such as grammar practice. These technologies already exist: mobile phone and tablet apps such as Babbel and Duolingo offer users the chance to ascertain their levels of grammar knowledge and work on grammar,

pronunciation and vocabulary exercises while gamifying the experience and introducing an element of fun. They can also be programmed to offer the user the chance to personalize the frequency and intensity of the practice sessions, and use social media platforms like Twitter to actively engage learners on a regular basis (something which textbooks alone cannot do).

Conducting longitudinal research into both the effectiveness of language learning applications in long-term language uptake, as well as the evolution of the technology behind the apps, could help us learn more about when teachers decide to incorporate mobile technologies into classroom practice. It might also shed some light on how the developers of such apps capitalize on the shortcomings of textbook production (such as purchase price, time frames needed to develop exercises and activities, regional variations, and language learning for specific purposes), to make their products more appealing and more relevant to English language teaching.

All of this does little good, however, if research willingly turns a blind eye to the working conditions that teachers face, and how those working conditions influence how teachers view their employment situations and their opinions about the long-term viability of English-language teaching as a career. While this may be a task better undertaken by a labor economist or a sociologist specializing in the world of work (such as Grin, whose work examining the intersectionality of economics and language learning has previously been mentioned), understanding why people quit jobs can be more informative than knowing why they choose to enter the profession in the first place. This is especially relevant if we decide to look at the long-term viability of the profession as a whole and understand how issues like human resource management, permanent employment opportunities, compensation, and professional development motivate people to stay in the profession for more than a few years at a time.

Those who are interested in looking at the applicability of the research results in other language contexts might want to look at how these factors apply to the teaching of other languages. One promising area is with French-language learning materials used in French-language training in the Canadian civil service. Hayday (2015) extensively details how the history of incorporating institutional bilingualism with federal employees has been met with varying degrees of success. Gentil, Bigras and O'Connor (2010) found that, among the non-native French speakers that they studied, there was a distinct dichotomy that divided the eleven study subjects who took part in their study: "at the risk of oversimplifying, they can be divided into two groups: those who use French at work, and those who (mostly) do not" (p. 94). Some students and language training administrators who work with French as a Second Language students in the federal government have identified three main problems with the French-language instruction books published by the Canada School of Public Service. First, the books mostly serve as repositories for vocabulary and set phrases that are suitable for work at a particular level, but are not always an accurate reflection of the vocabulary and phrases that are actually used in the target language environment, and err on the side of being overly formal, rather than being an accurate reflection of the language that people use in a bilingual workplace. Second, most of the books for French language instruction have not been updated since the early 2000s and do not contain words and vocabulary related to much of the new technology being used in the workplace; language databases offered by the Language Portal of Canada sometimes contain these words and phrases, but the Portal is not always marketed as a useful language learning resource to learners and is rarely used outside of the civil service. Third, the books are expensive: the complete set of books contains twenty-five separate volumes, ranging from level A to level C, and cost between \$16.50 and \$19.75 each (S. Flanagan, personal correspondence).

More study is needed to identify which teachers of French as a Second Language use the books, how the books are used by teachers, the process by which the Canada School of Public Service produces updated versions of the books, and how learners perceive the effectiveness of the books as a means of reaching their aspired-to language certification levels. Being able to observe the vocabulary and functions used by francophones in bilingual environments, and comparing it to the kinds of vocabulary and functions which are encoded in the CSPA textbooks might teach us how learners perceive of the books (and, in turn, how the books are used, adapted and ignored by teachers of French), and how teachers of French choose to incorporate other resources or materials into classroom content, in order to meet the dual needs of passing the Public Service Commission's Second Language Evaluation exam, and helping non-native speakers of French gain the competency and the confidence to communicate in French with their co-workers.

The reach of textbooks upon classroom practice is and has been long, extended and influential. This thesis has taken a look at how one particular group of teachers makes decisions on what to use based on their needs both in and out of the classroom, and what factors and issues about textbooks motivate teachers to make the decisions that they do. In the future, we may see the influence of textbooks waning as other tools become popular or common. For now, it would appear that textbooks remain a constant factor in language learning environments, given that language textbook publishers have readily embraced the formats and genres of exercises and activities that help teachers, and teachers, in turn, are glad to have tools at their disposal that save them time and work. It remains to be seen how language teaching, and English language teaching, evolves as the number of options for storing, filtering and codifying knowledge expands in the next decade or so – or if teachers still choose to use textbooks, even when other alternatives are available.

References

- Apple, M. W., and Jungck, S. (1990). "You Don't Have to Be a Teacher to Teach This Unit:" Teaching, Technology, and Gender in the Classroom. *American Educational Research Journal*, 27(2), 227-251.
- Argyris, C. (1992). *On Organization Learning*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Bell, J., and Gower, R. (1998). Writing course materials for the world: A great compromise. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* 135-150. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bierman, P., Massey, C., & Manduca, C. (2006). Reconsidering the textbook. *Eos, Transactions American Geophysical Union*, 87(31), 306-307
- Bolitho, R. (1990). An Eternal Triangle? Roles for Teacher, Learners and Teaching Materials in a Communicative Approach. Downloaded from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED366183>, 11 August 2016.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in grammar teaching: A literature review. *Language Awareness*, 12(2), 96-108.
- Borg, S. (2015). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. 2nd edition. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Breshears, S. (2004). Professionalization and exclusion in ESL teaching. *TESL Canada Journal*, 22, 23-39.
- Brunsson, N. (1993). Ideas and Actions: Justification and Hypocrisy as Alternatives to Control. *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 18(6), 489-506.
- Clark, C. M., and Peterson, P. L. (1984.) *Teachers' Thought Processes*. Occasional Paper No. 72. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED251449.pdf>, 8 August 2016.

Crookes, G. (1997). What influences what and how second and foreign language teachers teach?

The Modern Language Journal, 81(1), pp. 67-79.

Crookes, G., and Arakaki, L. (1999). Teaching Idea Sources and Work Conditions in an ESL

program. *TESOL Journal*, 8(1), 15-19.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge

University Press.

Edge, J. and Wharton, S. (1998). Autonomy and development: living in the materials world. In

B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching*, pp. 295-309.

Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ericsson, K. A. (2016). *Peak: How to master almost anything*. London: Penguin.

Fang, Z. (1996). A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices. *Educational research*,

38(1), 47-65.

Garrison, D. R., & Vaughan, N. D. (2013). Institutional change and leadership associated with

blended learning innovation: Two case studies. *The internet and higher education*, 18, 24-

28.

Gentil, G., Bigras, I., & O'Connor, M. (2010). Achieving bilingualism in the Canadian federal

public workplace. In B. Meyer and B. Apfelbaum (eds.) In *Multilingualism at Work:*

From Policies to Practices in Public, Medical and Business Settings, 81-105.

Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gideon, L. (2012). The art of question phrasing. In *Handbook of survey methodology for the*

social sciences (pp. 91-107). New York: Springer.

- Graeber, D. (2012). Dead zones of the imagination: On violence, bureaucracy, and interpretive labor. The 2006 Malinowski Memorial Lecture. *HAU: journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 2(2), 105-128.
- Graeber, D. (2015). *The Utopia of rules: On technology, stupidity, and the secret joys of bureaucracy*. New York: Melville House.
- Grimmett, P. P., & Crehan, E. P. (1992). The nature of collegiality in teacher development: The case of clinical supervision. In M. Fullan & A. Hargreaves (Eds.), *Teacher development and educational change*, 56-85. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Hayday, M. (2015). *So they want us to learn French*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Johnson, C. R. (2000). *Factors influencing motivation and de-motivation in Mexican EFL teachers*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), Vancouver, March 2000.
- Kartchava, E., & Chung, S. (2015). Pre-service and in-service English as a Second Language teachers' beliefs about the use of digital technology in the classroom. *Studies in English Language Teaching*, 3(4), 355.
- Kuramavadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Leung, C. (2013). Second/additional language teacher professionalism: What is it? In M. Olofsson (Ed.), *Symposium 2012: Lärarrollen I svenska som andraspråk*.
- Little, J. W. (1990). The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in teachers' professional relations. *Teachers college record*, 91(4), 509-536.
- Littlejohn, A. (1992). *Why are English Language Teaching materials the way they are?* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Lancaster, UK.)

- Littlejohn, A. (1998). The analysis of language teaching materials: Inside the Trojan horse. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching*, 190-216. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Liu, J. & Berger, C. M. (2015). Chapter 2: TESOL as a profession. In J. Liu & C. M. Berger, *TESOL: A guide* (pp. 37-95). London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. (2012). *Research methods in second language acquisition: A practical guide*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell Publishers.
- McGrath, I. (2013). *Teaching materials and the roles of EFL/ESL teachers: Practice and theory*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Miccoli, L. (2008). Brazilian EFL teachers' experiences in public and private schools: different contexts with similar challenges. *Narratives of learning and teaching EFL*. Houndsmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 64-79.
- Mintzberg, H. (2004). *Managers, not MBAs: A hard look at the soft practice of managing and management development*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers. Kindle edition.
- Mintzberg, H. (2009). *Managing*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers. Kindle edition.
- Morse, B. (2014). When one should use the likert scale for a questionnaire and how do you interpret the data collected from such a questionnaire? (Forum question). Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/post/When_one_should_use_the_likert_scale_for_a_questionnaire_and_how_do_you_interpret_the_data_collected_from_such_a_questionnaire, 14 August 2015.

- Nayar, P. B. (1997). ESL/EFL dichotomy today: Language politics or pragmatics? *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(1), 9-37.
- Numrich, C. (1996). On becoming a language teacher: Insights from diary studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(1), 131-153.
- O'Dowd, R., (2013). Telecollaborative networks in university higher education: Overcoming barriers to integration. *Internet and Higher Education* 18, 47-53.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2013.02.001>
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of educational research*, 62(3), 307-332.
- Pennington, M. C. (1995). The teacher change cycle. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(4), 705-731.
- Richards, J. C. (1993). Beyond the text book: The role of commercial materials in language teaching. *RELC journal*, 24(1), 1-14.
- Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. London: SAGE Publishers.
- Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc. Publishers.
- Simon, H. A. (1951). A formal theory of the employment relationship. *Econometrica* 19(3), pp. 293-305.
- Simon, H. A. (1959). Theories of decision-making in economics and behavioral science. *The American economic review*, 49(3), 253-283.
- Thornbury, S. (2013). Dogme: hype, evolution or intelligent design. *The Language Teacher*, 37(4). Retrieved from <http://nebula.wsimg.com/1314c2b2a10b6b7eb1b3065ff3faf353?AccessKeyId=186A535D1BA4FC995A73&disposition=0&alloworigin=1>, 31 October 2016.

- Tomlinson, B. (1998). *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.
- Tomlinson, B. (2011). *Applied linguistics and materials development*. New York: Continuum.
- Tricot, A., & Sweller, J. (2013). Domain-specific knowledge and why teaching generic skills does not work. *Educational Psychology Review*, 26(2), 265-283.
- Wakefield, J. F. (1998). A Brief History of Textbooks: Where Have We Been All These Years? Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED251449.pdf>, 7 July 2016.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1997). EIL, ESL, EFL: Global issues and local interests. *World Englishes*, 16(1), 135-146.
- Winograd, K. (2003). The function of teacher emotions: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *Teachers College Record* 105(9), 1641-1673.
- Woods, D. (1996). Teacher cognition in language teaching: Beliefs, decision-making and classroom practice. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.
- Valeo, A., & Faez, F. (2014). Career development and professional attrition of novice ESL teachers of adults. *TESL Canada Journal*, 31(1), 1.

Appendix A: Online Questionnaire

Teachers and Teaching Materials/Resources: Survey

Thank you for agreeing to take part!

First of all, please take a moment to read the following information about our research: This research aims to learn more about how teachers of English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) make the decisions they do about the kinds of materials and resources they use in the classroom.

THE RESEARCH HAS TWO PARTS. The first part is this questionnaire, which should take you approximately 30 minutes to finish (depending how much you write in the open-ended questions). The second part consists of a short interview that explores the answers you provided in the questionnaire. The interview should take between fifteen and thirty minutes to complete, but will not take more than a half-hour to do. At the end of the survey, we'll ask you for your contact details (Skype, e-mail or Google Hangouts) to conduct the interview. And to thank you for your time, we'll be delighted to give you a gift certificate to Amazon.com worth US\$10.00, once the interview is done!

Before we get started...

THERE ARE JUST A FEW CONDITIONS AND POLICIES TO LET YOU KNOW ABOUT, BEFORE WE BEGIN.

- The information that you share with us via this questionnaire will be kept in strict confidence, and data from the research will be kept in a secure location for five years, after which time it will be destroyed.
- Tell us what YOU think, not what you believe someone else would want you to say! Even if you think something is negative or looks bad, it's important to be honest.
- Please try to answer all of the questions that you can. Remember that you don't have to answer the questions in the order that they are given, so if you're not sure of an answer, you can come back to it later.
- You may withdraw from the research at any time by closing the browser window.
- If you would rather complete a paper questionnaire, we can also provide downloadable PDF files of the questionnaires, but we are not able to compensate you for any associated postage costs.
- The more information we have, and the more teachers we reach, the better! We'd be extremely grateful if you would pass on this link to any other language teachers or contacts you know who may be interested in taking part in this survey.
- If you've got any questions, doubts, or concerns, or you'd like to be kept up-to-date on the results of the research, please don't hesitate to write! You can contact the team by writing to patriciaseverenuk@gmail.com.
- This project was reviewed by the Carleton University Research Ethics Board at Carleton University which provided clearance to carry out the research. Should you have questions or concerns related to your involvement in this research, please contact: Professor Louise Heslop, Chair, or Professor Andy Adler, Vice-Chair, Research Ethics Board, Carleton University, 1325

Dunton Tower, 1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6 (Phone: 613-520-2517) or by e-mail at: ethics@carleton.ca.

Consent

- ☐ I have read, and agree to, all of the conditions and policies outlined above. By clicking on this box, I hereby give my consent for my data to be used in this research project and agree to take part in both parts of the research (the questionnaire and the interview).

1.	What is your first language (or the language that you most frequently use in your private life)?
2.	Where are you currently teaching? (city/country)
3.	What is your gender? ☐ Male ☐ Female ☐ I prefer not to say.
4.	What age group are you currently in? ☐ 25 years of age or younger ☐ 26-34 years of age ☐ 35-49 years of age ☐ 50-65 years of age ☐ 65 or older
5.	How long have you been teaching English? ☐ Fewer than three years. ☐ Between three and five years. ☐ Between five and ten years. ☐ Over ten years.
6.	What <u>English teaching certification</u> did you earn? ☐ TEFL/TESL Certificate (40 hours or fewer of class, such as a weekend seminar) ☐ TEFL/TESL Certificate (>40 hours or more of class, in a private institution) ☐ CTESL (at a university) ☐ Masters degree ☐ CELTA ☐ DELTA ☐ Trinity ☐ Other: _____
7.	If you underwent certification to become a language teacher, were you instructed to use any specific teaching methodology, such as Communicative Language Teaching? ☐ Yes (please specify): ☐ No: ☐ Other: _____

8.	These days, what kinds of environments do you mostly teach in? ☐ At an academy or private language school or language instruction company/consultancy. ☐ For a government language instruction program (such as LINC). ☐ Freelancing, teaching face-to-face classes (either individual or group). ☐ Freelancing, teaching online classes. ☐ At a university (or other post-secondary institution.) ☐ Other: _____
9.	In the past six months, what has been your average teaching load? <i>(If you also do private language classes, please include them in the total.)</i> ☐ Fewer than twelve hours per week. ☐ Between twelve and twenty hours per week ☐ Over twenty hours per week.
10.	Do you teach.... (choose ONE): ☐ ESL <i>(your students need English because they're living in an English-speaking environment and need to communicate in English every day)?</i> ☐ EFL <i>(your students are learning English as a supplementary skill but do not use English to survive in their everyday lives)?</i>

Next, for each question, read the statement, and then choose the answer that best matches how you feel. Don't tell us what you think we want to hear: we're interested in your honest opinion!

Note: For our purposes, "materials" means items such as textbooks, audio CDs and DVDs supplied with textbooks, student activity books that accompany textbooks, and sheets/photocopies of exercises or activities from other sources. "Resources" refers to tools such as interactive white boards, DVD players, or mobile technologies (such as tablets) that are supplied by the schools - not the students' own.

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

<i>Statement</i>	<i>Completely disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat disagree</i>	<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat agree</i>	<i>Completely agree</i>
11. I believe that textbooks make it easier for teachers to plan classes and courses.					
12. The school/company I work for provides me with all the teaching materials I need for free.					
13. I'm the only one responsible for choosing which textbooks and learning materials I use with my classes.					
14. In addition to textbooks that are supplied to me, I buy English-language textbooks for my own use.					
15. The way that information is presented in the textbook informs the way I teach					
16. I use activities and exercises taken from more than one textbook.					
17. I have access to audio-visual equipment (such as DVD players or interactive white boards) that I can use in class.					
18. I incorporate tech-based activities (such as computer-assisted language learning or internet-based activities) into my classes at least once a month.					
19. I encourage my students to use outside materials and resources, such as dictionaries and English-language websites, when they practice English outside of class.					
20. There are materials and/or resources that I would like to use with the students I teach, but I don't have access to them.					
21. The school/company I teach for encourages students and teachers to use mobile technologies, such as smartphones, in the classroom					
22. I'd like to learn more about how to use computers and mobile technologies to facilitate language learning.					
23. I supplement textbook activities with activities or exercises that I make myself.					
24. I have re-worked or modified a textbook activity at least once in the past					

<i>Statement</i>	<i>Completely disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat disagree</i>	<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat agree</i>	<i>Completely agree</i>
year.					
25. In the past year, I have taught at least one class without using any printed material (e.g. textbook/photocopies) at all.					
26. I create new class exercises and new activities that are NOT connected to the textbook at least once a month.					
27. I supplement class activities using activities or resources (such as YouTube videos) from the Internet at least once a month.					
28. I exchange activities that I've made with other teachers I work with.					
29. I don't do any planning at all - I improvise every class that I teach.					
30. The school/company I work for actively seeks teachers' opinions about where to invest money in resources/materials.					
31. I could teach an entire course without using any materials or resources (textbooks or technology) at all.					

Question 32

Now I'd like to ask you to think back to a recent class that you taught which went well, and where you used some kind of materials and/or resources with the students.

Why did you choose to use the materials/resources that you did?

In the end, did you use all of the materials/resources that you had previously chosen? Why or why not?

FEEL FREE TO PROVIDE AS MUCH INFORMATION AS YOU'D LIKE!

Question 33

Now I'd like to ask you to think back to a recent class that you taught which DIDN'T GO WELL, and where you used some kind of materials and/or resources with the students.

Why did you choose to use the materials/resources that you did?

In the end, did you use all of the materials/resources that you had previously chosen? Why or why not?

Question 34

Are there any other ideas, opinions or thoughts that you'd like to add about materials and/or resources that were NOT addressed in the questionnaire?

Thank you for your time! As we mentioned earlier, this questionnaire is the FIRST part of the research. The second part consists of a short interview via Skype, Google Hangouts or telephone.

Contact information: How would you prefer to be reached?

- ☐ By e-mail (enter your e-mail address here): _____
- ☐ By Skype (enter your Skype user name here): _____
- ☐ Other (enter your contact details here): _____

Appendix B: Interview Guide

LEARNING MATERIALS RESEARCH **PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW GUIDE**

Patricia Dawn Severenuk
School of Applied Linguistics and Discourse Studies,
Carleton University

This guide is to be used with all participants taking part in research. It contains both the interview questions (which follow up on participant data provided in the Phase One questionnaire) and the prompts to be used to explore questions in further depth.

A copy of this form is to be used during each interview for preliminary note-taking purposes. **It should not be used as a replacement for transcriptions of the interviews.**

INTRODUCTION (TO BE RECORDED):

First of all, thank you for taking the time to speak with me today! Just a reminder that the focus of this research is to find out more about the relationship that ESL and EFL teachers have with the kinds of materials and resources they use in the classroom, and how teachers make decisions about their teaching, based on the materials and resources that they have, they make, or that they would like to have. Since relatively little research has explored how teachers of ESL (in Canada) or EFL (in other countries) think, plan and act depending on the availability of teaching materials, such as textbooks and photocopies, and resources like DVDs and technology, so we're exploring how the availability of those things affect teacher thinking.

Please try to answer all of the questions that you can, but remember you are not required to answer a question if you don't have an answer. If you don't know the answer to a question, that's fine; and if an answer comes to you as you're answering another question, you can provide that quote-unquote "missing" answer at the end of the interview.

If you'd like more information about the project, my e-mail is patriciaseverenuk@cmail.carleton.ca and my supervisor's is eva.kartchava@cmail.carleton.ca. If you have any questions or want more information about the ethics clearance that has been received for this project, you may contact Professor Louise Heslop, Chair, or Professor Andy Adler, Vice-Chair, Research Ethics Board, Carleton University, 1325 Dunton Tower, 1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6 (Phone: 613-520-2517) or by e-mail at: ethics@carleton.ca. I'll be happy to send you that information via e-mail if you would like to have it in written form.

And finally: Do you provide your consent to take part in the second part of this research? You can signal your consent by saying "I do."

(Do you have any questions about the research before we begin?)

TOPIC	QUESTION	NOTES
TEXTBOOKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which textbooks are you currently using in your classroom? • How many different titles of textbooks would you say that you use every year? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the process of choosing a textbook for a particular class. (ASK FOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN WHEN TCH CHOOSES BOOK AND WHEN BOOK IS PRE-SELECTED FOR THE CLASS.) 	
	<p>[IF RESPONDENT INDICATED S/HE BUYS TEXTBOOKS, Q.14]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How much money do you spend each academic year on buying textbooks for yourself? • How much of the material in the textbooks can you recycle year to year? • How much of the material in the textbooks can you use between types of classes (e.g. business English to TOEFL preparation?) <p>IF "SOMEWHAT AGREE" / "COMPLETELY AGREE" FOR Q.11]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In what ways does using a textbooks make teaching easier for you? [PROMPT: time management? order of items to be taught? specific vocabulary lists?] • In your opinion, what kinds of exercises and activities should be included in the textbooks you use, but aren't? <p>[CHECK FOR: balance of skills, pronunciation, etc. [IF "SOMEWHAT AGREE" / "COMPLETELY AGREE" FOR Q.23 and/or Q.28]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe how you and the teachers you work with exchange materials that you've created yourselves. <p>IF "SOMEWHAT AGREE" / "COMPLETELY AGREE" FOR Q.23 and/or Q.24]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What motivates you to create your own exercises, rather than using what the book(s) give you? • How do you know when you're able to make a better exercise than the one that's given in the book? • When you choose to create a new exercise, do you also think about how often you'll be able to use that new exercise in the future? <p>Do you create the exercise all by yourself, or engage the students' participation in creating exercises and activities?</p>	

	<p><i>[FOR ALL OTHER RESPONSES FOR Q.23 and/or Q.24]:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the issues or barriers that keep you from making your own materials or exercises for use in class? <i>[CHECK FOR: time? money? copyright issues? use textbook only? not compensated for extra work involved?]</i> • How many other teachers do you work with who feel the same way that you do? 	
--	---	--

MATERIALS AND RESOURCES (GLOBALLY)	<p>Let's go back to the issue of textbooks for a moment. You mentioned in your questionnaire that you are given (X) textbooks by the school/company you work for. Can you explain a little bit about how this system works at your school/company?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the availability of materials/resources affect the way you plan for your courses and classes? <i>[CHECK AGAINST Q.29 – to plan or not to plan, and why?]</i> • Does the same hold true for resources like DVDs or audio? • <i>[CHECK AGAINST Q. 27: use of online resources like YouTube vs. material that comes as part of a textbook set?]</i> • In your opinion, how many of those materials could be done as tech-based activities? 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does your school/company handle teacher requests for new materials or resources? • How often do you get what you ask for? • If you request materials/resource(s) for classroom use and you don't get them, what do you do? • <i>[PROBE: drop the request? improvise? obtain it from another source? Probe for stories. Correlation between this and length of time teaching?]</i> <p>You mentioned in the questionnaire that you (CHOOSE ONE: <u>do/don't</u>) get the students to use online resources to supplement classroom time:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[IF NO]: Why not?</i> <i>[IF YES:] What makes you decide if an online resource is suitable for the students or the class? In what ways do you encourage students to use these resources?</i> 	

NO USE OF MATERIALS AT ALL?	<p>You mentioned in the questionnaire that you (CHOOSE ONE: have/have not) taught a class recently without using any materials or resources at all.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>[IF AFFIRMATIVE:] Tell me about the class.</i> • What were the circumstances that led you to teach without using anything? 	
------------------------------------	--	--

NO USE OF MATERIALS AT ALL?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Is this something that you typically do? Why or why not?</i> • <i>[IF NEGATIVE:] How would your students react if you taught a class using no materials at all? Would they notice?</i> • <i>Tell me how you would react if you were told to teach a class using no materials at all. How would you prepare?</i> 	
OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS	<p>[RECAP INFORMATION PROVIDED IN THE OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS.]</p> <p><u>PROBE:</u> WHAT MAKES A CLASS (UN)SUCCESSFUL? WHAT ROLES DO MATERIALS AND RESOURCES PLAY IN THOSE? HOW MUCH WOULD TCH EXPECT THAT SAME SCENARIO TO REPEAT ITSELF IN A FUTURE CLASS, AND WOULD THAT AFFECT TCH'S CHOICE TO USE IT AGAIN?]</p>	
SUMMARY	FURTHER COMMENTS/QUESTIONS FROM RESPONDENT:	

- ☐ Can respondent be contacted in the future if any other questions arise?
- ☐ Does respondent want to be updated on research/informed of any developments?

DURATION OF INTERVIEW: _____ minutes, _____ seconds
--

OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH RESPONDENT'S INFORMATION:

- ☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ Unacceptable
☐ Interview transcribed on: _____
- ☐ File name of interview transcription: _____
- ☐ Interview data coded on: _____

Appendix C: Ethics Clearance

Carleton University
Research Ethics Office
Research Ethics Board
511 Tory, 1125 Colonel By Drive
Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6 Canada
Tel: 613-520-2517, ethics@carleton.ca

Ethics Clearance Form – New Clearance

This is to certify that the Carleton University Research Ethics Board has examined the application for ethical clearance. The REB found the research project to meet appropriate ethical standards as outlined in the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Human, 2nd edition*, and the *Carleton University Policies and Procedures for the Ethical Conduct of Research*.

Date of Clearance: November 17, 2015

Researcher: Eva Kartchava (Primary Investigator)

Patricia Severenuk (Student Research: Master's Student)

Department: Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences/Linguistics and Applied Language Studies (School of)

University: Carleton University

Research Supervisor (if applicable): Prof. Eva Kartchava

Project Number: 103748

Project Title: The Role of Materials and Resources in Teacher Cognition

Funder (if applicable): N/A

Clearance Expires: May 31, 2016

All researchers are governed by the following conditions:

Annual Status Report: You are required to submit an Annual Status Report to either renew clearance or close the file. Failure to submit the Annual Status Report will result in the immediate suspension of the project. Funded projects will have accounts suspended until the report is submitted and approved.

Changes to the project: Any changes to the project must be submitted to the Carleton University Research Ethics Board for approval. All changes must be approved prior to the continuance of the research.

Adverse events: Should a participant suffer adversely from their participation in the project you are required to report the matter to the Carleton University Research Ethics Board. You must submit a written record of the event and indicate what steps you have taken to resolve the situation.

Suspension or termination of clearance: Failure to conduct the research in accordance with the principles of the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans, 2nd edition* and the *Carleton University Policies and Procedures for the Ethical Conduct of Research* may result in the suspension or termination of the research project.

Louise Heslop

Chair, Carleton University Research Ethics Board

Andy Adler

Vice-Chair, Carleton University Research Ethics Board