CONFRONTING CULTURE IN LOCAL AND GLOBAL ENGLISH COURSEBOOKS: STUDENT TEACHERS' PREFERENCES IN MATERIALS ADAPTATION

(YEREL VE KÜRESEL İNGİLİZCE DERS KİTAPLARINDA KÜLTÜRLE KARŞILAŞMA: ÖĞRETMEN ADAYLARININ MALZEME UYARLAMADAKİ SEÇİMLERİ)

Meliha R. ŞİMŞEK[1]

ABSTRACT

Much of textbook research in ELT concentrates on materials evaluation and analyses of (cultural) content, whereas existing studies on textbook consumption seem preoccupied with in-service teachers' self-reported beliefs and practices. It still remains underexplored how student teachers respond to culturally-inappropriate materials. Especially when they are mandated to follow local coursebooks as in Turkey, teacher mediation of texts becomes critical. Therefore, 58 pre-service English teachers in an urban university were surveyed to elicit their attitudes towards gendered and alienating texts from local and global English coursebooks, and identify their culturally-responsive preferences and rationales for materials adaptation. Their word associations were examined to determine prototypical views of culture. The content analysis revealed that whether local or global, over 50% of the participants preferred to use the texts unchanged or delete them altogether, while chances of fixing the materials dropped steeply in the face of foreign culture influence. The few adapters appreciated their potential for raising gender- and cultural-awareness, and increasing classroom interaction. The overwhelming majority (74%) conceptualised culture as the embodiment of daily activities, current state of being and common way of thinking within a community, and seemed concerned about the appropriacy and comprehensibility of cultural content.

Keywords: Cultural awareness, cultural content, English coursebooks, materials adaptation

ÖZET

İngilizce öğretimi alanındaki ders kitabı araştırmalarının çoğunluğu, malzeme değerlendirme ile (kültürel) içerik çözümlemelerine odaklanırken, ders kitabı kullanımıyla ilgili mevcut çalışmalar hizmetiçi öğretmenlerin özbildirimli inançları ve uygulamaları ile meşgul görünmektedir. Öğretmen adaylarının kültürel açıdan uygun olmayan malzemelere nasıl tepki verdiği ise yeterince araştırılmamış bir konu olarak kalmıştır. Özellikle Türkiye'deki gibi yerel ders kitaplarının kullanımı zorunlu tutulduğunda, öğretmenin metinlerdeki aracılığı kritik önem arz etmektedir. Bu nedenle, yerel ve küresel İngilizce ders kitaplarındaki cinsiyetçi ve yabancılaştırıcı metinlere karşı tutumlarını ortaya çıkarmak ve malzeme uyarlamada kültürel açıdan duyarlı seçimleri ile gerekçelerini belirlemek amacıyla, kentsel bir üniversitedeki 58 İngilizce öğretmeni adayına anket uygulanmıştır. Ayrıca prototipik kültür görüşlerini betimlemek için öğretmen adaylarının sözcük çağrışımları incelenmiştir. İçerik analizinin sonuçlarına göre, katılımcılarının %50'sinden fazlası, yerel veya küresel farketmeksizin, metinleri değiştirmeden kullanmayı veya tümden kaldırmayı seçerken, malzemeleri düzeltme şansları yabancı kültürün etkisi karşısında birden düşmüştür. Az sayıdaki uyarlayıcılar ise metinlerdeki cinsi ve kültürel farkındalık yaratma, sınıfiçi etkileşimi artırma potansiyeline değer vermiştir. Ezici çoğunluk (%74), kültürü bir topluluktaki gündelik etkinliklerin, güncel yaşayış ve ortak düşünme biçiminin oluşumu olarak kavramlaştırmış ve kültürel içeriğin uygunluğu ile anlaşılırlığı konusunda kaygılı görünmüştür.

Anahtar sözcükler: İngilizce ders kitapları, kültürel farkındalık, kültürel içerik, malzeme uyarlama

---

[1] Assistant. Prof. Dr., University of Health Sciences, Department of Foreign Languages.
Email: meliha.simsek@sbu.edu.tr

INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of educational technology has transformed all three components of the EFL class: learners, teachers, instructional materials. Due to the pressing need for multi-modal learning environments, materials have diversified to the extent that an all-embracing definition could be obtained, when Tomlinson (2001, p. 66) described them as 'anything… used to facilitate the learning of a language', be it in 'linguistic, visual, auditory or kinesthetic' forms or through the printed medium and otherwise. Among the plethora of commercial materials, without which most language classes worldwide would be hindered, it is the good old *coursebook* that has come out of the technological revolution as right as a trivet (Richards, 2001a).

Today, coursepacks provide teachers with 'everything' conceivable (whiteboard, test softwares, website activities, downloadable lesson plans), so that teachers can be excused for not giving any thought to supplementation (Littlejohn, 2011, p. 180). The modernisation of the coursebook seems to have ended the notorious argument around its essentiality, but may have complicated the already 'challenging task' of choosing the right one (Cunningsworth, 1995, p. 1). And where the adopted coursebook fails to meet expectations, there remains one option for the average teacher to ameliorate learners' displeasure toward the unfulfilling teaching partner: adapting the coursebook.

It is a common misconception that teachers resort to adaptation if the material is inappropriate. Even in the case of materials tailored to suit the context, the teacher will adapt 'either consciously or subconsciously' (Islam & Mares, 2007, p. 86). Considering the diversity of learner needs, it is only natural to think of adaptation as a reconciliatory action between the teacher's proposed plan and their reactions. This may seem a matter of teacher preference about textbook use, for just as a ride in a BMW and a rickshaw can be both unpleasant and unsafe depending on the expertise of the driver, the coursebook (global or local) is only a vehicle for teaching the foreign language, and its (ab)use is often in the teacher's hands. While 'a boring teacher' elevates it to the status of an incontestable holy book ('not to be tampered with… or rewritten... in no need of supplementation') and works through the material 'exactly as it is on the page', 'an enthusiastic and imaginative teacher' changes a 'mediocre' book into 'motivating material' (Prodromou, 1999, p. 16, 2002, p. 27).

Teachers' awareness of this distinction between textbook as a static object and a dynamic tool is regarded by many as a major determinant of teacher quality (Savova, 2009). Those equipped with the expandable skill of adapting will transform commercial materials (1) in any one/combination of these areas: *language* (students are exposed to and expected to produce), *process* (class management, interaction patterns, learning styles), *content* (topics, situations, cultural information), and *level* (linguistic and cognitive complexity); (2) by using three basic techniques: *omission* (deleting the whole/part of materials), *addition* (extending, expanding, exploiting materials), and *change* (modifying the language,

content, sequence); and (3) for four main reasons: *localization* (maintaining contextual relevance), *personalisation* (engaging learners by drawing on their own experience), *individualisation* (addressing different learning styles by varying classwork) and *modernisation* (updating language usage and factual content) (McDonough & Shaw, 2003; McGrath, 2002, 2013; Richards, 2001b).

In conclusion, every teacher that shows a sincere concern for teaching the students rather than worshipping the textbook will adapt in one way or another. The importance of this seemingly 'very practical' activity has been widely acknowledged, and its relation to different professional matters ranging from teacher competence to 'the whole management of education' has been observed (McDonough & Shaw, 2003, p. 85; McGrath, 2002, 2013). However, existing textbook research in ELT has concentrated on evaluation and content studies, and is considered not as developed as that in non-ELT fields (i.e. mathematics) (Guerrettaz & Johnston, 2013; Harwood, 2014). Despite being informative about the kinds and quality of textbooks, these studies cannot tell about teachers' intended and enacted uses of the materials as well as their anticipated and actual effects in the classroom (Harwood, 2014; Tomlinson & Masuhara, 2010; Tomlinson, 2011, 2012). Since teachers as mediators between the materials and unique teaching context will determine the way(s) in which they may (not) 'come to life for learners', their 'insights and decision-making' about textbook exploitation deserve further exploration (Garton & Graves, 2014a, p. 7; Garton & Graves, 2014b; Guerrettaz & Johnston, 2014, p. 672; Larsen-Freeman, 2014).

Related Research

The studies of textbook use have shown teachers, whether native/non-native or expert/novice, are not really teaching by the book, but they tune their main instrument of teaching for the sake of greater harmony in the class. Evidence from interviews, questionnaires, observations and analyses of course documents indicate that notwithstanding the type of coursebook in use, teachers employ different combinations of adaptation techniques at varying degrees of expertise. The textbook was treated as a resource teachers would borrow from in their own ways, and multiple factors were at play in the variation of teacher practice: teachers' beliefs and preferences, nature of materials, school context, particular group of learners, subject matter and level (Studolsky, 1989). In Richards and Mahoney's (1996, pp. 59-60) survey of 326 English teachers' textbook use, the majority reported that they made omissions, modifications, supplementations rather than 'slavishly follow[ing] the dictates of the textbook', and the widespread critical attitude towards materials was found to maintain their autonomy as teaching professionals, despite the all-pervasive usage of coursebooks in Hong Kong secondary schools.

Besides the intrinsic deficiencies of coursebooks, several other reasons for adaptation have been provided by more recent questionnaire-based studies, 'offer[ing] insights into what teachers report doing' (Guerrettaz & Johnston, 2013, p. 781). More than half of Dunford's (2004) 29 native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) in Japan claimed that their coursebooks needed adapting for increased

learner involvement, interest, challenge, variety and manageability, while 30% of them called for more cultural appropriacy. Yan (2007) analysed the lesson plans of 30 teacher trainees in China and found that their coursebook adaptations were characterized by four rationales: blending traditional and communicative methods, catering for learner needs, integrating primary language skills, satisfying teacher wants and needs. In Botelho's (2003) and Tsobanoglou's (2008) surveys, the teachers' common concern was about relevance, and the following reasons were offered for adapting the coursebook: fostering learner motivation, supplying extra practice for learning difficulties, changing the boring class routine, making the learning process more meaningful.

While the factors to be considered in adaptation have been listed by Graves (2000) as: the givens of institutional context (teacher's freedom to adapt, curriculum, examination system, class size, grade), teacher's beliefs and understandings about language learning (by interacting or integrating four skills), and students' needs and interests (their level, expectations of teachers, future contexts of language use), it is *exam-orientation* that has oft been cited as a more influential context-bound factor in teachers' adaptive decisions. In a good number of studies, the teachers, either in the Asian or Middle-Eastern context, expressed that they are 'teaching to the test' by slimming down the curriculum, focusing on revision and replacing their coursebooks with 'self-developed test-format worksheets' and 'past examination papers', and despite their disdain for it, these teachers reported skipping the parts that won't appear in the exam, and doing merely the reading, writing and vocabulary activities to improve students' test performance (Le, 2011; Lee & Bathmaker, 2007, p. 360; Menkabu & Harwood, 2014; Pelly & Allison, 2000, pp. 84-85).

The question of who adapts more has also intrigued researchers in the last twenty years or so. Comparative studies on dichotomous groups of teachers' textbook use have produced the shared outcome that experienced teachers with an acute awareness of learner difficulties are more inclined to adapt than novices with a greater concern over covering the material, whereas native-speakers gifted with improvisation are more independent of the predetermined lesson plan than non-native teachers that are more mindful of the national curriculum and examinations (e.g. Çoban, 2001; Grossman & Thompson, 2008; Hutchinson, 1996; Medgyes, 1994; Ravelonanahary, 2007; Richards, 1998; Sampson, 2009; Skierso, 1991; Tsui, 2003; Woodward, 1993). Instead of classifying teachers as 'textbook-bound/basics coverage', Shawer (2010, pp. 180-182) identified three textbook-use styles in teacher interviews and observations: (1) *curriculum-developers* (treating the coursebook as 'a springboard' and trying out flexible lessons), (2) *curriculum-makers* (using materials from different sources), (3) *curriculum-transmitters* (treating it as 'the single-source' and avoiding change).

It is clear that research on textbook consumption concentrated on in-service teachers' self-reported and/or observed practices of adaptation, while student teachers' voices appear to go relatively unheard. Another gap in the literature concerns teacher responses to cultural content in English coursebooks and their

rationales for adaptation in the face of cultural inappropriacy. Gray (2000, 2010) explored what 20 NESTs think about the cultural content of a given piece of material and how they should deal with the problematic content in ELT coursebooks, whereas foreign language teachers from seven different countries were surveyed in Davcheva and Sercu's (2005) study about their views and self-perceived practices in relation to the cultural dimension of their teaching materials. When Zacharias (2005) investigated 100 tertiary teachers' beliefs about internationally-published materials in Indonesia, the majority of 13 teachers she interviewed admitted the difficulty of understanding the cultural content, and like Ravelonanahary's (2007) 65 public school teachers in the Malagasy context, they notified us of the need for modification or change of texts to suit the reality of learners' culture.

Being aware of the misguided concentration of foreign language textbook research on texts, Sunderland et al. (2001) demonstrated through lesson transcripts and interviews that it is hard to tell how teachers will mediate a text, and that their talk around the text is more determinant of its effect. With a similar aim, Kızılaslan (2010) explored through a survey adapted from McGrath (2002) if, how, and why 68 Turkish preservice teachers of English would adapt gendered texts from two local textbooks, whereas Forman (2014) examined how three local teachers at a Thai university responded to the content of a global textbook by using Sunderland et al.'s (2001) analytical categories of *endorsing/subverting/ignoring* the message in the text.

Since (1) coursebook as 'the core text' instructs learners not just in linguistic knowledge but is carefully designed in such a way as to inject cultural messages, and (2) student teachers are both misguided by their teacher education programs (in abandoning the textbook) and unprepared to use it when required, it is essential that their attitudes towards culturally-loaded materials be elicited and their readiness to employ adaptation strategies be examined for serving learner interests and cultural sensitivities (Adaskou, Britten & Fahsi, 1990; Garcia, 2005; Gray, 2000; Gray, 2002, p. 151; Hutchinson & Torres, 1994; Moulton, 1997). By the same token, Harwood (2014) has criticised the chief preoccupation with analysing the cultural content of varied coursebooks, and lately indicated the more immediate need for determining how teachers will exploit even the inappropriate textbook content.

Considering the persistent dissatisfaction of Turkish teachers with the locally-produced, officially-mandated and culturally one-sided English coursebooks as well as their common reluctance to adapt them, surveying how student teachers respond to culturally-problematic materials and why they prefer to treat them in their own way discloses significant information about pre-service textbook education's projections for their future coursebook exploitation (Çakır, 2010; Çelik & Erbay, 2013). As teachers' BAK (beliefs, assumptions, and knowledge) systems mould both their perceptions of textbook content and decisions about its implementation, investigating their culture beliefs is considered instrumental in explaining student teachers' adaptive preferences (Woods, 1996). In consequence, this study addresses these three research questions:

1. What kind of adaptive preferences do student teachers make in response to culturally-explicit materials?
2. How do they justify their adaptive preferences?
3. How do they view culture in general?

METHOD

Participants

The participants of this study consisted of 58 senior students, (42 female, 16 male; aged 22-24) volunteering from the Department of Foreign Language Education in an urban university of Turkey. The participants were intentionally selected among student teachers, who took the three-hour course, *Materials Adaptation and Development*. The goal of this compulsory course is to equip pre-service teachers with the knowledge and skills for evaluating, adapting and designing materials in line with the needs of the specific context (Council of Higher Education, 2007, p. 135). The course-takers practised adaptation techniques on varied tasks, determined their own evaluative criteria and wrote evaluation reports on self-decided coursebooks. Consequently, *purposive sampling* was used for investigating pre-service teachers' responses to culturally-explicit materials and revealing the underlying reasons for their adaptive preferences. The researcher informed them of the research purpose and maintained their confidentiality by assigning each a case number (e.g. ST1) to increase the participants' consent and quality of their data (Ciambrone, 2004; Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Data Collection

The qualitative data was collected during the spring semester of the 2015-2016 academic year. The participants were first given two extracts from local and global English coursebooks and then administered the survey adapted from Gray (2000) in order to elicit their opinions on a *gendered* reading (the domestic story of a nagging housewife and her unhelpful husband) and an *alien* listening text (about three 20-somethings with improper lifestyles for Turkish learners), and also to explore how they will address the problems of cultural content in the given foreign language teaching materials (Durmaz, 2013, pp. 92-93; Soars & Soars, 2012, p. 125, see Appendix A and B). The closed-ended questions in the survey enabled us to allocate their responses to any one of the three kinds of treatment identified in the literature, whereas the open-ended questions served to reveal their self-reported reasons for adaptive choices and intended amendments (see Appendix C). Finally, the participants listed the first three expressions that flashed through their mind at the mention of culture, so that their default views of culture can be understood without having to write lengthy definitions (Gray 2010).

Data Analysis

Being a systematic, cost-effective and unobtrusive technique for 'making replicable and valid inferences' from large quantities of text, content analysis was

employed in the current examination of the qualitative survey data (Berg, 2001; Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007; Krippendorp, 2004, p. 18). Firstly, two experts classified STs' adaptive preferences into one of the three constructs of *users*, *rejecters* and *adapters*. Then, we read through the whole data set thoroughly and repeatedly to identify the recurring patterns in each set of responses. After the initial coding of the data independently, we consolidated emergent categories into ten themes for the local extract (LE: instructiveness and life-likeness of the text, unrealistic characters, risks of student misconceptions and unnecessary controversy, lack of depth, limitedness of situations, stereotypical representations, potential for gender-awareness raising, lack of authenticity), and seven themes for the global extract (GE: topicality of the target culture, didactic effect of the text, wrong role models, unfamiliar characters, disturbing theme, value conflicts, potential for cultural-awareness raising).

Ultimately, the qualitative data from the survey was quantified by following these few steps in mixed-methods research: (i) the qualitative findings were summarised into simple statements, (ii) the occurrences of responses supporting these statements were entered into Excel, (iii) the quantitative data from their occurrences were descriptively analysed for frequencies and percentages, and (iv) the results from data transformation were tabulated to allow comparisons between data sets, reduce bias and promote reliability (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007; Creswell, 2009; Creswell, 2012; Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2008; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Silverman & Marvasti, 2008; Silverman, 2010; Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011). In addition to the quantification of qualitative data, the intercoder reliability was calculated as 0.92 for the survey data and 0.96 for the word associations, which meant that the desired level of reliability was attained (Miles & Huberman, 1994). For the validity of the analysis, we refined our initial findings after the participants checked the accuracy of our themes. Also, we provided: (i) a detailed description of the research context, (ii) key quotations and representative exemplars from the responses, as well as (iii) a faithful presentation of the raw data by keeping their language intact.

FINDINGS

STs' Preferred Mode of Adaptation

The first research question related to the preferred approach the participants adopted for treating culturally-inappropriate texts. Table 1 displays the distribution of STs' adaptive preferences in the face of the gendered and alienating extracts.

Table 1. The Distribution of STs' Adaptive Preferences

Type	LE		GE	
	f	**%**	**f**	**%**
Use	18	31	5	9
Drop	14	24	37	64
Adapt	26	45	16	27
Total	58	100	58	100

When asked about their ideas on the cultural content of LE, 18 of 58 STs (31%) in Table 1 stated that they felt comfortable about it, while 14 STs (24%) rejected the material, and the remaining 26 (45%), though finding it unfavourable, preferred to adapt it. When the same STs evaluated the cultural content of GE, the number of the participants that approved the material sharply decreased from 18 (31%) to 5 (9%). Interestingly, 37 STs (64%) liked to drop GE altogether, and another 16 (27%) might keep it only after some adjustments. Compared to LE, where 69% felt uncomfortable about the cultural content, the participants finding GE totally/partially inappropriate amount to 91%.

The reasons why these STs preferred to use, drop or adapt the materials were revealed in a further analysis of their responses below.

STs' Rationales for Adaptive Preferences

In response to the second research question, the participants were asked to justify their adaptive preferences. STs firstly evaluated the gendered content in LE, and self-reported reasons for their adaptive decisions were summarized in Table 2 below.

Table 2. STs' Self-Reported Reasons for Adaptive Decisions in LE

Reasons for using/dropping/adapting the text	f	%
The text is educational in that awareness of gender equality can be raised in students with traditional family backgrounds.	13	72
The text presents familiar figures with a real-life problem students may daily encounter in their home culture.	5	28
Use	18	100
The unrealistic portrayal of the characters may cause students to lose interest.	5	36
The text may confirm deep-rooted misconceptions about gender roles.	4	29
The text may cause debate among students with different family backgrounds.	3	21
The text lacks depth and reduces gender equality to sharing housework.	2	14
Drop	14	100
The setting is confined to the household and needs expanding into different situations to enhance the theme of gender equality.	8	31
Students can be provided with good role models if stereotypical characters are modified to better deliver the moral of the text.	8	31
The text can be exploited to motivate class discussions on gender roles and increase students' awareness of sexism.	8	31
The text is inauthentic in that it reflects a traditional Turkish family and needs supplementing with other cultures.	2	7
Adapt	26	100

It is evident from Table 2 that 13 out of 18 users (72%) found LE beneficial for raising students' consciousness of gender equality and building democratic families, where labour is distributed evenly: e.g. 'Women grown in a patriarchal society grow their kids according to it. When they find out all is equal, they will give up discriminating their kids' (ST10). Secondly, five of the users (28%) believed that students can easily relate to the real-life problems of the characters in LE. As put forward by ST9 and ST26, 'the couple is part of their life', and 'students will not feel weird about the conversation which can be experienced apparently in their lives between their parents'.

It can also be seen from Table 2 that of all the 14 rejecters, five (36%) argued that the story lacks credibility: 'whether you like it or not, indoor activities (cleaning) is the job of mother, and outdoor activities (earning money) is the job of father in Turkish culture' (ST6), and 'Turkish man NEVER APOLOGIZES!' (ST47). Therefore, they offered to replace the material with a more convincing demonstration of Turkish home life as in ST47's example, where the 'woman is back to her father's home' and gets a divorce.

According to Table 2, four rejecters (29%) pointed out that students have in-built conceptions of gender roles in Turkish society, which might get maintained by stereotypical characters. As 'the text includes typical Turkish family structure and imposes men's power and gender discrimination' (ST58), 'some can internalize negative aspects and effect their future life' (ST51). They suggested displaying egalitarian relationships at home and work with the help of a different text, where 'the couple is going shopping, preparing dinner, watching TV together, sharing what they did during the day' (ST51), or 'real women as mechanics, doctors, engineers with real men as nurses, babysitters, houseworkers' (ST1) can be seen.

Another three of the 14 rejecters (21%) were concerned that the text may cause unnecessary controversy and poor classroom management, as in ST38's response: 'Students can take sides, start an argument and I will have difficulty in controlling them'. Similarly, only two rejecters (14%) complained about LE's lack of depth. For instance, ST30 asserted, 'equality and sharing can be given to students in a better context, as it is not just about washing dishes, chopping onions'. For both reasons, these STs recommended changing the spousal relationship into a parental/sibling relationship and instructing students (as children) in equal division of labour (ST2, ST15, ST30).

Table 2 shows three equally-cited reasons (31%) for 26 STs' preference of adaptation. The first one concerns the restrictedness of the domestic area in exposing learners to different situations where men and women doing similar jobs converse about their achievements in life: 'It is not just about housework... gender equality should be integrated to all aspects of life like education, politics, business' (ST23). The second reason is about presenting good role models for teaching gender equality. 31% unanimously claimed the husband's refusal of help, abandonment of his wife, consultation with a male friend as well as her meekness in forgiveness may have a negative influence on learners, and must be modified by removing 'the advice part' (ST22) if 'especially boys' are to be influenced in the class (ST45).

From the perspective of another eight adapters (31%), LE's sexist flavour can be alleviated, if learners are led to: (1) 'find similarities and differences between their family life and text' (ST13), (2) 'tell who is making housework at home and if their fathers share work' (ST32), (3) 'say the right and wrong beliefs in text' (ST20), or (4) 'brainstorm what they would do if they were in their shoes' (ST17), and can thus be made aware of gender discrimination through discussing gender roles.

Finally, two STs (8%) preferred adaptation for the single reason that the text loses its authenticity, when it montages the target culture's values on the home

culture's stereotypes, while giving characters foreign names cannot save them from becoming parodies of the modern couple: 'The man watching football match and drinking tea in a small glass cup doesn't look realistic in terms of English speaking cultures… chopping onions to help his wife feels very cliché' (ST12). These respondents likewise considered adding examples from other countries (Britain) or of women doing men's work, and making comparisons between their parents and the given couple (ST4, ST12).

Secondly, STs evaluated the alienating content in GE, and Table 3 presents the frequency of the reasons with which they chose to use, drop or adapt the foreign material.

Table 3. STs' Self-Reported Reasons for Adaptive Decisions in GE

Reasons for using/dropping/adapting the text	f	%
The text is interesting in that students can learn about cultural norms and lifestyles of the target culture different from their own.	3	60
The text is educational in that students can learn life lessons from the characters' failures.	2	40
Use	5	100
The characters set a bad example to Turkish teenagers with their weak family bonds and unacceptable forms of behaviour.	28	76
Students cannot relate to the foreign characters and feel distant from the text.	6	16
The theme is disturbing in that students may feel discouraged and fearful of their own future.	3	8
Drop	37	100
Value conflicts can be resolved if more proper characters are added from home culture.	8	50
The text can be manipulated to promote cross-cultural comparisons in class discussions.	8	50
Adapt	16	100

It is clear from Table 3 that the five users of GE provided two main reasons. Three participants (60%) argued that the text is of inherent interest to learners, as it presents authentic information about the way of living in the target culture. GE's topicality, therefore, resides in cross-cultural differences (ST6: 'There is another world different from us. Students should realize what other people do in other cultures, learn other world'), and encounters with western values of modern life can also be inspiring for learners (ST56: 'Teenagers see how mobility affects a person's life and change their lifestyle in a positive way'). The other two users (40%) acknowledged the presence of the *laissez faire* family (ST24: 'They get bored, move out without thinking, go abroad, enjoy life… when problems appear, they become regretful'), but they hoped that life experiences in GE may get teenagers to understand the sad consequences of wrong decisions taken in youth (ST3: 'Such a condition [leaving home at 18] is invalid and not normal for parents in our culture and our kids can take a good lesson from this text').

As can be seen in Table 3, 28 of 37 rejecters (76%) fear Turkish teenagers will be adversely affected by the false ideals of the target culture. According to these rejecters, their *hedonistic* lifestyle and carefree attitude toward life may tempt our youth: 'They have no anxieties, no stress. These things are normal for them but

unsuitable for the young in Eastern countries. They feel like pressured and want to live the same, which may not suit their own cultures' (ST22). The threat of moral degeneration imposed by conflicting role models came to their attention: e.g. 'Turkish family structure don't tolerate living together without marrying' (ST1); '... parents don't forgive her [a girl moving in with her boyfriend] as it isn't moral in our community' (ST16). Another six rejecters (16%) warned that the characters sound unfamiliar and learners may not make connections with the text: 'Learners cannot see so free people in their families or environments, so they cannot personalize the text' (ST33). The final reason for rejection relates to the distasteful theme of GE. Three STs (8%) were worried that hopelessness may be evoked in students: 'They have failed in self-actualization and events they had may direct students to wrong directions' (ST21).

Eventually, the majority of rejecters agreed to keep the theme ('being twenty something'), but could not do without replacing bad examples, foreigners and pessimistic role models with more motivating, familiar, local characters acting in line with Turkish norms of social behaviour: e.g. 'To talk about how it feels being 20s, I will arrange Turkish guys whose lives are more acceptable for our culture' (ST15); 'Instead of boomerang kids, success stories of ideal examples, married with children, studied at university and has a job must be used' (ST37).

In Table 3, 16 adapters put forward two equally-weighted reasons for not abandoning GE. Eight adapters (50%) believed, even if the text reflects opposing values of the target culture, it can be retained after reasonable representatives are provided in the home culture. In ST10's own words, 'Our people cannot leave their house at 20 without study, job or marrying. There must be two more Turkish adolescents talking about university, efforts to find a job, marriage and military service'. Though being apprehensive about its cultural content, the other adapters (50%) recognized that the text can increase interaction and develop cross-cultural understanding. These adapters emphasized the facilitative potential of cross-cultural comparisons and offered to encourage participation in class discussions. In this way, ST31 commented: 'they become aware of their own culture and other cultures and improve their thinking with speaking skills'. Furthermore, two adapters decided to include cultures other than the target and home culture: e.g. 'Mehmet, 26, Turkey; Amir Khan, 24, India' (ST48).

STs' Tacit Theories of Culture

The third research question concentrated on STs' culture conceptions, and required eliciting their first three associations for the word, *culture*. The classification of their prototypical culture words into Byram and Risager's (1999) *four concepts of culture* produced the following results in Table 4.

Table 4. Categorisation of STs' Word Associations for Culture

Concept	Culture Words		Exemplars
	f	**%**	
A (Way of life, traditions)	42	24	daily life, distinctive customs, experience, interaction, interpersonal relationships, lifestyles, living style, social habits, traditions, way of life
B (Objective structure)	50	29	background, clothes, country, family, foods, generation, heritage, history, hometown, meals, society, time
C (Norms and values)	36	21	beliefs, ethic, framing matter, gender roles, morals, norms, point of view, religion, social rules, taboos, thoughts, values
D (Art, literature)	13	7	architecture, art, books, celebrities, cinema, folk dance, folklore, literature, music style
Other	33	19	assimilation, cultural shock, developing, differences, human, language, respect, transfer, transmitted
Total	**174**	**100**	

According to Table 4, 58 STs associated 174 words with culture during the brainstorming activity and more than half of these initial culture words belonged to the categories, A (%24) and B (%29), where culture is viewed either as 'people's way of life or traditions' or as 'the objective structures [they] live in, the social, political and economic institutions' (Byram & Risager, 1999, p. 85). 21% of all word associations related to the category C, where culture is interpreted as 'the norms or values characterising people's lives', whereas only 7% of these brainstormed words could be placed into the category D, where culture is understood as artistic life and products (Byram & Risager, 1999, p. 85). The majority of exemplars (74%) in Table 4 overlapped with the definitive descriptors in the first three categories, focusing on the habits, living conditions and attitudes of communities (Byram & Risager, 1999). These figures were also explanatory of STs' obvious sensitivity over appropriacy and comprehensibility of cultural content in English coursebooks because they primarily conceptualized culture as the embodiment of the average folks' habitual activities, common way of thinking and their current state of being rather than the high-brow culture of the arts.

33 word associations (%19), however, did not correspond to any one of these four categories, and 16 were alone taken up by the word, *language*. 'Human' (ST35, ST45) was the other inclusive term. This associative tendency for such all-embracing words for culture is indicative of STs' awareness that language and culture are inextricably intertwined products of society (as *human beings* living together). Another thematic word in the 'other' category was 'differences' and its variants like 'different countries', which was logically followed by the word, 'respect' (ST48). There were only a few STs that referred to important cultural phenomena like 'cultural transfer' (ST41) and 'cultural transmission' (ST17), while social problems like 'cultural assimilation, culture shock' (ST41, ST52) occurred to them as well, and were unsurprisingly accompanied by the names of the native-

speaking 'USA' and 'UK' (ST19). The emerging pattern of culture as different people in contact instantiated that STs were conscious of the natural consequences of cultural encounters along with the active agents of cultural diffusion. Finally, the dynamic aspect of culture was demonstrated with the attributes of 'current, developing, gradually improving' (ST17, ST21).

DISCUSSION

The analysis of STs' responses to culturally-explicit materials revealed that no matter what kind of coursebook was in use, over 50% of STs preferred to use it unchanged or delete it altogether, whereas chances of fixing the material were drastically diminished with the increasing opposition to foreign culture influence in the global coursebook. When their word associations were examined, the overwhelming majority (74%) were found to perceive culture as a set of daily habits, living conditions and values peculiar to a community, and therefore had a sociological sense of culture, which is in line with prior literature (Adamowski, 1991; Bayyurt, 2006; Lessard-Clouston, 1996).

Contrary to the general tendency of most coursebooks to immerse learners in the 'achievement culture' (history, geography, literature, art, music), these STs concentrated on the teaching of the 'behavior culture' (culturally-influenced beliefs and perceptions) (Tomalin & Stempleski, 1994, pp. 6-7). This finding stands in direct contrast to Byram and Risager's (1999) analysis of Danish and English teachers' culture definitions, where culture was understood in very general and uncontroversial terms, and to Gray's (2010, p. 149) study of five teachers' word associations, where their prototypical views of culture were more oriented towards 'high culture', 'popular culture', and 'the centrality of language'. STs' higher disapproval rate for the global material can thus be explained by the dominant socially-conditioned view of culture. Since they seemed to value family, home life, interpersonal relationships and customs more, they might have handled it with caution (Adaskou, Britten & Fahsi, 1990).

A closer analysis of their comments showed that users selected both materials for being educational and interesting. As selection involved using without changing, it was not even considered as a form of adaptation by McGrath (2013). Despite having similar motives, rejecters came up with proposals of change predominantly, while adapters made more use of addition. Rejecters demanded a total replacement of the sexist and threatening content by sanitizing conversations (socially acceptable or ideal norms induced) and converting interlocutory relationships (spousal>parental). However, adapters used omission to censor the undesirable parts of the domestic conversation and pictorial absurdities (in John's illustration, stereotyped as a traditional Turkish man). It sufficed for adapters to extend existing materials by providing different situations where learners can be engaged with aspirational role models and familiar relatable figures (adding conversations/texts about successful professionals or Turkish characters modelling cherished local values). The exploitation of the local context was motivated by STs'

willingness to encourage cross-cultural comparisons, as they proceeded with expansions in the form of class discussions, where learners are initiated to talk about their real life or try second-positioning (comparing division of domestic labour/lifestyles of 20-somethings in English and Turkish societies).

Therefore, a combination of *addition*, *omission* and *change* was identified as STs' preferred mode of adaptation like the previous studies on in-service teachers' coursebook practice (Çoban, 2001; Hutchinson & Torres, 1994; Richards, 1998; Richards & Mahoney, 1996; Tsobanoglou, 2008). Similarly, Yan's (2007) teacher trainees applied the trio of adding (group work), deleting (unnecessary grammar exercises) and modifying (texts into role-plays), though they were more evenly distributed in the current study.

Regardless of the origin, subject matter and skills-focus of the materials, two main reasons for adoption were foregrounded in user responses: didactic effect and relevance. The former related to the function of the materials to instruct learners morally on gender equality and unorthodox lifestyles, while the latter concerned the ability to correspond to learners' sociocultural background and interests. STs' urge to present learners with the homely/local and exotic/foreign settings might signify their awareness of the link between familiar schematic knowledge and improved foreign language learning as well as the greater inherent interest aroused by the target culture (Alptekin, 1993). Similarly, one Muslim teacher in Menkabu and Harwood's (2014) study expressed her opposition to deleting topics for cultural reasons in order to educate her medical students about the consequences of drinking and lifestyles of different societies, whereas another in Gray's (2010) study reported the death of a formerly engaging lesson (on women mechanics) after the context of instruction was shifted from Cairo to Barcelona.

In the case of the local material, three major concerns lie at the bottom of STs' rejection decision (24%): unrealistic representation of characters, fixation of false beliefs about gender roles and conflict avoidance. Firstly, the cartoonish portrayal of a compromising husband (under an English name but with Turkish manners) worried STs about losing relevance and learner interest. Likewise, Reimann (2009, p. 89) remarked on the artificiality of 'un-Japanese' characters with Japanese names, 'kiss[ing] in front of the university', whereas Melliti (2013) noted the dissonance between the realities of the local culture and such egalitarian representations of opposite sexes in EFL materials. Secondly, the possibility of their students as naive readers to internalise the sexist content caused the omission of the text. Ample support for such benign censorship was provided over thirty years ago by numerous studies of sexism in ELT materials. For instance, Hartman and Judd (1978) shunned similar illustrations of housework merely done by women, while Porreca (1984) warned against serious effects of exposure to sex bias and occupational stereotyping on learners' perceptions of future job possibilities. Thirdly, their fear of losing class control in a heated debate over sexism made them abandon the text. This conflict avoidance was similarly detected in Kızılaslan's (2010) study, where the majority of Turkish candidate teachers chose to pass over gendered texts due to their uneasiness with controversial topics.

However, STs' distress seems heightened by cultural inappropriacies of the global text about the boomerang generation in Western culture (64% rejecters). This finding was confirmed in Gray's (2000) research, where at least half of NESTs opted to censor the UK-produced material embodying alien cultural values like alcohol and teen promiscuity. Just as the text about Britain's drinking culture was rehabilitated for Muslim students by changing the situation from pub to school cafeteria in Gray's (2000) study, the individualistic, idle and liberal models of young people were here substituted with more down-to-earth counterparts from the students' own culture.

This censorship path taken by the majority in the present study had also been trialled in Adaskou et al.'s (1990) Morroccan textbook project, whereby over 50% of the characters were made Moroccan (mostly out of English-speaking students and young professionals without any serious flaws) so as to create a world Moroccan learners can aspire to. In the same way, some STs expressed their intentions of inculcating moral values and increasing mental engagement with the help of exemplary Turkish characters. In this study, *cultural localisation* (replacing 'culturally unfamiliar, alien or inappropriate elements with local equivalents') might have been commonly practised due to STs' lack of experience and knowledge in teaching culture or its relative ease of use compared to other adaptation techniques (McGrath, 2013, p. 67). But this *nativisation* solution had been criticised for being authoritarian, unrealistic and claustrophobic, as teachers have to make judgments for students, remove the negative content possibly with interesting information as well, and therefore, usurp both the right to contact the world outside and their means for self-defence (Alptekin, 2002; Hyde, 1994; McGrath, 2013).

Despite their good intentions, rejecters were not aware that neutral materials can be rather artificial, 'bland', 'boring' and 'unengaging', while provoking topics can serve teachers well in: 'stimulat[ing] an affective response', questioning cultural stereotypes and facilitating learning (Banegas, 2011, p. 80; Saraceni, 2007, p. 78; Tomlinson, 2001, 2012, p. 162; Wandel, 2003). Unlike rejecters that forsook the topicality of gender stereotypes and premarital cohabitation for Turkish students' perceived sensitivities, a small circle of adapters in each case accurately identified the communicative potential of cross-cultural comparisons for class discussions.

As they preferred 'explicitly confronting the foreign culture' over filtering the cultural content (Hyde, 1994, p. 304), these few STs amended problematic materials by adding elements of native, target and even other foreign cultures, and getting students to compare and contrast *their* way of living with *ours* (asking how household chores are shared in their homes and what kind of life 20-somethings lead in Turkey). Zacharias (2005), too, found that instead of discussing the dating system in English-speaking countries as dictated by the coursebook, one teacher compared theirs with the local, while the others extended pre-speaking activities by questioning Indonesian practice of apologizing and using L1 examples. In Menkabu and Harwood's (2014, p. 162) analysis of seven teachers' adaptation methods at a Saudi Arabian university, four teachers similarly discussed the differences between societies, unlike the rest deleting 'culturally or religiously alien' topics like

smoking, alcohol and sex. In this way, adapters show their willingness to: (1) build 'conceptual bridges' between the cultures learners are born and entering into, (2) interpret the culturally unfamiliar through the universal lens of 'human experience', (3) reduce alienation by creating a third place, and (4) eventually promote cross-cultural comprehension and awareness (Alptekin, 1993, pp. 141-142; Kramsch, 2010; McGrath, 2013).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It can be concluded from the analysis of their elicited opinions on local and global materials that stereotypical, irrelevant and culturally-inappropriate content gave the sociologically-minded candidate teachers major discomfort, and their adaptive decisions were primarily characterized by either selection or abandonment. The immediate benefits adapters saw in the two texts involved abolishing gender stereotypes, raising cultural awareness and enlivening classroom discussions through provocative topics and cross-cultural comparisons. It was not undertaken to explain why adapting could not be the mainstream technique opted by pre-service teachers in approaching culture-loaded materials. Possible causes, worthy of further research, might include their lack of knowledge and practice in materials adaptation and culture teaching, supposed convenience of deletion and replacement, apprenticeship of observation or professional inexperience, and self-doubt. It was also beyond the scope of this study to investigate the effects of special training on their observed performances of adaptation.

To a great extent, the fault seems to lie with *pre-service textbook education* because (1) teacher-training programmes undervalue materials development and evaluation, (2) they either banish textbooks for their inability to meet learner needs or worship them as useful resources for inexperienced teachers, and hence (3) neglect to familiarize teacher trainees with processes of textbook pedagogy (how to use, access and adapt texts) (Canniveng & Martinez, 2007; Horsley, 2007; Harwood, 2014; McGrath, 2013; Richards, 2001b). Given that the previous efforts to develop culturally-diverse materials have remained 'largely cosmetic', and most EFL coursebooks reflect biased worldviews, using them in a culturally-responsive way gains importance for teachers to avoid 'cultural estrangement' and resultant demotivation of learners (Canagarajah, 1993, p. 615; Pulverness, 2007, p. 427; Shin, Eslami & Chen, 2011; Song, 2013). Yet, most teachers – though being aware and sick of their limitations – adhere to culturally-problematic materials and refrain from compensating for them by reason of: time, resource, institutional constraints and heavy workloads, or due to: the prestige of foreign publications, comfort of curriculum delivery, and teacher ambivalence about integrating language and culture (Çakır, 2010; Çelik & Erbay, 2013; Davcheva & Sercu, 2005; Forman, 2014; Luk, 2012; Shawer, Gilmore & Joseph, 2009).

Consequently, the following measures may add up to a thorough revision of course contents in teacher education programmes, but they should be taken if the desired type of teacher is a critical textbook consumer – one not *impulsively*

adopting (sharing his closet with a skeleton) or *abandoning* (throwing it away), but *carefully adapting* the textbook (teaching it to dance). It is recommended that student teachers should: (1) have a good command of the learner and target culture with critical reading skills to keep their radar tuned for cultural incongruities in school texts, (2) master varied adaptation strategies through: continual exposure to current coursebooks, trialling of adapted materials under the (co-)supervision of their teacher trainer and cooperating teacher, and reflection on their *glocalization* of coursebooks (appropriating materials to local and global contexts) via learner responses, and also (3) develop a rich repertoire of task-oriented activities, from which they can freely select and apply to promote learner awareness of the target, source, and hopefully international cultures.

REFERENCES

Adamowski, E. (1991). What does teaching culture mean? In J. Sivell & L. Curtis (Eds.), *TESOL'90: Reading into the future* (pp. 64-75). Toronto: TESL Ontario.

Adaskou, K., Britten, D., & Fahsi, B. (1990). Design decisions on the cultural content of a secondary English course for Morocco. *ELT Journal*, *44*(1), 3-10. DOI: 10.1093/elt/44.1.3

Alptekin, C. (1993). Target-language culture in EFL materials. *ELT Journal, 47*(2), 136-143. DOI: 10.1093/elt/47.2.136

Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal, 56*(1), 57-64. DOI: 10.1093/elt/56.1.57

Banegas, D. L. (2011). Teaching more than English in secondary education. *ELT Journal, 65*(1), 80-82. DOI: 10.1093/elt/ccq016

Bayyurt, Y. (2006). Non-native English language teachers' perspectives on culture in English as foreign language classrooms. *Teacher Development, 10*(2), 233-247. DOI: 10.1080/13664530600773366

Berg, B. L. (2001). *Qualitative research methods for social sciences*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

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. Retrieved on January 23, 2016 from: https://etd.ohiolink.edu/

Byram, M., & Risager, K. (1999). *Language teachers, politics and cultures*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1993). Critical ethnography of a Sri Lankan classroom: Ambiguities in opposition to reproduction through ESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, *27*(4), 601–626. DOI: 10.2307/3587398

Canniveng, C., & Martinez, M. (2007). Materials development and teacher training. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp. 479-489). New York: Continuum.

Ciambrone, D. (2004). Anonymity. In M. S. Lewis-Beck, A. Bryman & T. F. Liao (Eds.), *The Sage encyclopedia of social science research methods* (pp. 18-19). California: Sage Publications.

Council of Higher Education. (2007). Eğitim fakültesi öğretmen yetiştirme lisans programları [Undergraduate programs for teacher education]. Retrieved on May 18, 2016 from: http://www.yok.gov.tr/web/guest/icerik/-/journal_content/56_INSTANCE_rEHF8BIsfYRx/10279/49875

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design*: *Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches.* California: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston: Pearson.

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

Çakır, İ. (2010). The frequency of culture-specific elements in the ELT coursebooks at elementary schools in Turkey. *Novitas-ROYAL, 4*(2), 182-189.

Çelik, S., & Erbay, Ş. (2013). Cultural perspectives of Turkish ELT coursebooks: Do standardized teaching texts incorporate intercultural features? *Education & Science, 38*(167), 336-351.

Çoban, Z. (2001). *Experienced and novice English language teachers' use of textbook adaptation strategies at Gazi University* (Unpublished master's thesis). Bilkent University, Ankara. Retrieved on January 20, 2016 from: http://www.thesis.bilkent.edu.tr/0001837.pdf

Davcheva, L., & Sercu, L. (2005). Culture in foreign language teaching materials. In M. Byram & A. Phipps (Eds.), *Foreign language teachers and intercultural competence: An international investigation* (pp. 90-109). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

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.

Durmaz, E. H. (2013). *Forward English student's book 8*. Ankara: A Yayınları.

Forman, R. (2014). How local teachers respond to the culture and language of a global English as a foreign language textbook. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *27*(1), 72-88. DOI: 10.1080/07908318.2013.868473

Garcia, M. C. M. (2005). International and intercultural issues in English teaching textbooks: The case of Spain. *Intercultural Education, 16*(1), 57-68. DOI: 10.1080/14636310500061831

Garton, S., & Graves, K. (2014a). Materials in ELT: Current issues. In S. Garton & K. Graves (Eds.), *International perspectives on materials in ELT* (pp. 1-15). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Garton, S., & Graves, K. (2014b). Identifying a research agenda for language teaching materials. *The Modern Language Journal*, *98*(2), 654-657. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2014.12094.x

Graves, K. (2000). *Designing language courses: A guide for teachers*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Gray, J. (2000). The ELT coursebook as cultural artefact: How teachers censor and adapt. *ELT Journal*, *54*(3), 274-283. DOI: 10.1093/elt/54.3.274

Gray, J. (2002). The global coursebook in English language teaching. In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and language teaching* (pp. 151-167). London: Routledge.

Gray, J. (2010). *The construction of English.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Grossman, P., & Thompson, C. (2008). Learning from curriculum materials: Scaffolds for new teachers? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*, 2014-2026. DOI: 10.1016/j.tate.2008.05.002

Guerrettaz, A. M., & Johnston, B. (2013). Materials in the classroom ecology. *The Modern Language Journal*, *97*(3), 779-796. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2013.12027.x

Guerrettaz, A. M., & Johnston, B. (2014). A response: The concept of the classroom ecology and the roles of teachers in materials use. *The Modern Language Journal*, *98*(2), 671-672. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2014.12094.x

Hartman, P. L., & Judd, E. L. (1978). Sexism and TESOL materials. *TESOL Quarterly, 12*(4), 383-393. DOI: 10.2307/3586137

Harwood, N. (2014). Content, consumption, and production: Three levels of textbook research. In N. Harwood (Ed.), *English language teaching textbooks* (pp. 1-41). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hesse-Biber, S. N., & Leavy, P. (2008*). Handbook of emergent methods*. New York: Guilford Press.

Horsley, M. (2007). Textbooks, teaching and learning materials and teacher education. In M. Horsley & J. McCall (Eds.), *Ninth international conference on textbooks and educational media* (pp. 249-260). Hogskolen: IARTEM.

Hutchinson, E. G. (1996). *What do teachers and learners actually do with textbooks? Teacher and learner use of a fisheries-based ELT textbook in the Philippines* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Lancaster University, Lancaster. Retrieved April 21, 2016 from: http://ethos.bl.uk/OrderDetails.do?uin=uk.bl.ethos.337343

Hutchinson, T., & Torres, E. (1994). The textbook as agent of change. *ELT Journal, 48*(4), 315-328. DOI: 10.1093/elt/48.4.315

Hyde, M. (1994). The teaching of English in Morocco: The place of culture. *ELT Journal, 48*(4), 295-305. DOI: 10.1093/elt/48.4.295

Islam, C., & Mares, C. (2007). Adapting classroom materials. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp. 86-100). London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Kızılaslan, İ. (2010). Student teachers' perceptions of gendered texts in English language textbooks. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2*(2), 3528-3531. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.546

Kramsch, C. (2010). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krippendorp, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology.* California: Sage Publications.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2014). It's about time. *The Modern Language Journal*, *98*(2), 665-666. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2014.12094.x

Le, M. T. (2011). *The reception of new language materials: A case study evaluation of an EFL textbook in Vietnamese high schools* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Macquarie University, Sydney.

Lee, R. N. F., & Bathmaker, A. (2007). The use of English textbooks for teaching English to vocational students in Singapore secondary schools. *RELC Journal*, *38*(3), 350-374. DOI: 10.1177/0033688207085852

Lessard-Clouston, M. (1996). Chinese teachers' views of culture in their EFL learning and teaching. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 9*(3), 197-223. DOI: 10.1080/07908319609525231

Littlejohn, A. (2011). The analysis of language teaching materials: Inside the Trojan horse. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 179-211). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Luk, J. (2012). Teachers' ambivalence in integrating culture with EFL teaching in Hong Kong. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *25*(3), 249-264. DOI: 10.1080/07908318.2012.716849

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.* London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Medgyes, P. (1994). *The non-native teacher.* London: Macmillan.

Melliti, M. (2013). Global content in global coursebooks: The way issues of inappropriacy, inclusivity and connectedness are treated in Headway intermediate. *Sage Open, 3*(4), 1-12. DOI: 10.1177/2158244013507265

Menkabu, A., & Harwood, N. (2014). Teachers' conceptualization and use of the textbook on a medical English course. In N. Harwood (Ed.), *English language teaching textbooks* (pp. 145-177). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Miles, B. M., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis.* California: Sage Publications.

Moulton, J. (1997). *How do teachers use textbooks? A review of the research literature.* Washington, DC: SD Publication Series.

Pelly, C. P., & Allison, D. (2000). Investigating the views of teachers on assessment of English language learning in the Singapore education system. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics, 5*(1), 81-107.

Porreca, K. L. (1984). Sexism in current ESL textbooks. *TESOL Quarterly, 18*(4), 705-724. DOI: 10.2307/3586584

Prodromou, L. (1999). How to be a boring teacher. *English Teaching Professional*, *12*, 16-18.

Prodromou, L. (2002). The great ELT textbook debate. *Modern English Teacher, 11*(4), 25-33.

Pulverness, A. (2007). Materials for cultural awareness. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp. 426-438). New York: Continuum.

Ravelonanahary, M. (2007). The use of textbooks and educational media: The Malagasy experience. In M. Horsley & J. McCall (Eds.), *Ninth international conference on textbooks and educational media* (pp. 166-175). Hogskolen: IARTEM.

Reimann, A. (2009). A critical analysis of cultural content in EFL materials. *Utsunomiya University Journal of the Faculty of International Studies, 28*(8), 85-101.

Richards, J. C. (1998). *Beyond training: Perspectives on language teacher education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (2001a). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (2001b). The role of textbooks in a language program. *RELC Guidelines*, *23*(2), 12-16.

Richards, J., & Mahoney, D. (1996). Teachers and textbooks: A survey of beliefs and practices. *Perspectives: Working Papers*, *8*(1), 40-61.

Sampson, N. (2009). *Teaching materials and the autonomous language teacher: A study of tertiary English teachers in Hong Kong* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong. Retrieved April 21, 2016 from: http://hdl.handle.net/10722/56640

Saraceni, C. (2007). Adapting courses: A critical view. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing materials for language teaching* (pp. 72-85). New York: Continuum.

Savova, L. (2009). Textbook use as part of the ESOL classroom ecosystem: Teaching the students, not the book. In L. Savova (Ed.), *Using textbooks effectively* (pp. 1-7). Washington, DC: TESOL.

Shawer, S. F., Gilmore, D., & Joseph, S. B. (2009). Learner-driven EFL curriculum development at the classroom level. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 20*(2), 125-143.

Shawer, S. F. (2010). Classroom-level curriculum development: EFL teachers as curriculum-developers, curriculum-makers and curriculum-transmitters. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*, 173-184. DOI: 10.1016/j.tate.2009.03.015

Shin, J., Eslami, Z. R., & Chen, W. (2011). Presentation of local and international culture in current international English-language teaching textbooks. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *24*(3), 253-268. DOI: 10.1080/07908318.2011.614694

Silverman, D. (2010). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook*. London: Sage Publications.

Silverman, D., & Marvasti, A. (2008). *Doing qualitative research: A comprehensive guide*. California: Sage Publications.

Skierso, A. (1991). Textbook selection and evaluation. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 432-453). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Soars, J., & Soars, L. (2012). *New Headway pre-intermediate student's book* (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Song, H. (2013). Deconstruction of cultural dominance in Korean EFL textbooks. *Intercultural Education*, *24*(4), 382-390. DOI: 10.1080/14675986.2013.809248

Studolsky, S. (1989). Is teaching really by the book? In P. W. Jackson & S. Haroutunian-Gordon (Eds.), *From Socrates to software: The teacher as text and the text as teacher* (pp. 159-1849). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sunderland, J., Cowley, M., Rahim, F. A., Leontzakou, C., & Shattuck, J. (2001). From bias 'in the text' to 'teacher talk around the text': An exploration of teacher discourse and gendered foreign language textbook texts. *Linguistics and Education*, *11*(3), 251-286. DOI: 10.1016/S0898-5898(00)00034-6

Tomalin, B., & Stempleski, S. (1994). *Cultural awareness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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. (2010). Published research on materials development for language learning. In B. Tomlinson & H. Masuhara (Eds.), *Research for materials development in language learning* (pp. 1-18). London: Continuum.

Tomlinson, B. (2011). Comments on part c. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Materials development in language teaching* (pp. 296-300). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tomlinson, B. (2012). Materials development for language learning and teaching. *Language Teaching, 45*(2), 143-179. DOI: 10.1017/S0261444811000528

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.

Wandel, R. (2003). Teaching India in the EFL-classroom: A cultural or an intercultural approach? In M. Byram & P. Grundy (Eds.), *Context and culture in language teaching and learning* (pp. 72-80). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Woods, D. (1996). *Teacher cognition in language teaching: Beliefs, decision-making and classroom practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Woodward, A. (1993). Introduction: Learning from textbooks. In B. K. Britton, A. Woodward & M. Binkley (Eds.), *Learning from textbooks: Theory and practice*, (pp. vii-x). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Yan, C. (2007). Investigating English teachers' materials adaptation. *Humanising Language Teaching, 9*(4). Retrieved May 20, 2016 from: http://www.hltmag.co.uk/jul07/mart01.htm

Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2011). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri.* Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Zacharias, N. T. (2005). Teachers' beliefs about internationally-published materials: A survey of tertiary English teachers in Indonesia. *RELC Journal, 36*(1), 23-37. DOI: 10.1177/0033688205053480

Appendix A. Local Extract

Abby asked for help from her husband, John. John refused her request and Abby got angry with him. Abby: John, can you help me with the washing? I've just cleaned the bathroom and now, I'm busy with the dusting. It's not fair, John. John: I'm sorry, Abby but I can't because I am watching an excellent football match on TV. Abby: I've already done the shopping, made the beds, made the breakfast, done the washing since we woke up, but you haven't done anything. You're only sitting there and watching TV. Please, turn off the TV and do the washing-up.

John left home and went to a café... Mac gave him a piece of advice... John came back home and he apologized to Abby. After that, he expressed his gratitude to Abby. John: Abby, I am really sorry. I know I was wrong. You don't have to do all the housework alone. Abby: No matter, darling. Can you help me with the cooking? Please, chop the onions. John: Abby, thank you very much. You're very kind. I'm very lucky to have a nice wife like you.

Appendix B. Global Extract

Leo, 28: … I'm 28 and I don't feel grown up at all. I have a great life - a good job, lots of friends, I go out with them most nights. I go to the gym every morning. I'm going to buy a flat by the river next year. Maybe when I'm in my 30s I'll get married…

Elsa, 26: … the more I studied law the more I hated it… so I decided to give it all up and go travelling… I went to Australia, New Zealand… but then I arrived back home. I was now 24 and with no money, no job, and nowhere to live. I moved back with mum and dad… they don't make me pay rent... I've got a boyfriend but we're not thinking of getting married…

Dan, 24: When I left home at 18 I thought that was it – 'Goodbye mum and dad'… I moved into a flat with some friends… I couldn't afford the rent for the flat, so here I am, back with mum and dad. They call us the 'boomerang kids'… You can't grow up when you're still at home with your parents. I'm fed up.

Appendix C. Survey Questions

(1) What do you think about the cultural content in the given extracts?

(2) What will you do with each: a) use it as the coursebook suggests, b) drop it altogether, or c) adapt it in some way? Give your reasons, and if (c), briefly explain what you will do.