

The Eurasia Proceedings of Educational & Social Sciences (EPESS), 2022

Volume 25, Pages 9-16

**IconSoS 2022: International Conference on Social Science Studies**

## Using Learner Feedback to Improve Teacher Practices in Materials Adaptation

Meliha R. SIMSEK

University of Health Sciences

**Abstract:** Commercial textbooks are doomed to disappoint user expectations to various extents because irrespective of origin (global/local), they are designed with an idealised classroom in mind, and their prescribed configuration probably won't be compatible with the ever-diversifying contexts of L2 teaching and learning. Even in the case of a longtime bestseller, EFL teachers may need to customise the student-purchased materials often based on their perceived learning needs, and learner feedback is not as a rule sought on the mostly teacher-led modifications to the textbook content and procedures. Therefore, this study aimed to demonstrate how Maley's (2011) inputs-processes-outcomes model could be used to evaluate and adapt an intermediate unit on modals of deduction, and examine how a multicultural group of 14 prep students from a major metropolitan state-run university in Turkey reacted to the teacher's adaptive practices. Descriptive analyses of students' activity ratings and retrospective reflections demonstrated that the addition of two scaffolded grammar tasks proved better for generating student interest and facilitating learning than replacement of another guessing game with the relatively more open and difficult task on video-based end-of-unit writing activity. Despite being independent users (B1), the participants indicated greater liking for the use of visual aids, ample practice opportunities, collaborative group work, explicit focus on grammar, and learner translations respectively. While their fewer dislikes mainly concerned video quality, activity difficulty and duration, there was almost unanimous agreement that they finally achieved to develop an increased awareness of how to use modality in English. A quick comparison of the 20-item quiz results also showed a considerable increase in their learning gains, for the mean number of correct answers more than doubled from pre- to post-test.

**Keywords:** Inputs-processes-outcomes model, Materials adaptation, Retrospective evaluation

### Introduction

More than two decades ago, Tomlinson (2001, p. 66) reconceptualised L2 materials as "anything... to facilitate the learning of a language", whether produced in "linguistic, visual, auditory or kinesthetic" forms, and presented through print or other media (e.g. live performance, CDs/DVDs, and the internet). And ever since then, the global coursebook, perhaps the most controversial but indispensable product of the ELT industry, has not remained unaffected by the digital revolution sweeping across sectors and communities. The English course as we know today also has come to "provide for everything" the users could possibly want (e.g. downloadable lessons, online activities, videos, whiteboard and test-generating software), to the extent that teachers are supposed to neither supplement it with anything nor feel guilty about it (Littlejohn, 2011, p. 180). However, the teacher-chosen but student-purchased coursebook as a learning partner is no similar to that Benjamin Franklin (as cited in Abbott, 2019, p. 66) recommended to "keep [one's] eyes wide open [for] before marriage [adoption], half-shut afterwards". In the presence of even the most compatible match for their unique classroom, the responsible teacher probably won't fail her learners, and shall employ a range of adaptation strategies in an attempt to teach and include them all.

Contrary to popular opinion, adaptation is therefore not just about alleviatory treatment, but rather more of "a reconciliatory action between the teacher's proposed plan and their reactions" (Simsek, 2017, p. 278). Despite

- This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 Unported License, permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

- Selection and peer-review under responsibility of the Organizing Committee of the Conference

© 2022 Published by ISRES Publishing: [www.isres.org](http://www.isres.org)

the lack of a common language for describing the ways in which teachers can transform L2 materials, McGrath (2013) has rightly indicated that three major distinctions could at least be derived from various schemes (e.g. Maley, 2011; McDonough & Shaw, 2003; McGrath, 2002; Richards, 2001; Tomlinson & Masuhara, 2004) according to the basic nature of their treatments: i.e. *omission* in the *minus* category, referring to partial use (subtracting quantitatively and abridging qualitatively) and non-use of materials (if given as homework); *addition* in the *plus* category, referring to provision of extras (extending with similar items), unintended and alternative uses (exploiting existing materials creatively), more difficult versions, or totally new materials (expanding texts and tasks); and *modification* in the *zero* category, referring to changes in the sequencing (reordering), language (rewriting) and content (replacing) of activities.

An examination of existing studies on textbook consumption has demonstrated that they seemed preoccupied with investigations into the type (e.g. native/non-native, pre-/in-service, or novice/experienced) of teachers that made more adaptations (e.g. Dunford, 2004; Tsui, 2003; Yan, 2007), their rationales for adapting the materials (e.g. Botelho, 2003; Mede & Yalcin, 2019; Tsobanoglou, 2008), and preferred techniques (e.g. Kara, 2019; Simsek, 2017) in different teaching-learning situations. In spite of the focus on teacher self-reports of textbook use, only a few case studies could still be found where the coursebook researchers enacted adaptation strategies and elicited learner views on their transformations of a given (part/unit of) material (e.g. Duarte & Escobar, 2008; Murphy, 1993). Also, it has long been recommended in the coursebook literature that instead of undertaking the laborious task of evaluating a whole coursebook retrospectively, or satisfying oneself with impressionistic evidence, teachers should conduct micro-evaluations, or more precisely, focus on the effectiveness of the specific tasks that they have actually used in the classroom (Ellis, 1996, 1998, 2011; McGrath, 2002; Murphy, 1993). In this way, they can more easily determine whether their self-chosen materials are deemed useful and engaging by “the students as consumer-readers”, and also how efficient they themselves have proved in “mediating between the materials and the learners” (McGrath, 2002, p. 184; Swales, 1995, p. 6).

For this reason, the current study sought to both instantiate how an intermediate unit from a best-selling global coursebook could be made more learner-friendly through the use of addition, and modification strategies, and explore the impact of teacher adaptations on their learning alongside student perceptions of task effectiveness. Maley’s (2011) inputs-processes-outcomes (IPO) framework was especially chosen for the unit analysis and adaptation because of its practicality in guiding materials evaluation and development. There are three pillars of materials design in the IPO model: *inputs*, referring to varied text types (printed/visual/auditory); *processes*, referring to “a set of generalisable pedagogical procedures” to be applied to the inputs in different combinations, and *outcomes*, referring to the goals to be achieved through participation in the processes, with material (e.g. student compositions) and pedagogical (e.g. improved test performance) types as direct products of student learning, besides educational (e.g. critical thinking skills) and psycho-social (e.g. group solidarity) ones relating to even broader objectives (Maley, 2011, pp. 386-387, 2013). By varying the interaction between the coursebook texts (inputs) and processes, the teacher as “the evaluator-reader” attempted to exercise choice for her learners to develop the desired learning outcomes in this study (Swales, 1995, p. 6). Therefore, the following research questions were addressed here: What are the student-perceived strengths and weaknesses of the adapted lesson? How much student learning has taken place as a result of the adapted lesson?

## **Method**

In this mixed-methods study, the participants were formed by a multicultural group of 14 intermediate students (10 female and four male, aged 17-20) (i.e. five Turkish, six Turkic, two Syrians and one Afghan) studying at the English preparatory class of a major metropolitan state-run university in Turkey due to their easy accessibility. During the descriptive analyses of their activity ratings, reflective writing and quiz results, qualitative and quantitative approaches were utilised simultaneously in order to gain a fuller picture of student reactions to teacher-led adaptations of the course material.

## **Data Collection and Analysis**

For the purpose of judging the effectiveness of the teacher’s adaptive manipulations of an intermediate unit on modals of deduction, a nine-item self-report questionnaire was developed on the basis of related literature (Ellis, 1998; Murphy, 1993). The first six items on the learner questionnaire were closed-ended and got them to decide whether each of the three teacher-created activities were fun/boring, and useful/no-use. As in Murphy’s (1993) example, the students were informed of the alternative glosses for the terms of interest and usefulness (i.e. fun>enjoyable, interesting; useful>makes it easier to learn/understand; no-use>unhelpful, difficult). There were

three open-ended items that wanted the students to reflect on the things they liked and disliked about the adapted lesson, as well as what they gained/learned from it. The students were informed of the study purpose and their anonymity was ensured by assigning case numbers (e.g. S8). They were also allowed to respond to the questionnaire in the common/native language of the classroom (Turkish) to promote their self-expression, and translated participant quotations were amply provided.

Besides seeking learner views, a teacher-made 20-item quiz was administered twice to determine what changes took place in their learning from pre- to post-test. The three-section test was focused on evaluating and raising students' grammatical awareness. As a result, they were required to decide if the modal verbs had the same/different meaning in sentence pairs, correct the mistake (of misjudging probability) in conversations, and complete a speculative text using the target grammar. The qualitative data from the learner questionnaire was subjected to descriptive analysis and quantified in this study. Consequently, ratios of interest and usefulness were calculated on the basis of the 14 students' ratings of teacher-created tasks. The qualitative findings from their written reflections were also formulated as thematic statements, and the frequencies/percentages of occurrence were appropriately tabulated. Finally, the change in the mean number of correct answers was determined to evaluate the student progress over the adapted lesson.

## Procedure

The *Headway* series has both been a reliable yardstick for judging the quality of any English course and provided the core methodology around which EFL teachers can build both form-focused and communicative lessons for learners worldwide. For this reason, the tenth unit, entitled "Beyond belief", from *Headway 5e Intermediate Student's Book* (Soars et al., 2019a) was chosen for examination and adaptation with Maley's (2011) inputs-processes-outcomes model. To begin with, two auditory texts (i.e. long dialogues with at least 10 turns) and ten images (i.e. eight with functional and two with decorative purposes) were used for introducing the target language, while written texts might have better served to concentrate conscious attention on the grammatical forms. The inputting texts to the two following activities were however found efficient in providing learners with abundant examples of present and past modals of deduction and developing a feeling for speculative grammar. In the first of the processing activities, the students were requested respectively to look at the illustrations of eight optical illusions (inherently intriguing), guess which of them related to the eight lines (e.g. "It looks like a skeleton. It can't be a lady") from the listening, point to the pictures being talked about, and identify the ones the woman could not see (Soars et al., 2019a, p. 100). In the second case, they were similarly asked to guess what the conversation was about (i.e. what went wrong) just by looking at Rick's side of the conversation, work out with their partners Alex's side, tick the most likely answer (e.g. "He may have forgotten his passport/Hannah could have forgotten her passport") to the comprehension questions (e.g. "Why was Alex furious?"), and finally check their responses again after listening to the full conversation (Soars et al., 2019a, p. 102). Therefore, both processing activities were considered useful for going beyond simple contextualisation in that they guided the learners from the very first into making deductions.

Yet, the participants, being mostly Middle Eastern and Asian expatriates, were accustomed to a traditional didactic culture of education, and seemed to care more about their exam performance. They sought teacher authority on the subject-matter and preferred the grammatical knowledge to be dictated to them. The coursebook's *grammar spots*, on the other hand, made use of discovery questions (e.g. "Which sentence is the most sure? Which are less sure?") in order for the learners to formulate the grammar rules for themselves (Soars et al., 2019a, p. 100). The present material could still have generated enough language focus, if only they were also helped to become aware of the difference between degrees of possibility and dual use of all true modals (not just *must*) for expressing epistemic and non-epistemic (root) meanings (e.g. "Remember *must* also expresses obligation. What is the past of these sentences?") (Soars et al., 2019a, p. 103). Consequently, the addition of two scaffolded grammar activities, i.e. probability scale and bilingual table completion, was considered to do no harm to their learning (Simsek, 2010). In the first of these activities, the students individually ranked further examples from the first listening on a scale of low- to near-certainty (e.g. "I'm not sure about that. It may [50% sure] be a candlestick" vs. "It must [90% sure] be a soldier – he's wearing a helmet") (Soars et al., 2019a, p. 137). Secondly, student groups were given a scaffolding table with relevant hints (e.g. "The speaker thinks something was possibly true") and asked to classify the modal sentences they had underlined in both tapescripts by time (as present/past), polarity (as positive/negative) and degree of certainty (as near/low-certainty). They finally inserted their Turkish translations because cross-lingual links were considered to increase their chances of retaining and retrieving new knowledge.

During the productive phase, two subsequent practice activities were adopted with only minor changes in interaction patterns and procedures to increase learner involvement, while another two were omitted due to time constraints and relative challenge. In the teaching of both present and past modals, pairs initially engaged in controlled output practice, i.e. by taking turns to read the lines (e.g. “I can’t find my ticket.”) in their coursebook and responding to them (e.g. “You must have dropped it”) using the bracketed cues (e.g. “*must, drop*”) (Soars et al., 2019a, p. 103). Then, they switched into the relatively less controlled activities, where groups of four (originally pairs), for instance, listened to five short conversations, wrote modal sentences (about their negotiated guesses) (e.g. “They can’t be at home...”) in response to the cued questions (e.g. “Where do you think the people are? At home? In a restaurant? In a pub?”) and also gave reasons for their conclusions (e.g. “...because they’re paying for the drink”) (Soars et al., 2019a, p. 101). The last coursebook activity involved holding a whole-class discussion on “the different meanings” of modal verbs, or more precisely, which ones could complete the given sentences (e.g. “He <can’t/may/could/might/must/should> have been born in the 1960s”) (Soars et al., 2019a, p. 103). In the adapted lesson, the teacher also elicited their explicit knowledge on epistemic (e.g. *should* for what is possible) and non-epistemic uses (*should* for what is advisable).

Because just another guessing game (i.e. researching urban myths and testing peers with true/false statements) was suggested in the teacher’s book for consolidation (Soars et al, 2019b, p. 130), the teacher chose to replace it with a video-based writing activity on the American myth of discovery to ensure relevance and skills balance. The interactive phase of the adapted lesson started with the students’ choral response, “Columbus did!” to the teacher’s provocative question, “Who discovered America? ... Did he really?”. Upon viewing the funny clip from *Horrible Histories Series 4, Episode 6 (Potty Pioneers)*, where serious doubts about Columbus’s discovery were aroused (Brigstocke & Connelly, 2012), the students were asked to do an internet search and write their conclusions about alternative discoverers of America. Having predicted classroom constraints, the teacher also devised a factsheet from Maurer’s (2017, pp. 69-70) article about the discovery of America, so that they could invest more time in reading different stories about Viking, Irish and Japanese explorers, assessing their plausibility and reformulating speculative sentences in a descending order of possibility. In return for the teacher’s adaptive practices, the learners were ultimately expected to have a good command of English modality (pedagogical), work collaboratively, think critically and reflectively (educational), and develop cultural awareness (psycho-social).

## Results and Discussion

When the 14 prep students were asked to evaluate the effectiveness of their teacher’s adaptive practices by using Murphy’s (1993) 2-point Likert scale, the results in Table 1 were obtained. By looking at their interest and usefulness ratios, the two scaffolded grammar activities, probability scale and bilingual table completion, were found better at both generating enjoyment and promoting learning than the apparently more difficult reformulation activity based on the comic video prompt.

Table 1. Results from students’ ratings of task effectiveness

Adaptive Practices	Interest Ratio (Fun/Boring)	Usefulness Ratio (Useful/No-use)
Addition of probability scale	14:0 (1:0)	14:0 (1:0)
Addition of bilingual table	13:1 (1:0.07)	13:1 (1:0.07)
Replacement with video-based writing	10:4 (1:0.40)	8:6 (1:0.75)

In addition to rating these teacher-created activities in terms of interest and usefulness, the participants were also requested to elaborate on their likes and dislikes about the adapted lesson, as well as ultimate attainments. According to Table 2, their responses concentrated more on the students’ self-perceived benefits (84%) from the adapted lesson than on its limitations (16%). Despite being independent users (B1), the participants expressed appreciation primarily for ample practice opportunities (S6: “We solved a lot of examples and were able to practise well”) (f=8), collaborative group work (S14: “Group work let us have discussions and chat about the subject, so we did the activities without getting bored”) (f=6), explicit focus on grammar (S9: “The thing that I liked in this lesson was detailed presentation of modal verbs and comprehensible handling of the subject”) (f=5), and use of learner translations (S7: “Translating sentences was good reinforcement. It helped us keep information in mind”) (f=4).

Yet, the most-cited advantage of the adapted lesson turned out to be the use of visual aids (f=11). The adjectives, “exciting” (S4), “entertaining” (S12), “facilitating” (S13) and “lasting” (S2) were commonly preferred to characterise the incorporation of the graphic organisers (probability scale and bilingual table) and funny clip from *Horrible Histories* into the processing and interactive phases of the instruction. Due to the

complexity of the English modal system and previous failed attempts, the majority of the respondents like S4 (“Placing the sentences into the summary table added vigour to the lesson. Everything fell into place in my mind more rapidly”) and S8 (“Probabilometer was very useful for me. I used to confuse modal verbs because I misunderstood their possibilities [degrees of possibility]”) seemed more pleased with the catalytic effect of alternative learning mediums.

As to which other factors contributed to enhanced learning and retention, few were however as specific as S1, who also acknowledged the role of skills integration (“It was much better to be able to do reading, listening, speaking and grammar on the same day”) (f=3) and active participation (“Today’s lesson is one where we, too, have been very active... Being different from our usual was good and fun”) (f=2). Similarly, only four participants, taking a more holistic approach to lesson evaluation, distinguished the given case collectively as a “pleasant” diversion from classroom routines (e.g. textbook (in)dependency in S1’s terms). Moreover, S14 drew attention to the affective dimension of their learning process: “When the lesson is enjoyable, it stays in one’s mind... We learn by enjoying what we receive, and we aren’t afraid of making mistakes... Your way of teaching was very relaxing”.

Table 2. Results from students’ retrospective evaluation of the adapted lesson

User Responses	f	%
Likes (I liked...)	46	52
ample practice opportunities	8	9.09
collaborative group work	6	6.81
use of an amusing video as a lead-in to writing activity	6	6.81
use of visual organisers for clarifying and summarising complex concepts	5	5.68
explicit focus on grammar	5	5.68
use of learner translations	4	4.54
diversion from the monotony of classwork	4	4.54
acquisition of general knowledge	3	3.40
integration of the language skills	3	3.40
active participation	2	2.27
Dislikes (I disliked...)	14	16
video quality	7	7.95
activity difficulty	4	4.54
activity duration	2	2.27
topic selection	1	1.13
Gains (I learned/developed...)	28	32
increased awareness of how to use modality	13	14.77
facts about the discovery of America	6	6.81
new words	3	3.40
how to make cross-lingual comparisons	2	2.27
how to practise grammar communicatively	2	2.27
group work skills	1	1.13
deductive reasoning skills	1	1.13
Total	88	100

\*Respondents gave multiple answers.

It can also be observed from Table 2 that more than half of their complaints (f=8) related to the components of the video-based end-of-unit writing activity, namely, the picture and sound quality, video length (S11: “The video can be longer, and the quality of sound and images should be better”) and thematic choice (S14: “The [cueing text] reading was a bit boring because the topic wasn’t attractive”). A closer look at their negative reactions to activity duration and difficulty also showed that just as high-achievers (S2: “I didn’t like that it took so long to complete the activities. There were too many sentences in the Columbus activity”) could lose interest because of the time on task, so low-achieving students could get bored if they encountered “challenging questions” (S9) that might cause them to “feel as if [they] knew nothing” (S10).

Finally, when they were surveyed about their gains from the adapted lesson, 13 out of 14 students asserted that they finally achieved to develop an increased awareness of how to use modality in English (S4: “After this lesson, I really came to understand them [modals] consciously. I learned their present, past and even passive uses. I noticed my misconception. I used to think modal verbs had past forms [inflections]... May and might were the same and could replace each other. I learned the subtle difference between them”). While six participants referred to the learning of facts about the discovery of America (S6: “I got to know some interesting

events about America's discovery"), only three of them actually indicated their liking for acquisition of such general knowledge (S12: "I enjoyed it [Columbus activity]. We obtained very useful knowledge. It was fun"), and also went on to state that acquisition of new words was another gain from their learning experience. It was worth noting that only three students again undertook higher-order reflections in the current study group. S1 and S5 addressed how their learning was facilitated by comparisons between the common/native and target languages as well as communicative use of newly-learned grammar/structures (S5: "Doing more activities than usual, comparing and reinforcing with our mother tongue, using mathematical formulas and expressing our learning with our own sentences have been effective in that [better learning]. But what matters most is the product of our own pen"), whereas S3 remarked on improved adaptivity to group work and inferencing abilities.

Apart from the responses to the learner questionnaire, student performance on the teacher-made quiz underwent evaluation. A quick comparison of their results revealed that the mean number of correct answers grew from 4.85 on the pre-test to 9.92 out of 20 items on the post-test. In other words, the students, on the average, more than doubled their scores from pre- to post-test. The considerable increase in the learning gains resonated with their self-reported outcomes and was considered encouraging despite constraints on time and sampling. As Ellis (1998) pointed out, dual evaluation of tasks, as presently constituted, investigates not only the extent of learning from a task (i.e. whether the task works) but also the learners' own views of the task (i.e. how it can be improved), and is not frequently undertaken due to the amount of time and effort they cost the evaluator. Despite offering valuable insights into the effectiveness of the materials L2 teachers teach by, micro-evaluations still have not received adequate attention in the literature also because they are often found "too localised and too small scale" (Ellis, 2011, p. 232).

Yet, the few existing studies that focused on (at least) the teacher and/or student reviews of the adapted lesson revealed similar patterns of adaptive action and learner reaction. In one of the earliest examples, Murphy (1993) analysed 20 teachers' opinions on the experience of conducting task evaluation with their secondary school pupils in Malaysia, and similarly found that their students, with a dislike of their textbook and traditional teaching methods, demanded variety and responded positively to the use of group work and real-life tasks, while they rejected those embodying difficult content. Duarte and Escobar (2008), who compared 15 Colombian students' perceptions of their global English coursebook (*Cutting Edge Intermediate*) and the locally adapted material for greater sociocultural compatibility, also reported that 93% of them expressed enjoyment of participation in the activities of the latter primarily because the adapted material enabled them to not only recycle grammar and varied vocabulary at the right level of difficulty, through the use of more familiar, realistic situations, and in a more integrated way, but also develop their cognitive abilities in problem-solving activities.

Despite being limited to 14 (in)experienced instructors' self-reported beliefs about adapting another global English coursebook (*New English File Intermediate*) at the English preparatory department of a private university in Turkey, Mede and Yalcin's (2019) qualitative analysis of their reflective essays, lesson plans and semi-structured interviews uncovered similar motives for teacher practices; for instance, they tended to omit repetitive tasks, add warm-up and exam-related (reading) activities, modify the class mode and content of speaking tasks mainly to increase student interest and classroom interaction, and also to maintain the prescribed pace. In a recent study by Karatepe and Civelek (2021), a dialogue activity for teaching requests was likewise modified, and 100 Turkish EFL teachers' views were surveyed with a 19-item questionnaire and semi-structured interviews after examining the original and adapted versions. 96% of the teacher respondents indicated a preference for the adapted activity because the addition of pragmatic awareness-raising exercises (i.e. focus on direct/indirect requests, modals and politeness markers, discussion on request strategies and comparisons between Turkish and English uses) and the more popular discourse role-play tasks were believed to foster their students' pragmatic development and language use.

## **Conclusion**

As is often the case with non-native contexts, where (government-)published coursebooks are imposed upon teacher- and student-users, EFL teachers from different educational stages in Turkey have lately admitted their reluctance to carry out materials adaptation for various reasons (i.e. lack of time, heavy workload, students' low-proficiency and exam-orientation) but attributed it more to lack of confidence, or more precisely, their own lack of knowledge and experience in making modifications to existing coursebooks (Karatepe & Civelek, 2021). Consequently, the present study sought to instantiate how an intermediate unit from a best-selling global coursebook could be made more learner-friendly through the use of addition and modification strategies, and also explored the impact of teacher adaptations on their learning alongside student perceptions of task effectiveness. Descriptive analyses of students' activity ratings and retrospective reflections demonstrated that

the addition of two scaffolded grammar tasks, probability scale and bilingual table completion, proved better for generating student interest and facilitating learning than replacement with the relatively more open and difficult task on video-based end-of-unit writing activity. Despite being independent users (B1), the students also indicated greater liking for the use of visual aids (i.e. graphic organisers and video prompt), ample practice opportunities, collaborative group work, explicit focus on grammar, and learner translations respectively. While their fewer dislikes mainly concerned video quality, activity difficulty and duration, there was almost unanimous agreement that they finally achieved to develop an increased awareness of how to use modality in English. A quick comparison of the 20-item quiz results also showed a considerable increase in their learning gains, for the mean number of correct answers more than doubled from pre- to post-test. In the light of these findings, the teacher as reflective practitioner might be well-advised to consider offering alternatives to the video content (e.g. local historical, detective or medical mysteries) and communicative output (e.g. spoken, written or multimodal texts) so as to increase contextual relevance and accommodate different learning styles. Such co-use of student-based and learning-based evaluations can thus be argued to incorporate accountability in teacher actions and inform development of future learning tasks (Ellis, 1998, 2011).

## **Recommendations**

Although the current micro-evaluation was not intended to make generalisations but rather document the impact of teacher adaptations of a grammar unit on the learning and attitudes of a specific group of intermediate learners of English at tertiary level, the sample size (n=14), sampling method (convenience sampling) and duration (eight 45-min periods) could be listed among the limitations of this study. Future research should consider evaluating the efficiency of published coursebooks (global/local) and their adapted versions by different teacher types (e.g. expertise levels and language backgrounds) through the use of multiple data sources (e.g. classroom discourse) besides self-reports and achievement tests.

## **Scientific Ethics Declaration**

The author declares that the scientific ethical and legal responsibility of this article published in EPESS journal belongs to the author.

## **Acknowledgements or Notes**

This article was presented as an oral presentation at the International Conference on Social Science Studies ([www.iconsos.net](http://www.iconsos.net)) conference held in Istanbul/Turkey on August 25-28, 2022.

## **References**

- Abbott, J. S. C. (2019). *Benjamin Franklin*. Frankfurt am Main: Outlook Verlag GmbH.
- Botelho, M. (2003). *Multiple intelligences theory in English language teaching: An analysis of current textbooks, materials and teachers' perceptions* (Unpublished master's thesis). Ohio University, Ohio.
- Brigstocke, D., & Connelly, S. (Directors). (2012). *Christopher Columbus 'discovers' India* (Series 4, Episode 6) [Video]. Youtube. <https://youtu.be/9fZnWlt-X-0>
- Duarte, S. A., & Escobar, L. A. (2008). Using adapted material and its impact on university students' motivation. *PROFILE*, 9, 63-87.
- Dunford, N. (2004). *How do teachers interpret the need for the adaptation and supplementation of coursebooks, with specific reference to data collected by questionnaire from Shane English schools Japan?* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Nottingham, Nottingham.
- Ellis, R. (1996). *Does it 'work' Evaluating tasks in language teaching*. <https://jalt-publications.org/tlt/articles/2045-does-it-work-evaluating-tasks-language-teaching>
- Ellis, R. (1998). The evaluation of communicative tasks. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 217-238). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2011). Macro- and micro-evaluations of task-based teaching. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd ed.) (pp. 212-235).
- Kara, S. (2019). Pre-service teachers' coursebook evaluation and adaptation: An evaluation of 9th grade English coursebook. *Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 20(2), 564-577.

- Karatepe, C. & Civelek, M. (2021). A case study on EFL teachers' views on material adaptation for teaching pragmatics. *RumeliDE Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 23, 894-910.
- Littlejohn, A. (2011). The analysis of language teaching materials: Inside the Trojan horse. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd ed.) (pp. 179-211). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maley, A. (2011). Squaring the circle: Reconciling materials as constraint with materials as empowerment. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd ed.) (pp. 379-402). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maley, A. (2013). Creative approaches to writing materials. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (2nd ed.) (pp. 167-187). London: Bloomsbury.
- Maurer, J. (2017). *Focus on Grammar 5* (5th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- McDonough, J., & Shaw, C. (2003). *Materials and methods in ELT*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- McGrath, I. (2002). *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- McGrath, I. (2013). *Teaching materials and the roles of EFL/ESL teachers: Practice and theory*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Mede, E., & Yalcin, S. (2019). Utilizing textbook adaptation strategies: Experiences and challenges of novice and experienced EFL instructors. *TESOL International Journal*, 14(1), 91-104.
- Murphy, D. F. (1993). Evaluating language learning tasks in the classroom. In G. Crookes, & S. M. Gass (Eds.), *Tasks in a pedagogical context: Integrating theory & practice* (pp. 139-161). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Simsek, M. R. (2010). The effects of L1 use in the teaching of L2 grammar concepts on the students' achievement. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 6(2), 142-169.
- Simsek, M. R. (2017). Confronting culture in local and global English coursebooks: Student teachers' preferences in materials adaptation. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 13(2), 277-300.
- Soars, L., Soars, J., & Hancock, P. (2019a). *Headway intermediate student's book* (5th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Soars, L., Soars, J., & Griggs, K. (2019b). *Headway intermediate teacher's guide* (5th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swales, J. M. (1995). The role of the textbook in EAP writing research. *English for Specific Purposes*, 14(1), 3-18.
- Tomlinson, B. (2001). Materials development. In D. Nunan & R. Carter (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 66-71). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomlinson, B., & Masuhara, H. (2004). *Developing language course materials*. Singapore: SEAMEO RELC.
- Tsobanoglou, S. (2008). *What can we learn by researching the use of textbooks and other support materials by teachers and learners?* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Nottingham, Nottingham.
- Tsui, A. B. M. (2003). *Understanding expertise in teaching: Case studies in ESL teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yan, C. (2007). *Investigating English teachers' materials adaptation*. <http://old.hltmag.co.uk/jul07/mart01.htm>

---

### Author Information

---

**Meliha R. Simsek**

University of Health Sciences

Istanbul, Turkey

Contact e-mail: [malliday@gmail.com](mailto:malliday@gmail.com)

---

### To cite this article:

Simsek, M. R. (2022). Using learner feedback to improve teacher practices in materials adaptation. *The Eurasia Proceedings of Educational & Social Sciences (EPESS)*, 25, 9-16.