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Abstract

Three EFL classrooms in primary schools in Greece were introduced to dyslexia friendly practices so as to explore whether dyslexic pupils’ inclusion was enhanced. The aim of this study was to investigate the impact of the dyslexia friendly practices on dyslexic and non-dyslexic EFL pupils’ performance and motivation. EFL teachers’ experiences of the introduction of the dyslexia friendly practices were also explored. Classroom observations, focus groups and teacher and pupil interviews before and during the introduction of the dyslexia friendly practices were conducted. A personal research diary was kept throughout the whole study. It was shown that, the dyslexia friendly practices enhanced dyslexic EFL pupils’ participation in classroom activities and increased their motivation towards learning English. However, less visible changes were shown in their performance. In contrast to the dyslexic EFL pupils, most of their non-dyslexic peers showed improvements in both their motivation and performance. All three EFL teachers experienced positively the introduction of the dyslexia friendly practices while the need for more training on dyslexia was highlighted. These findings indicate that the dyslexia friendly practices enhance inclusion for dyslexic pupils in foreign language education and have positive effects on all classroom pupils and the teachers’ practice. This study contributes to the field of language teaching for dyslexic pupils and suggests a need for more studies on dyslexia support in foreign, second and additional language learning contexts.
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1 Introduction

The area of dyslexia has attracted a lot of attention in the past twenty years (Squires, 2012). Research in the field of dyslexia has shed light on the difficulties that dyslexic pupils face. However, most studies on dyslexia are concerned with literacy skills in children’s first language and tend to ignore pupils who learn additional, foreign or second languages. Similarly, language-learning theorists have so far overlooked the presence of pupils with difficulties in language classrooms. Further developments in both of these areas are needed to enable dyslexic language learners to access the language curriculum. The present study examines the inclusion of dyslexic pupils in language education. This is accomplished through the introduction of dyslexia-friendly practices (MacKay, 2004) in classrooms where English is taught as a Foreign Language (EFL). The aim is to remove the barriers to learning for dyslexic EFL learners and provide recommendations for dyslexic pupils' inclusion in language learning contexts.
This chapter introduces the reader to this study and aims to present briefly the following chapters of this thesis. An overview of the literature that guided this study is discussed along with the study’s research questions. The study’s rationale, challenges and contribution to knowledge are also presented.

1.1 Dyslexia and language learning: the research to date

The present project stems from an interest in responding to learner diversity in language education. It is common for teachers to deal with different learners (Ainscow et al., 2006). Although teaching a classroom means treating pupils as a group, there is the need for teachers to be aware of their pupils’ individual characteristics when they are planning their lessons: teachers “are expected to show a range of skills in differentiating work for pupils” (Smeets & Mooij, 2001, p.440) and account for their pupils’ personality, family, linguistic and cultural background to help everyone to access the curriculum (ibid). However, apart from social, family and personality issues, pupils differ in terms of how they process information. Some manage this well, while others are confronted with difficulties. Due to neurological problems, some children have profound disabilities such as hearing, visual and movement impairment, while others need special adaptations in their everyday life and in school. Other pupils have difficulties only with the learning process, which usually stem from neurological or environmental issues, or a combination of the two. For this category of pupils, countries such as Britain and Greece
usually adopt the umbrella term 'Specific Learning Difficulties' (SpLD, e.g. dyslexia, dyspraxia, ADHD, Asperger's syndrome).

Students with SpLD in mainstream schools usually lag behind their peers. Problems in comprehending mathematics (e.g. dyscalculia), hyperactivity (e.g. ADHD) or reading and spelling difficulties (e.g. dyslexia) hinder SpLD pupils' school progress and negatively affect their personal and social development. The present study focuses on dyslexia, a specific learning difficulty mainly associated with literacy skills (e.g. reading, spelling).

Dyslexia is a field that has been widely researched. When the term 'dyslexia' was first introduced, it was considered a medical problem stemming from genetic factors. The term 'word-blindness' would refer to children's problems with letters and words (e.g. Orton, 1937). In 1968, the World Federation of Neurology offered a definition of dyslexia, which presented it as a persistent reading disorder, despite "conventional instruction, adequate intelligence and sociocultural opportunity" (Critchley, 1970 as cited in Snowling, 2000, p. 15). However, the medical view of dyslexia started to fade in the 1980's, when the British Medical Association stated that dyslexia is an educational matter (Ott, 1997).

Nowadays, dyslexia is viewed as a difficulty that affects reading and spelling skills. A range of disciplines (e.g. psychiatry, biology, neurophysiology, educational psychology) have investigated dyslexia and have pointed towards the biological (brain functions), psychological (e.g. motivation) and social components (e.g. educational environment) of dyslexic pupils' difficulties. The two main views of
dyslexia (causal, social) are discussed in the literature review section and are associated with the environmental adaptations that dyslexic pupils need.

Researchers’ debates about dyslexia have contributed to our knowledge of dyslexic pupils’ characteristics (Armstrong & Squires, 2015). This information is valuable for educationalists, since an awareness of dyslexia is the prerequisite for the provision of effective learning opportunities for dyslexic pupils. However, the difficulties that learners with dyslexia demonstrate are shaped by the nature and the task demands of the various school subjects. Therefore, teachers need to modify these demands in order to help dyslexic pupils to access the curriculum. Since dyslexia mainly refers to literacy and sometimes language problems, dyslexic learners are likely to struggle considerably in language classes (Schwarz, 2007). These difficulties appear regardless of whether the context is monolingual, bilingual or foreign/additional/second language education.

Assessing dyslexia in bilingual or multilingual learners is an intricate process due to various factors (e.g. individual learner profiles, educational background, language variability). The research on this area has shown that dyslexic learners find it challenging to learn a foreign, second or additional language due to their literacy difficulties (Frederickson & Frith, 1998; Sparks et al., 1989; Ganschow et al., 1998), and new visual learning demands (e.g. a new language system) (Brunswick, 2012) will hamper their acquisition of language skills. However, education systems tend to overlook learner diversity. The latter, in combination with the empowerment of some
languages over others (e.g. English), are factors that hinder dyslexic language learners’ development (Martin, 2013). Furthermore, dyslexic language learners’ difficulties pose challenges to language teachers who are required to respond to dyslexic learners’ needs and help them to compensate for their difficulties.

In the International Consultation on Early Childhood Education and Special Educational needs (UNESCO, 1997), it is argued that teachers should receive training and gain practical experience to be able to move towards more inclusive practice for children with difficulties. However, in many education systems, this rarely happens with mainstream teachers (Garner, 2001) or subject teachers (Peer & Reid, 2001). Although, in recent years, several studies have examined the fields of dyslexia inclusion and language education (e.g. Deponio et al., 2000; Martin, 2013), the research in this area still remains sparse. The latter, in combination with the lack of training for language teachers, limits the opportunities for dyslexic pupils’ inclusion in language classes. The inequality that is created for dyslexic pupils in language education conflicts with the comparatively high value that today’s society assigns to foreign or second language learning. The latter is specifically important for world languages like English; in many school systems around the world, English language classes are considered essential parts of the curriculum. Dyslexic learners are likely to face difficulties when learning English as a Second (ESL), or Foreign Language (EFL), given that “English conjures up accuracy in spelling, writing and reading – the things with which most dyslexics have experienced difficulty in their day-to day

---

1 Learning English in an English-speaking country
2 Learning English in a non-English speaking country
life” (Turner & Pughe, 2003, p. 2). The same applies to dyslexic pupils who migrate to English-speaking countries such as the UK and for whom English is an Additional Language (EAL). Studies on students with dyslexia in ESL/EFL contexts have shown that dyslexic pupils are challenged in the processes of English language learning. Problems with literacy (Helland & Kaasa, 2005), perception (Lescano, 1995) and articulation (Yamada, 2004) limit dyslexic EFL/ESL pupils’ opportunities for language development, since this group faces difficulties “in accessing this field of globalization” (Helland & Kaasa, 2005, p. 42) that English language learning represents.

The studies on dyslexia differentiation in ESL/EFL/EAL contexts have so far been limited (Kormos & Kontra, 2008; Martin 2013) and the field of language teaching to dyslexic pupils needs to be further researched. EFL/ESL/EAL teachers receive inadequate training on learning difficulties and often feel frustrated or insecure in supporting dyslexic learners. These factors, along with the lack of resources in some schools, often result in the withdrawal of dyslexic pupils from English language classes.

Further research on dyslexic pupils’ inclusion in the context of EFL/ESL/EAL learning is warranted. This can be accomplished through teacher training on dyslexia, curriculum adaptations and classroom-based interventions. The area of dyslexia support in language education needs to be enriched with practices that remove the barriers to learning for dyslexic pupils (e.g. dyslexia-friendly) and support them in the language learning process. What is more, language teachers’ views of inclusion need to be explored, since their attitudes impact on inclusive attempts (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002).
Given that the term 'inclusion' mainly refers to the teaching of all pupils (dyslexic and non-dyslexic) in mainstream contexts, there is a need to examine the effects of inclusion on non-dyslexic language learners. Although it has been proposed that dyslexia inclusion approaches are beneficial for all pupils (dyslexic and non-dyslexic) (see Turner & Pughe, 2003), little empirical evidence has supported this claim.

1.2 The present study: Dyslexia and English language teaching

This study addresses inclusive education in the context of English language teaching. The aim is to develop an inclusive framework for dyslexic pupils who learn English as a Foreign Language. For this reason, an intervention study was designed in which inclusive practices for dyslexic pupils were introduced in Greek EFL education. Due to the lack of inclusion practices for mainstream classrooms in the Greek context, practices were 'borrowed' from UK education. The dyslexia-friendly practices (MacKay, 2004) were selected because they have a mainstream nature and are suggested to have positive effects on both dyslexic and non-dyslexic pupils (MacKay, 2004; BDA, 2005). Based on this claim, their effects are explored with a focus on dyslexic and non-dyslexic pupils' motivation and performance. The EFL teachers who took part in this study first received resources on dyslexia (Appendix 1) to gain (further) knowledge of dyslexic pupils' difficulties. Later, they were asked to employ the dyslexia-friendly practices in their classrooms (Appendix 2). As such, their experiences of these processes (training, using new practices) were
also addressed. The research questions for this study were guided by these three themes (performance, motivation, experience).

1.3 Research Questions

The Research Questions of this study are:

1. How do dyslexia-friendly practices affect dyslexic EFL learners’:
   a. motivation towards learning English?
   b. performance in English language tasks?

2. How do dyslexia-friendly practices affect non-dyslexic EFL learners’:
   a. motivation towards learning English?
   b. performance in English language tasks?

3. How do EFL teachers experience the introduction of dyslexia-friendly practices in their classrooms?

The first and the second research questions were established at the beginning of this study. However, the third research question was added shortly before I started my data collection, when I started providing the EFL teachers with resources on dyslexia. Literature suggests that teachers’ attitudes and beliefs determine whether inclusive practices will be successful or not (Norwich, 1994). This was shown during the project, since EFL teachers’ experiences (thoughts, beliefs, views, feelings, commitment) of the articles on dyslexia they received and of using the dyslexia-friendly practices impacted on the process of developing inclusion for dyslexic EFL pupils. Although
previous studies have examined teachers’ views of inclusion (Vlachou & Barton, 1994), few have explored language teachers’ experiences of developing dyslexia support in language classrooms. In this project, the Greek EFL teachers who took part in the study were firstly advised to participate in training on dyslexia and later select dyslexia-friendly practices to employ in their classroom. Therefore, the use of the dyslexia-friendly practices was dependent on the EFL teachers’ attitudes towards the intervention and how their experiences were put into practice. This lead to the creation of a third research question that addressed the teachers’ views, attitudes, beliefs and feelings towards developing a more welcoming environment for the EFL pupils with dyslexia. The way in which these attitudes, beliefs and feelings were translated into action was also explored.

The research questions were designed to explore whether the dyslexia-friendly practices enhance inclusion in Greek EFL education. This was addressed in reference to three themes: motivation, performance, and experiences. The project was divided into two parts: before and during the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices (pre-intervention stage, intervention stage), as the teachers received resources on dyslexia at the beginning of the project. These practices were introduced into the EFL classrooms for seven weeks, while the whole project lasted twelve weeks (three months). Through the use of qualitative methods (see Methodology chapter), I investigated how the dyslexia-friendly practices ‘worked’ in the Greek EFL context and whether they were ‘friendly’ for all classroom learners (dyslexic and non-dyslexic) and for EFL teachers.
If the results indicate that these practices had positive effects on all pupils' (dyslexic and non-dyslexic) motivation and performance and were experienced positively by the teachers, it means that dyslexic pupils' inclusion in these Greek EFL classrooms was increased (the study's aim) resulting in positive outcomes for the EFL pupils and their teachers.

This study contributes to the field of dyslexia and language teaching since, if the dyslexia-friendly practices are found to enhance inclusion, they might be promoted in other language contexts. In this study, I provide a detailed discussion of attempting inclusion in EFL education (see Data Analysis & Discussion chapters) and describe the extent to which the dyslexia-friendly practices are affected by contextual characteristics (EFL classrooms, the Greek education system). This will inform future studies in language education that might attempt to employ the dyslexia-friendly practices in their own contexts. The study explores the process of developing inclusion through the use of practices from another context (the UK) and enhances the circulation of inclusive practice among different education systems. Nevertheless, if the practices do not produce the anticipated positive results, the reasons for this will be explored (see Data Analysis chapter) and discussed (see Discussion chapter) and recommendations for future studies will be offered.

1.4 Three perspectives: teachers, pupils, researcher

The elements of pupils' motivation and performance were addressed due to their significance to the learning process and their cyclical relationship (Ushioda, 1996; Dörnyei & Ottó, 1996). In this study,
performance refers to pupils' academic performance in English language tasks (e.g. reading tasks, writing tasks). Performance was explored with teacher interviews, a review of some of the pupils' assessment tools and classroom observations. The exploration of pupils' performance was influenced by the A2 criteria for English language learning (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, Council of Europe) and by the guidelines given by the Hellenic Ministry of Education for EFL learners at the last two classes of primary school (MNER, 1991) (see Methodology chapter).

Motivation is a term that describes the pupils' feelings and attitudes towards learning and other factors (see the Literature review and Methodology chapters) and is equally significant to performance; both of these elements significantly influence learners' educational progress. However, motivation is an intricate matter for pupils with dyslexia, due to their low self-related beliefs (e.g. self-esteem) caused by their difficulties (Humphrey, 2003; Riddick, 2009). Given that the dyslexia-friendly practices aim to develop a 'feel-good factor' for dyslexic pupils (BDA, 2005), dyslexic learners' self-related beliefs (see Literature Review chapter) were explored not in isolation but in reference to other affective factors (e.g. learners' anxiety). In the present study, these factors were put under the umbrella term 'motivation'. The 'borrowing' of different motivational theories (Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Gardner, 1985; Clement, 1980, 1986; Clement et al., 1994) aided the design of instruments that allowed the exploration of pupils' motivation (see Methodology chapter).
Consequently, the main research area of this study was explored from both the pupils’ and teachers’ perspectives on the practices introduced (in addition to the teachers’ perspective of the dyslexia-friendly practices). Additionally, my experiences and views of the whole process were recorded in a personal research diary (see Methodology chapter). My research diary helped me to address the study’s research questions from my standpoint and triangulate my data using the teachers’, pupils’ and my own views.

1.5 Rationale

The area of EFL was chosen because the (Greek) EFL context is my personal area of expertise and constituted a “motive and an opportunity for research” (Hammersley, 1984, p. 28). As an EFL teacher in Greece, I had witnessed the inequality that dyslexic pupils were facing due to the lack of differentiation and support provided in Greek primary EFL classrooms. The above, in combination with a personal and professional interest in dyslexia, established the context of the present project.

The term ‘dyslexia’ is a rather popular term in Greece and is usually linked to writing, spelling and reading difficulties. Greek policy on special education has been influenced by international developments on inclusion (UNESCO, 1994; 2000). This led to an increased interest in the identification and inclusion of dyslexic pupils, with the latest law being released in 2008 (Law, 3699/2008). However, the presence of pupils with dyslexia in mainstream schools in Greece does not necessarily mean that they are included, since the teaching of dyslexic pupils in subjects such as mathematics and Greek language
takes place outside the mainstream classrooms (called inclusion classes). This is at odds with an inclusive education system in which all pupils (e.g. dyslexic and non-dyslexic) are placed in the same school and classroom setting (Ainscow et al., 2006). Hence, the inclusion class formed by pupils with dyslexia in Greece becomes an integration unit that works “as an exclusionary rather than inclusionary place” (Boutskou, 2007, p. 297). Greek inclusion classes are run by specialist teachers (Vlachou, 2004) as mainstream and subject teachers rarely use inclusive practices – including EFL classes. Research has shown that, although English language teachers in Greece are interested in dyslexia support and consider this matter relatively significant (Nikolaidis & Matthaioudakis, 2008), they usually have a limited awareness of dyslexia. This is due to the limited training they receive on dyslexia (and other learning difficulties) during their undergraduate studies. The latter has contributed to inadequate and sometimes inexistent dyslexia support in Greek EFL classrooms (Rontou, 2010).

Similar to Greece, other countries have committed to UNESCO’s (1994; 2000) proclamations of inclusion and have adapted them in ways that suit their educational system. These adaptations lead to a variation in the way that inclusion is perceived and addressed across different countries and to different modes of inclusive teaching and learning (Schwarz, 2007). For example, the way pupils with dyslexia receive tuition in mainstream schools in the UK differs from the individualised tuition that this group receives in mainstream schools in Greece. It should be noted that this happens despite the fact that the inclusive discourse in Greece has been influenced by the UK
context (see Literature Review section 2.4.3). In the UK, dyslexic pupils receive specialist tuition in mainstream classrooms since classroom teachers form partnerships with the specialist teachers and design and deliver the lessons together (Clark et al., 1997). Therefore, the dyslexia support approaches in the UK are mainly designed for mainstream contexts following a more inclusive approach than the Greek education system.

A review of the literature within the UK education system lead me to attempt the development of dyslexia-friendly classrooms (Mackay, 2004) (designed in the UK) in Greek EFL education; three Greek EFL teachers were introduced to dyslexia and asked to employ dyslexia-friendly practices in their classrooms.

The dyslexia-friendly practices (MacKay, 2004) have been designed in the UK in order to respond to dyslexic learners' difficulties in mainstream schools. The Dyslexia-friendly Schools resource pack (BDA, 2005) was published by Department for Education and Skills (DfES) in the UK in cooperation with the British Dyslexia Association based on Neil Mackay's suggestions regarding developing dyslexia-friendly schools (Riddick, 2006). Because MacKay's (2004) recommendations showed positive results in some UK schools (e.g. in Swansea), they were later adopted by a number of Local Authorities around the UK. In a dyslexia-friendly school, dyslexia is seen as a specific learning difference for which teaching differentiation is needed. The key idea behind the development of a context that is dyslexia-friendly is to design a curriculum according to dyslexic pupils' needs and create a supportive environment for pupils with dyslexia in mainstream settings.
Furthermore, the dyslexia-friendly practices are not context-specific but are seen as appropriate and adaptable to the Greek EFL context; MacKay (2006) suggests that the inclusive character of the dyslexia-friendly practices allows for their employment in different education contexts; dyslexia-friendly teaching can occur “all the time, every time, with everybody” (MacKay, 2006, p. 171).

1.6 Challenges: terminology and contextual issues

Some challenges to this study are noted from the start. Most of them are contextual. The interaction between the Greek and British education system occurs not only in the use of UK practices in Greece, but can also be traced in the theoretical and methodological aspects of this study. The background literature is international (theoretical aspect) while the Greek language of the data (with some exceptions) is translated into English in the data analysis process and final reports (methodological aspect). It is also acknowledged that terms such as ‘dyslexia’ and ‘inclusion’ are perceived and addressed differently in England and Greece respectively (see Literature Review chapter). Furthermore, I take into consideration contextual factors that influence the processes of the study in general, and the dyslexia-friendly practices in particular. Examples are: the availability and types of resources in Greek schools, the time restrictions (seven and a half weeks available for the use of the dyslexia-friendly practices), and the cultural characteristics of the Greek context. What is more, the dyslexia-friendly practices are explored in an EFL context where English language is taught in class but is not used in everyday life, like in ESL or EAL contexts.
Additional challenges that arose during the study are presented in the Discussion chapter (Chapter Six), Conclusion chapter (Chapter Seven) and Methodology chapter (Chapter Three).

1.7 Study's contribution

The present study is an attempt to develop dyslexia-friendly classrooms in an EFL setting. This might result in significant advances in the support of EFL pupils with dyslexia, an area that needs to be further researched. The study may also give rise to innovative approaches and recommendations for the fields of both language teaching and educational psychology.

By employing an intervention approach, this study aims to establish whether practices designed for the inclusion of pupils with dyslexia (dyslexia-friendly practices – Mackay, 2006) achieve their aim in the Greek EFL context. The exploration of the impact of the dyslexia-friendly practices on dyslexic and non-dyslexic pupils enlightens their effects on mainstream education. All pupils' experiences of the dyslexia-friendly practices in combination with the EFL teachers' experiences build a theory around dyslexia inclusion in EFL education. The area of language teaching will benefit from the dyslexia-friendly practices since their usage helps EFL teachers to address dyslexic pupils' needs. The present study will benefit the dominantly monolingual field of dyslexia research, since it removes barriers to learning for dyslexic pupils who are learning a foreign language.

Methodologically, the present study is one of the few doctoral research projects in education to adopt Realism as its theoretical
framework (see Methodology chapter). The use of this framework enables me to explore the mechanisms that the Greek EFL context activates for pupils and teachers. These mechanisms refer to the teachers and pupils' thoughts, motives, beliefs and feelings. I am also able to see how these mechanisms are related to pupils' performance and teachers' practice. Realism is a framework that allows the exploration of the relationship between educational outcomes, contextual elements and pupils' potential: contextual elements (e.g. certain practices) trigger pupils' potential (e.g. reading abilities) and lead to educational outcomes (e.g. certain practices can improve, lower, or maintain pupils' reading level). This framework opens up new opportunities in educational research, since it allows for explorations of the effects of educational programmes and the way these work in certain contexts (e.g. EFL contexts) and for certain pupils (e.g. pupils with SpLD).

The study's final recommendations can extend beyond the EFL framework and provide new areas for development in the general context of EFL/ESL/EAL, multilingual and bilingual education. Other language contexts may also benefit from this research (e.g. French/Spanish as a foreign language). In areas where the use of the dyslexia-friendly practices appears positive, language teachers may choose to employ them in their own practice to enhance inclusion. Furthermore, because this study stresses the importance of contextual influences on inclusive attempts, it helps the teachers to reflect and account for the characteristics of their own context when attempting inclusion.
1.8 Structure of the thesis

The present thesis consists of six chapters. This introductory chapter provides a brief summary of the present project. Chapter Two presents the literature review in which I relate the current study to the literature on dyslexia, inclusion and language learning and teaching, and critically discuss the theories, discoveries and debates on these areas. In this way, I situate this study in the literature and outline the reasons for conducting it. Situating this study enables the reader to understand how this thesis addresses the research ‘gap’ in dyslexia and language teaching. Chapter Three discusses the methodology I employed and describes the ways the study’s aim will be accomplished. More specifically, I discuss how and why specific methods of data collection were chosen to answer the research questions. The third chapter also outlines how the data were analysed and clarifies my Realism stance: the concepts of context, generative mechanisms and outcomes will be present throughout the whole thesis.

The data analysis chapter (Chapter Four) presents in detail the data analysis process and the findings that arose for each classroom. Later, I compare and contrast the findings from each case, guided by the study’s aim (Chapter Five). The findings from all of the cases and the general conclusions drawn from the cross-case comparison help me to answer my research questions.

Chapter Six is the Discussion chapter of this thesis. In this chapter, I present the way in which the information gained from the data analysis process provided me with the necessary knowledge to draw my final conclusions and suggest new insights into the area of
dyslexia and English language teaching. This is accomplished through a comparison of my findings with existing research. The seventh and final chapter follows from the discussion chapter and summarises the significance of my study’s findings. Finally, based on the knowledge I have gained from my findings, I provide new insights in the field of dyslexia and language teaching and recommend areas for further research.

This introductory chapter briefly stated the reasons for conducting this study, what it set out to achieve and its ultimate goal. It also provided the reader with a clear idea of the chapters that follow. The following chapter deals with the literature that guided this study.
2 Literature Review

2.1 Chapter Outline

This chapter discusses the background literature related to this study in order to help the reader to contextualise the study and understand its significance. The first section introduces the content of this chapter to the reader and clarifies the sources of the background literature (2.1.1). The second section critically describes the models of dyslexia (2.2), how dyslexia is perceived and addressed in Greece and in the UK (2.3). Dyslexia identification within these two contexts is also discussed (2.4). The following sections link dyslexia with inclusion (2.5) and discuss the significance of teachers' experiences of inclusion (2.5.2). Identification, inclusion and support are also discussed in the context of language education (2.5.5; 2.5.6; 2.5.7; 2.5.8; 2.5.9). The following sections discuss the Greek language education context (2.6). In this way, the reader draws comparisons between the Greek and the UK contexts regarding the fields of dyslexia and inclusion and relates these with language learning and teaching. The limited research in the area of inclusion for dyslexic
language learners motivated the current study. Among the various English language education contexts around the world, the present chapter explores the Greek EFL context and studies on the field of inclusion for dyslexic EFL pupils in Greece are discussed. This review of the literature on dyslexia in Greece shows the problematic area of inclusion for dyslexic EFL pupils in Greece and warrants further research in this field. The study's aim is to respond to this need. Because the UK approaches for pupils with dyslexia are more inclusive than the Greek approaches, the practices that this study employs are drawn from British education. These practices are the 'dyslexia-friendly' practices (Mackay 2004) (discussed in section 2.6.3), which are designed to promote inclusion for dyslexic pupils in mainstream settings. The study employs the dyslexia-friendly practices to explore whether and how inclusion is accomplished in the Greek EFL context (2.6.4; 2.6.5).

The research questions that follow (2.7) are based on the aforementioned sections of this chapter. The aim of this project is to enhance inclusion in EFL education with the ultimate goal of informing the Greek EFL context and other language education contexts that deal with learners with dyslexia. These aims, in combination with the new issues that arose, constitute the study's contribution to knowledge. In the final sections, the concluding points are discussed (2.7.1), followed by an introduction to the next chapter (2.8).
2.1.1 Sources of background literature

At this point, the sources of the literature need to be discussed and clarified (see also Appendix 3) as the project entails the interaction between the British and Greek education systems (dyslexia-friendly practices, Greek EFL context). The articles, books, dissertations and theses that are included in this literature review were mainly traced through the use of UK-based search engines (Google UK, Google scholar UK, library search) by identifying the following keywords: dyslexia, dyslexia – language learning, English language learning, teachers – inclusion, teachers dyslexia, Greece, Laws, Acts – Special Education, dyslexia – EFL/EAL/ESL, inclusion – language learning, motivation – language learning, and dyslexia – self-esteem/self-concept. The Greek literature was located in Google UK by typing the Greek equivalents of these words (using Greek characters) and by using Google Greece. I also searched for books and Greek Laws/Acts in the schools involved in the study. During the data collection in Greece, I also asked specialist teachers and educational advisors about information on Greek sources. The only exception was one study that was conducted in the Greek EFL context (Petala, 2011), where I personally contacted the author (through a social networking website). The author sent me her Master’s dissertation and granted permission to use it in my literature review.

Numerous documents were found as a result of the key word searches. The documents finally selected were guided by their relevance to the study’s topic, which can be described in one sentence: ‘promoting inclusion for language learners with dyslexia by developing dyslexia-friendly classrooms in Greek EFL education and
addressing EFL teachers' and pupils' needs. So, the themes sought in the sources of literature were 'inclusion', dyslexia-friendly, 'English as a Foreign Language', 'Greek EFL context', 'dyslexia and English language learning and teaching', and 'teachers' views of inclusion'. These themes provided a basis for selecting the sources I considered appropriate for my thesis and for rejecting those that did not contain any information related to my project (see Appendix 3).

Although this project explores dyslexic pupils' inclusion in Greek education, the literature that refers to the models of dyslexia, inclusion and teachers' attitudes towards inclusion mainly stems from British sources. The presence of the Greek literature in this chapter is stronger in the descriptions and explorations of the study's context (Greek education, Greek EFL education).

2.2 Dyslexia

Dyslexia is a term used to describe pupils' difficulties with reading and spelling skills. Up until the 1960's, dyslexia in the UK was considered a problem for medical specialists (Snowling, 2000, p. 14) and the prevailing view was that innate factors (e.g. biological) cause dyslexic pupils' difficulties with literacy skills. This is perhaps the reason why the term 'dyslexia' was borrowed from the Greek language, which has influenced the language of medicine in English. However, later, in the 1980's, the term 'Special Educational Needs' was introduced (BMA, 1980) and dyslexic pupils started being assessed by educationalists and psychologists (BMA 1980). The term 'Special Educational Needs', refers to dyslexia, other learning difficulties or physical disabilities, and to children who are "under
Dyslexia is now an integral part of education policies (e.g. DfE, 2014). It is the responsibility of the teachers and the school systems to respond to dyslexic pupils' needs and support them in the process of learning.

Dyslexia has been examined by different disciplines and sub-disciplines (biology, neuropsychology, psychology, educational psychology, education, sociology of education), which have provided significant information on the characteristics of dyslexic pupils. The different research perspectives have given rise to different models of dyslexia, which affect the way in which dyslexia is perceived and addressed in education. The aim of the present chapter is not to discuss all of the different models of dyslexia, but to describe how these models have contributed to our understanding of dyslexic pupils' difficulties. For this reason, the different dyslexia perspectives are initially grouped into the causal model of dyslexia, which sees the difficulties within the child (e.g. cognitive deficiencies) and the social model which locates dyslexia in social factors (e.g. educational agendas that treat learners as homogeneous). Later, the interactionist view of dyslexia is discussed. According to this view, dyslexic learners' needs are an outcome of the reciprocal relationship that exists between the learners' characteristics and the support provided within their educational context (Frederickson & Cline, 2009).

Because the social and the causal view locate dyslexia in different areas, the terminologies they employ are different; the neurological source of difficulties implied in the medical model has given rise to terms such as 'dyslexic', 'causation' and 'treatment', while the social
model enhances the term 'pupils with dyslexia' to stress the social factors that assign to pupils dyslexia labels. In the discussion of these two models of dyslexia, the descriptions of dyslexia correspond to the model being described each time so as to help the reader understand the different approaches. In the interactionist view, the social and the causal model of dyslexia are not mutually exclusive. Therefore, the terms 'dyslexic pupils' and 'pupils with dyslexia' are used interchangeably.

2.2.1 The causal view of dyslexia

The causal model of dyslexia is strong in the dyslexia literature. Stakeholders and educationalists on this side hold the notion that dyslexic pupils' difficulties are the result of biological or cognitive deficiencies. In the causal view of dyslexia, it is suggested that the difficulties that dyslexics demonstrate stem from brain abnormalities (Fabbro et al., 2001; Galaburda & Livingstone, 1993; Moore et al., 1995; Stein, 2001), brain asymmetries (Beaton, 2004), or activation and deactivation of the brain areas (Paulesu et al., 1996; Rumsey et al., 1997, Shaywitz et al., 1998). Problems with the nervous system are also seen as the reason for dyslexic pupils' difficulties (Galaburda, 1999), while visual (Lovegrove et al., 1980; Pavlidis, 1981, 1985; Stein, 2001) and auditory problems (McAnally and Stein, 1996; Serniclaes et al., 2001), or problems with motor skills and automaticity (Fawcett and Nicolson, 1995; Gladstone et al., 1989; Nicolson and Fawcett, 1990) have also been examined. However, most of these studies have been characterised as unconvincing (Eden et al., 1996; Johannes et al., 1996; Vanni et al., 1997; Victor et al., 1993;
Savage, 2004). Although dyslexia has also been linked with discrepancies between reading and IQ (Ferrer et al., 2010), the association of a child’s intelligence with his reading skill has been questioned by a number of researchers (Elliott, 2005b; Gunderson & Siegel 2001; Stanovich, 1986) and has not informed other studies (Fletcher et al., 2000; Lyon et al., 2003; Vellutino et al., 2000). “It is now recognised that dyslexia occurs across the IQ spectrum” (Snowling, 2013, p. 7).

Many studies have examined dyslexic pupils’ phonological awareness problems as factors that impede the appropriate development of reading skills (Ramus et al. 2003; Snowling, 2000; Stanovich & Siegel 1994). Phonological awareness is the learner’s ability to understand and use sounds from smaller units (e.g. phonemes) to larger (e.g. syllables) (Castles & Coltheart, 2004). Learners with good phonological awareness skills can segment words (Morais, 1991b), code information on sound-base systems (phonological memory) and retrieve phonological codes from memory (phonological access to lexical storage) (Anthony & Francis, 2005). Phonological awareness is a key factor for children’s literacy development (Adams, 1990; Anthony & Francis, 2005) and learners with impaired phonological systems tend to have difficulties with their literacy skills (Ziegler & Goswami, 2005). The British Psychological Society notes: “the role of phonology is accorded in many of the other hypotheses in mediating the impact of dyslexia on the acquisition of word reading and spelling skills” (BPS, 1999, p. 44).

Dyslexic pupils find it difficult to transform phonological representations into orthographic ones (the direct ‘visual’ route)
(Plaut et al., 1996) and semantic transformations into phonological ones (the phonological route) (BPS, 1999). Although several studies have shown that the practice of phonological skills improves the reading abilities of dyslexic pupils (Torgesen, 1999; Vellutino et al., 1996), other factors need to be addressed when examining dyslexic pupils' reading skills. Examples are dyslexic pupils' age (Muter 2004), general verbal ability (Torgesen, 1999), grammar knowledge (Muter and Snowling, 1988) and speech perception and discrimination (Mody et al., 1997).

2.2.2 The Social view of dyslexia

The inconclusiveness that appears in some of the causative theories discussed above is the result of the difficulties that researchers face when examining brain functions and the cognitive aspects of learning. However, the above studies have advanced our understanding of dyslexic pupils' characteristics (Armstrong & Squires, 2015) and the areas with which they struggle but, apart from focusing on why the pupils with dyslexia face such challenges, we should also examine the challenges that the political, social and cultural structures pose to dyslexic pupils and how these affect their phonological and reading skills (e.g. Raz & Bryant, 1990; Vellutino et al., 1996). The current educational structures assume homogeneous learner profiles and utilise standardised assessment measures that tend to disregard learners who process information differently (Martin, 2013). Environmental (e.g. learning opportunities) and social components (e.g. culture) affect the development of dyslexic pupils' skills (BPS, 1999; Riddell & Weedon, 2006). A social approach to
dyslexia informs educators on the way in which social and environmental factors influence dyslexic pupils' abilities. This enables the teachers to design a curriculum that corresponds to dyslexic pupils' needs and remove the barriers to learning (Armstrong & Squires, 2015).

2.2.3 Dyslexic pupils' environment

Dyslexia is a set of cognitive elements and behavioural manifestations (Morton and Frith, 1995) and the different perspectives of dyslexia are important in understanding dyslexic pupils' difficulties. In her three level framework, Frith (1999) associates the different views of dyslexia (biological, cognitive, social) (Figure 1) and suggests that dyslexia is a phenomenon that is socially-constructed, partly formed by environments that are not always adaptable to different people's needs (Riddick, 2001). However, dyslexia has a cognitive basis since, in some cases, dyslexic pupils' difficulties will persist, despite differentiation (Vellutino et al., 1996).

Therefore, dyslexia cannot be defined with 'either' (causal) 'or' (social) definitions. Reciprocity of the causal and the social theories of dyslexia has proven advantageous for dyslexia research (Bailey, 1998); it has informed teachers of different dyslexia perspectives and the way these are influenced by teaching conditions (Armstrong & Squires, 2015). The causal model has influenced dyslexia assessment and has shaped many interventions in special education (Riddick, 2001). Equally important, the social model has challenged our assumptions about literacy standards and has led to a renewed interest in dyslexic pupils' inclusion (Riddick 2001). Apart from the
social and the causal models of dyslexia, teachers need information on "educational adjustment accommodations" (McDonald, 2009, p. 349) to be able to support dyslexic pupils. By building learner profiles based on pupils' personal characteristics, culture, parents, teachers etc., educators acknowledge cultural and individual influences on dyslexic pupils' difficulties, adapt the teaching environment based on their needs and enhance their inclusion (Goodley, 2001; Riddick, 2001).

Figure 1: Uta Frith's model of dyslexia (adapted from Frith, 1999, p. 193)

2.2.4 Interactionist view of dyslexia

Firth's model (Figure 1) should not be seen as static as the different models of dyslexia can complement each other. According to the interactionist view of dyslexia, attention should be drawn to both environmental and individual variables that affect a child's needs (Frederickson & Cline, 2009). The difficulties learners with dyslexia face might not be solely the result of biological or cognitive factors but from an interaction of these with personal and family relations,
school conditions and emotional and mental health needs (Frederickson & Cline, 2009). This leads to models of inclusion in which the environment adapts to the needs of the dyslexic learner by acknowledging individual and environmental variables and the dynamicity of their relationship.

2.3 Dyslexia in two different contexts: Greece, UK

Contextual factors such as legislative support, the linguistic and cultural context and the definitions of dyslexia each country adheres to (Smythe & Salter, 2004) affect the way dyslexia is perceived and addressed in different education systems. The following section contextualises this study by discussing the way dyslexia is perceived and addressed within the Greek and the English education system as this research entails an 'interaction' between the two.

2.3.1 Dyslexia in Greece

‘Dyslexia’ is a complex matter in Greece and an official definition of dyslexia has not yet been established. With the introduction of the Laws on Special Education since 1980’s (Law 1566/1985; 2817/2000; 3699/2008), dyslexia in Greece became synonymous with the term ‘Specific Learning Difficulties’ (Boutskou 2007; Stasinos, 1991). The terms ‘dyslexia’ and ‘Specific Learning Difficulties’ were introduced in the country mainly from foreign education systems (e.g. the Education Act in Britain 1981) (Bablekou, 1981; Lappas, 1997; Porpodas, 1981), Furthermore, the descriptions of dyslexia in Greece are heavily influenced by a body of literature that originated in the
UK (e.g. Greek Dyslexia Association 2012 influenced by Snowling, 2000) or the US (e.g. Martinussen et al., 2006).

Although a number of Greek researchers stress the need for the Greek framework to consider social factors that are associated with dyslexia (Karakasidou, 2011; Greek Dyslexia Association, 2012, based on Olson & Bryne, 2005; Reid, 2005, 2009; Schumacher et al., 2007; Porpodas, 1997; Koromelas, 1985), in Greek education, the causal model of dyslexia has a much stronger influence than the social model (Lappas, 1997; Fotopoulou, 2006). In the most recent descriptions of dyslexia, the focus is mainly on spelling, reading and writing difficulties and IQ associations (MNER, 2006; Greek Dyslexia Association, 2012). What is more, the current assessment processes and support approaches for dyslexic pupils mainly focus on cognitive abilities (see also section 2.2.1). The following section discusses in more detail dyslexia identification in Greece as well as the broader framework of dyslexia in Greek education.

2.3.2 Dyslexia in the UK

As dyslexia in Greece is strongly influenced by the UK education system (Bablekou, 1981; Lappas, 1997; Porpodas, 1981; Tzouriadou, 1979) it would be interesting to explore how the terms ‘dyslexia’ and ‘inclusion’ are viewed and addressed in the UK. Although both countries have similar descriptions of dyslexia, the UK education system follows a different approach to dyslexia identification. Furthermore, the support approaches employed in UK education tend to be more inclusive than those used in the Greek education system. England and Greece have both been influenced by the Salamanca
(UNESCO, 1994) and Dakar agreements (UNESCO, 2000) that were established at an international level. However, inclusion in Greece and the UK is practiced in different ways, influenced by each country's respective contextual characteristics (e.g. culture, education system).

In the UK, dyslexia is an issue that has been examined for more than a hundred years (Guardiola, 2001) and the definitions of this concept are numerous. More radical voices in the UK question the existence of dyslexia (e.g. Elliot & Gibbs, 2008). The British Dyslexia Association (2007) suggests that dyslexia is “the specific learning difficulty which mainly affects the development of literacy and language related skills” (BDA 2007, p. 1). In addition, the BDA suggests that the development of dyslexic pupils' skills might not match with their cognitive abilities (BDA, 2007).

The British Psychological Society proposes a working definition with no exclusionary criteria: “Dyslexia is evident when accurate and fluent word reading and/or spelling develops very incompletely or with great difficulty” (BPS, 1999, p. 18). This focuses on literacy learning at the word level and implies that the problem is severe and persistent despite appropriate learning opportunities. It provides a staged process of assessment through teaching (BPS 1999). The BPS definition entails no discrepancy (e.g. discrepancy between expected and actual reading performance). Also, the importance of a cognitive basis for dyslexia is acknowledged (causal model), along with the

---

1 e.g. phonological processing skills, rapid naming, working memory, processing speed
importance of social (social model—e.g. cultural background) (BPS, 1999) and environmental factors (learning opportunities, teaching conditions) (BPS, 1999).

2.4 Dyslexia identification

The causal and the social models of dyslexia previously discussed (section 2.2) have informed the identification processes for dyslexic pupils. The causal model has had a greater influence on dyslexia assessment in many countries (for examples, see Greece and the UK—sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2). This is because dyslexic pupils are usually assessed by educationalists or academics that are usually constrained in the child’s educational setting and find it difficult to assess and evaluate the social factors that affect the child (Riddick, 2009).

Assessment processes for pupils with dyslexia mainly focus on their cognitive difficulties such as speech and language problems, sequencing, automaticity, auditory memory or metacognitive awareness skills, yet rarely on the social factors that affect dyslexic pupils’ abilities. Children are seen as pupils within the boundaries of a school rather than individuals in a wider social context. The field of dyslexia identification requires more assessment processes that address dyslexic pupils’ cognitive abilities along with the historical, social and cultural factors that affect their skills (Martin, 2013).

2.4.1 Dyslexia identification in Greece

The assessment of dyslexic pupils in Greece takes place mainly in the Centres for Differential Diagnosis, Diagnosis and Support (CDDS—KEDDY in Greek) and only statements from CDDS centres are
acceptable in Greek state schools (assessment can also take place at the University of Patras and in private dyslexia centres). Referrals to these centres usually originate from the child’s family, after a consultation with the teacher or the special education teacher of the school the child is attending. The school is not involved in the assessment of dyslexic pupils in Greece and the CDDS team of professionals who assess the child is comprised of a special education teacher, a psychologists, a social worker, a speech pathologist and a child psychiatrist. Statements for dyslexia include the signatures of all of them (Law 3699/2008). Nevertheless, the tools employed in dyslexia assessments in Greece have been described as inadequate, since the child’s response to interventions is not examined and teachers and parents are excluded (Porpodas, 1997).

2.4.2 Dyslexia identification in the UK

The reciprocity between the causal and social views of dyslexia in the UK is apparent in both the assessment processes and support approaches for dyslexic pupils (for support approaches see section 2.5.4). The dyslexia assessment process in the UK depends on the child’s response to the Individual Educational Plan (IEP) (environmental adaptations), developed by the teacher and the SENCo (Special Educational Needs Co-ordinator). The LSA (Learning Support Assistants) and the child’s parents are also involved in the process. If the IEP fails to produce positive results the child will be assessed by an outside specialist (School Action Plus stage); otherwise a statutory assessment will be followed (Referral for Assessment Stage) (DfES, 2001a).
2.5 **Inclusion**

The models of inclusion resulted from the social perspective of learning difficulties in general, and of dyslexia in particular. The term 'social model of disability' (Oliver, 1981) led to the removal of labels and special schooling at the end of the twentieth century, when pupils with special needs started to be included in mainstream schools (Armstrong et al., 2011).

The goal of inclusive education is to promote learning and enhance the support of all pupils by embracing their differences (Ainscow, 2000). In the past twenty years, a number of proclamations on inclusion have been established at an international level (UNESCO, 1994; 2000). In 1994, in the Salamanca statement (UNESCO, 1994), the term 'inclusive orientation' was introduced, according to which all children have the right to education and should have access to mainstream schools. Later, in 2000, the need for international inclusive developments was enhanced with the statement of the World Education Forum, suggesting that inclusion for pupils with difficulties are “a national and international priority” (UNESCO, 2000, p. 17).

The aforementioned initiatives, although significant, achieved their goal to some extent (O'Brien, 2001). Inclusion is a perplexing term (Pearson, 2001) and the way it is perceived and addressed among the different education systems is heavily dependent on contextual factors (e.g. education system, school characteristics - Booth & Ainscow, 2002).
2.5.1 Dyslexia and inclusion

Inclusion is a dynamic process in which different learner needs are addressed, learning challenges are set and barriers to learning are overcome (Primary National strategy model – DfES, 2006a). Inclusion for pupils with dyslexia refers to the responsibility of school systems and educationalists to help dyslexic pupils to access the curriculum. For inclusion to be accomplished, teachers need to adapt their practice based on dyslexic pupils' characteristics and “teach them the way they learn” (Mckay 2006, p.95). Curriculum adaptations based on dyslexic pupils' needs, enhance their inclusion, raise their self-esteem and improve their performance.

The term 'performance' in education usually refers to pupils' academic performance. At a school level, pupils’ academic performance is relevant to educational outcomes usually explored through teacher evaluations and assessment tools (e.g. tests). In the case of dyslexic pupils, great focus is placed on curriculum accessibility, their performance in literacy tasks (reading, spelling) while there are cases where their performance in other areas (e.g. speech, numeracy) is also explored. Because of its complexity, dyslexia “can seriously interfere with pupils’ educational progress and achievement” (Kirk, 2001, p. 160). Although pupils' performance is strongly associated with their inclusion, many studies focus on the principles of inclusion rather than the impact of these principles on SEN pupils and their peers (Dyson, Farrell, Polat, Hutcheson & Gallanaugh, 2004). There is a need for studies to explore the impact of inclusive attempts on mainstream pupils' performance (with and without dyslexia) so as to provide recommendations for teaching that will benefit all learners.
Apart from the area of performance, a major area of concern for dyslexia research is dyslexic pupils' low self-esteem (Humphrey 2003; 2003). Self-esteem refers to the comparisons of the beliefs individuals hold about themselves (self-concept - Leflot et al., 2010) to what they would like to be (the ideal self - Lawrence, 1996). In mainstream school settings, pupils with dyslexia often experience feelings of stress, failure, embarrassment and anger, especially where comparisons are made with their non-dyslexic peers (Chapman, 1988; Humphrey, 2002; Renick & Harter, 1989). Also, mainstream (non-dyslexic) pupils are prone to segregate (Terras et al., 2009) or bully pupils with dyslexia because of their difficulties (Rose, 2009). All of these factors, in combination with the standardised educational and cultural norms and other social factors (e.g. pupils' background), can lower dyslexic pupils' self-esteem (Burden, 1982; 2005; Burnett & McCrindle, 1999; Humphrey, 2003a; Kozulin et al., 2001).

Self-efficacy (the belief that one is able to accomplish a task - Bandura, 1977) has also attracted interest in the field of inclusion for dyslexic pupils (see Burden, 2005; Frederickson & Jacobs, 2001; Humphrey, 2002, 2003; Lerner, 2000). Because of their difficulties, dyslexic pupils are prone to have low self-efficacy, which leads to limited task participation and diminished personal competency (based on Bandura, 1977). Literacy tasks cause anxiety for pupils with dyslexia ('emotional arousal' - Bandura, 1977) and result in them having low performance expectations in school contexts (low 'personal mastery experiences' - Burden, 2008, p. 195). What is more, pupils with learning difficulties tend to internalize their failures and
attribute their low performance to their low ability (causal attributions) (Chapman & Tummer, 2011). All of these factors negatively affect dyslexic pupils' inclusion and performance and make them feel segregated in mainstream school contexts.

2.5.2 Teachers' experiences of inclusion

Apart from pupil-related areas of exploration in the studies on inclusion, the teachers' views of inclusion affect the extent to which inclusive developments are successful (Avramidis & Norwich, 2002) and teachers' response to inclusive attempts is a common characteristic in relevant studies (Collins, 2005).

One of the most important factors that affect the teachers' views of inclusion is the training that teachers receive in the area of disability (Sharma, Forlin & Loreman, 2008). The social model of disability increased the presence of pupils with special educational needs pupils in mainstream schools at the end of the twentieth century (Armstrong et al., 2011) and the need for teacher training on SEN arose (UNESCO, 1997; UNESCO, 2008). Evidence on the effectiveness of different types of programmes (e.g. single subject or systematic infusion programmed) that prepare teachers for inclusion still remains sparse (Sharma et al., 2008). However, an emphasis on practical strategies and reflective practice has been shown to reduce teachers' concerns regarding the implementation of inclusive practices (Sharma et al., 2008). When teachers are asked to teach learners with disabilities, problems such as a lack of time, increased workload and lack of resources often arise (Sharma & Sokal, 2013). Teacher training that addresses these types of
concerns and enables teachers to understand the nature of disability increases their positive attitudes towards implementing inclusive programmes (Sharma et al., 2008; Sharma & Sokal, 2013).

Contextual characteristics (e.g. country's legislation) affect teachers' efficacy and attitudes towards inclusion (Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996; Ainscow & Sandill, 2010; Tod, 2001; Sharma & Sokal, 2013; Avramidis & Norwich, 2002) as the context defines the extent to which teachers' gain awareness and experience of inclusive developments (Garner, 2001; Savolainen, Engelbrecht, Nel & Malinen, 2011). Several researchers argue that teachers should be provided with opportunities to engage in fruitful contact with people with disabilities and gain direct experiences of successful models of inclusion (LeRoy & Simpson, 1996; Sharma et al., 2008; Sharma & Sokal, 2013). Furthermore, teachers tend to show positive attitudes towards inclusion in contexts where well-established government support for inclusion has been put in place (Sharma et al., 2008). On the other hand, lack of teacher training programmes and support funds fail to provide the teachers with efficacy in teaching students with disabilities (Romi & Layser, 2006 cited in Sharma et al., 2008). For example, in his study, Molto (2003) found that teachers' limited experience of inclusion resulted in some teachers suffering culture-shock when asked to adapt their teaching strategies. What is more, the limited awareness of the teachers in Molto's (2003) study resulted in them questioning the effectiveness of instructional adaptations for inclusive classrooms. Teacher efficacy is also affected by the way in which interventions for inclusion are introduced. Interventions that allow teachers to make decisions raise
their confidence and influence them positively to attempt inclusion (Cornwall, 2001).

What is more, teachers' personal characteristics, beliefs, self-confidence levels and experience affect their willingness to experiment and take the 'risk' of inclusion (Ainscow & Sandill, 2010; Cole, 2005, Cornwall, 2001) (Bell, 2013; Center & Ward, 1987; De Boer, 2011; Semmel et al., 1991; Vaughn et al., 1996). The way in which teachers define and perceive disability also influences their response to inclusive attempts (Collins, 2001). Research has shown that teachers that follow an interventionist rather than medical approach to disability feel more responsible for responding to pupils' difficulties and are in favour of inclusive attempts (Jordan & Stanovich, 2003).

2.5.3 Inclusion for pupils with dyslexia in Greece

Although the Greek education system is influenced by English speaking countries such as the UK (Bablekou, 1981; Porpodas, 1981; Tzouriadou, 1979), Greece lags behind the UK in the area of inclusion. In addition, the recent austerity measures put in place in the country (2009 - 2010) have negatively affected education (see Koulouris et al., 2014) and impeded inclusive developments. Despite the fact that the European Commission defines Greece as 'one track' country (a high percentage of integration of all pupils in mainstream settings) (EC, 2005) regarding special educational needs, these data disregard contextual issues (e.g. terminology) that influence inclusive education (Armstrong et al., 2011). The Greek Ministry of Education holds a strong authoritative position in all levels of Greek education (Pigiaki,
as the curriculum, the books, the appointment of the teachers and each school’s timetable are based on the Ministry of Education guidelines. This has created confusion around the term inclusion (Zoniou-Sideri et al., 2006). “Greek inclusive discourse cannot be seen as a single, well-defined and well encompassing discourse” (Zoniou-Sideri et al. 2006, p. 280). What is more, the societal pressure to succeed in education in Greece that places extensive emphasis on pupils’ grades is a factor that constrains the use of differentiation approaches for pupils with difficulties (Lappas, 1997). In Greece, school failure is sometimes seen as a family problem and parents of children with difficulties do not easily accept that their child has a learning difficulty (Lappas, 1997). This places limitations on the parent-teacher collaborations and on the identification and support of learners with difficulties.

In Greece, specialist teachers are the only professionals responsible for pupils with difficulties in mainstream schools (Lappas, 1997). The mainstream classroom teacher and the school’s subject teachers (e.g. EFL teacher, arts teacher) rarely cooperate with the specialist teacher at the school (Constantopoulou, 2002). After children obtain a statement for dyslexia from the CDDS centre, they receive tuition outside the classroom in the subjects of Greek language and mathematics from the specialist teacher. Individualised tuition takes place in a pull out class, called ‘inclusive class’, which is similar to pull out programmes used in the US or the withdrawal classes that are sometimes formed in the UK (Vlachou, 2006). In this class, remediation approaches are mainly used, although this depends on the specialist teacher. The tuition in the inclusive class is offered for up
to fifteen hours a week and the maximum number of pupils is 12 (Law 3699/2008). Dyslexic pupils are rarely subjected to separate arrangements for other subjects (including English) (Boutskou, 2007, p. 296; Zoniou- Sideri et al., 2006).

Therefore, inclusive education in Greece mainly means accommodating children with difficulties through the expansion of special provision. However, the inclusion approaches of each school are not standardised as these are influenced by the teachers, the school's ethos and the context (Boutskou, 2007). Although the current Law on Special Education in Greece (proposed on 06/05/2014) promotes more inclusive developments and enhances cooperation between mainstream and specialist teachers4, the current political tensions in the country (national elections- January 2015 and July 2015) have temporarily paused these initiatives.

The area of inclusion for dyslexic pupils in the Greek context poses challenges for EFL teachers due to the lack of teacher training and support from stakeholders and schools. However, mainstream and other subject teachers also face challenges in Greek schools regarding dyslexia.

2.5.4 Inclusion for pupils with dyslexia in the UK

The concept of inclusion has had a significant impact on the UK educational system since 1980’s and relevant papers (see The

---

4 “the specialist teacher is part of the mainstream class and forms partnerships with the mainstream teacher. With the initiative taken from the classroom teacher, there is an interplay of the two roles” (forwarded Law on Special Education 2014, p.8)
Warnock report 1978; DES 1978 for England and Wales; SOED 1978 for Scotland), have stressed the counter-productiveness of pupils’ withdrawal to remedial classes. In 1990’s a number of papers on inclusion in the UK (The Green Paper 1997; DfES 2001) promoted the inclusion of children with disabilities in mainstream schools. To date, inclusion remains a topic of major concern in the UK and research projects on inclusion are still ongoing (e.g. *Raising the achievement of all learners in inclusive education*).

Most of the inclusive developments in the UK examine the social processes of learning (e.g. Ainscow et al., 2006) and acknowledge the contextual and cultural influences. However, the introduction of inclusive practice can sometimes cease due to bureaucratic issues or a lack of resources. Furthermore, the pupils with difficulties in schools are sometimes seen as the reasons for which the schools’ performance rates might drop (O’Brien, 2001). More school-based changes towards inclusion and enhanced communication among those involved in the inclusion processes have the potential to embrace pupils’ differences, remove barriers to participation and promote learning (Ainscow, 2000). Some of these elements have been enhanced in more recent inclusive developments in the UK (DfE, 2014) (e.g. enhanced family involvement in pupils’ support).

In 2010, The Equalities Act opened up various sources of funding for students and employees with dyslexia in the UK (GEO & DCMS, 2013). Many of the developments regarding the inclusion of dyslexic pupils in the UK that have so far been established (e.g. DfE 2001; 2014), have been influenced by the causal and the social model of dyslexia. In UK education, mainstream schools employ intensive reading support
approaches (Brookes, 2003) and Individual Educational Plans (IEPs) for the assessment and support of dyslexic pupils. However, the effects of some of these inclusive approaches have been questioned (see Klassen, 2001), because there is an extensive focus on pupils’ weaknesses (Fulcher, 1989). Furthermore, affective factors are rarely addressed (e.g. self-esteem) (Riddick, 2006). In UK education, although inclusive developments aim to inform the practice of teachers, they tend exclusively to reflect the views of policy makers and gaps between policy and practice have been identified (O’Brien, 2001).

2.5.5 Dyslexia and language learning

Dyslexia difficulties are universal (Ziegler & Goswami, 2005) and although the transparency of language might influence the manifestations of dyslexia, dyslexic learners’ problems with literacy will persist (ibid). The importance of language learning in today’s society poses the need for the provision of opportunities for dyslexic learners to access the language curriculum. Although there are studies on dyslexia identification and support for dyslexic language learners, further research in these fields of research is warranted. The following sections discuss studies in the area of dyslexia and language learning in SL/AL and FL contexts.

2.5.6 Dyslexic language learners’ inclusion

Although a vast area of research that is concerned with dyslexic pupils’ inclusion and teachers’ responses to inclusive attempts, inequality exists within the field of inclusion, given that the majority
of studies on dyslexia support and inclusion have been conducted in monolingual contexts (Martin, 2013). Despite the fact that we live in a globalised society and more multilingual than monolingual people comprise today's world population (Tucker, 1999), the research on inclusion often disregards the strong presence of linguistically-diverse learners in education. The same applies to the area of language teaching where, although learner differences are acknowledged, limited research has looked into the nature of these differences and their relation with learning difficulties. In 2005, the European Commission stressed that the exclusion of learners from language classes means denying them access to European citizenship (Executive Summary, EC 2005). However, the under-researched area of inclusion in language education has resulted in limited teacher training on dyslexia. As a result, language teachers “may have not kept in pace with the processes of inclusion and increasing classroom diversity” (Executive Summary, EC 2005) and feel challenged by the presence of dyslexic pupils in their classroom.

Apart from language teachers, dyslexic pupils in language learning contexts encounter barriers to accessing the language curriculum due to their difficulties with language-related areas (e.g. phonological awareness skills). What is more, the standardised assessment measures and the fact that education systems usually assume homogeneity among pupils limit dyslexic pupils' opportunities to acquire language skills. Therefore, although there are cases where language learning benefits pupils with difficulties (e.g. developing flexible thinking) (see McColl, 2000), in most cases, dyslexic pupils find it difficult to learn world languages like English and respond to
new forms of globalisation (e.g. digital literacies). More research on dyslexic pupils' support in language contexts is warranted in order to inform teachers on how to respond to dyslexic pupils' needs and promote their inclusion in language contexts.

2.5.7 Dyslexia identification for language learners

An extensive focus on cognitive skills is apparent in the field of dyslexia identification for language learners (bilingual/FL/SL/AL). In the area of EFL and dyslexia, where language is mainly instructed in class, most studies are influenced by the psycholinguistic paradigm (i.e. the causal model) (Kormos, 2013). Therefore, the process of language learning is mainly viewed as the acquisition of specific skills (reading, listening, speaking, writing) (Kormos, 2013). Also, assessment measures for language learners tend to disregard the social, cultural and language factors that affect multi/bilingual pupils' skills development. In the UK, where EAL learners use the language inside and outside school, their assessment takes place in English (Martin, 2013). This results in assessment processes that are linguistically and culturally biased (Martin, 2013).

The assessment of bilingual or multilingual dyslexic pupils is a key challenge for educators (Reid, 2009), since cross-language differences (e.g. transparent-opaque orthographies), individual learner characteristics and cultural aspects affect second/foreign additional language learning processes (Brunswick, 2012; Constable, 2001; Kelly & Phillips, 2012). Also, dyslexic language learners' e.g. communication through social networks, purchasing online is mainly in English.
difficulties are sometimes believed to be language problems rather than problems related to their dyslexia (Lindsay et al., 2006). Despite the fact that dyslexia identification for language learners is problematic (Deponio et al., 2000; Lindsay et al., 2006), it has been extensively researched and has enriched our understanding of multi-/bilingual dyslexic learners’ difficulties. Empirical studies on dyslexia and second language learning have shown that dyslexic second language learners will continue to struggle with spelling and reading skills (Helland & Kaasa, 2005) and stress the need for assessing word recognition skills and word reading efficiency in ESL learners (Miller-Guron & Lundberg, 2000). Articulation problems in second language learning for learners with dyslexia have also been shown (Yamada, 2004). Similar results have been shown in studies where the learners’ first language is nonalphabetic (e.g. Chung & Ho, 2010).

Dyslexia identification for multi-/bilingual pupils is an intricate process; the mistakes that EAL learners make are similar to dyslexia characteristics (Sparks, 2013) and, depending on the language orthography (e.g. transparent/opaque), learners might face additional visual learning demands (Brunswick, 2012; Goswami, 1992). Although some studies have shown that bilingual learners show strength in areas of phonological awareness, fluency and flexible thinking (e.g. Bialystok, 2001), the phonological weaknesses and learning mechanisms of dyslexic pupils will persist, regardless of the language system (Ziegler & Goswami, 2005). These weaknesses might prohibit dyslexic language learners’ development of reading, writing and - in some cases - speech production skills (Miles & Miles, 1999) in SL (Geva et al., 2000; Miller-Guron & Lundberg, 2000) and FL settings.
(Goldfus, 2013; Sparks & Ganschow, 1993). Furthermore, cultural and social barriers (e.g. inequality in settings of linguistic diversity - see Artiles et al., 2011) will limit skills development. Only a few studies in the field of dyslexia identification for bi-/multilingual pupils have focused on environmental elements (e.g. pupils’ responses to intervention, RTI - Rose, 2009). This poses the need for more social assessment processes that are 'culture-fair' (BPS 1999, cited in Peer & Reid, 2001, p. 55) and examine the way language learners’ experiences and political policy impact on their literacy skills (Martin, 2013). Additionally, affective factors (e.g. self-esteem) and attitudes towards the target language influence dyslexic learners’ language development (Cochrane et al., 2012; Csizér et al., 2010; Miller-Guron & Lundberg, 2000; Morfidi & Reason, 2000). In monolingual education, studies suggest that the limited development of dyslexic pupils’ literacy skills may be due to inappropriate support and educational practices (e.g. Collinson & Penketh, 2010). This raises implications for dyslexia identification (and support) for language learners. It must also be noted that the meaning of the term 'language learning' can vary, as there are differences on whether the learner learns a foreign, a second or an additional language. As a result, there are variations in the amount of language input that the pupils receive. The term 'Foreign Language' (FL) means that language is mainly taught in class and therefore there is a more 'level playing field' than 'Second' or 'Additional Language' settings (SL/AL), whereby learners are also exposed to the target language outside school.
2.5.8 Support approaches for dyslexic language learners

The support approaches for dyslexic language learners has been informed by research on dyslexia identification in bi-/multilingual and FL/SL/AL dyslexic pupils and support approaches from monolingual education. Dyslexic pupils' improvement in phonological ability is prominent in studies on dyslexia in EFL/ESL/EAL settings (e.g. Helland et al., 2008, Helland & Kaasa, 2005; Nijakowska, 2008; 2010, Stampoltzis & Pumfrey, 2000). The suggested support approaches for dyslexic language learners usually involve direct instruction, synthetic, analytic and diagnostic teaching (Ganschow & Sparks, 2000). The use of specific techniques such as lower-level verbal operations (Koda, 1992), the association of the first-target language (D’Anguilli et al., 2004) or sound-symbol relationships (NRP, 2000) are also enhanced. However, support approaches that take into account social and environmental factors that affect bi-/multilingual learners' skills enable teachers to respond to learners' differences and enhance dyslexic pupils' inclusion in language classrooms. Many studies in EFL/EAL settings have examined the teaching approaches that are helpful for English language learners with dyslexia. Multisensory teaching is one of the most popular practices in the area of dyslexia support in language contexts (e.g. Everatt et al. 2013; Miller & Bussman-Gillis 2000; Sparks & Miller, 2000). The multisensory approach involves the use of different senses in the process of learning (e.g. visual, tactile, kinetic), as these have been shown to improve EAL pupils' phonological awareness (Everatt et al., 2013; Mortimore et al., 2012). Research also suggests that multisensory techniques, combined with direct teaching, benefit bi-
The teaching approaches that support dyslexic language learners can support all language learners (Turner & Pughe, 2003). However, “the implementation and evaluation of inclusive practice” (Blamires, 2001, p. 111) is needed in order to improve the inclusion concept in the field of language teaching. This warrants further studies that focus on the evaluation of inclusive practices in language classrooms.

2.5.9 Empirical studies on dyslexia support for language learners

Dyslexia interventions that have taken place in language learning contexts have evaluated the impact of specific practices on dyslexic language learners. Literature suggests that interventions that correspond to dyslexic learners’ needs provide an evidence-base approach in helping dyslexic learners overcome their difficulties (Shaywitz, Morris & Shaywitz, 2008). Explicit instruction (Vear & Edwards, 2007), the use of ICT and auditory and visual stimuli and positive reinforcement are some of the support approaches that have been suggested as effective for dyslexic ESL learners (Root, 1994; Cloud, 1988). The intervention studies in different types of English language contexts (i.e. ESL/EAL/EFL) have produced significant information on the effectiveness of the approaches mainly by exploring their impact on dyslexic pupils. The outcomes of these studies are based on dyslexic learners’ response to specific practices; these are introduced in the classroom or in individual sessions.
Because of the widespread use of English in the modern world, a number of dyslexia interventions in language education have occurred in English language classrooms (EAL/ESL/EFL). A common finding in most of the studies on dyslexia and language learning is the positive impact of ICT, multisensory and direct teaching techniques on dyslexic EFL/EAL pupils' reading and spelling skills.

Scully (2000) notes that the use of ICT and multimedia methods supports learners with dyslexia in language classrooms (Scully, 2000). The use of specific software programmes is a common element in empirical studies on dyslexia support in EAL settings. In their study, Mortimore and her colleagues (2012) found that two computer delivered programmes, Nessy and Rapid Reading, improved dyslexic EAL learners' reading skills. Apart from the impact of these programmes on the dyslexic EAL learners, the teaching assistants in the school experienced positively the intervention and the training they received. Along similar lines, Dimitriadi (2000) found that the use of ICT increased the performance of bilingual dyslexic language learners. Apart from performance, affective factors such as motivation are also improved with the use of ICT. For example, Smythe and Gyorfi (2009) showed that the use of mobile technology enhanced motivation for dyslexic learners of English in Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary and Sweden.

What is more, the use of multisensory and direct teaching approaches have also been found to help dyslexic EAL learners with their difficulties (Vear & Edwards, 2007). Sarkadi (2008) conducted an empirical study in the Hungarian EFL context and showed that the use of multisensory and explicit teaching and mnemonic devices
significantly improved dyslexic EFL learners’ vocabulary. Along similar lines, Morfidi and Reason (2000) showed that poor EAL readers’ performance significantly improved with phonics training. Examples of the practices Morfidi and Reason used were alliteration, sound blending and training in letter recognition and writing, while the learners were also receiving the literacy hour (DfEE, 1998) in class.

In Poland, Nijakowska (2010) conducted an experimental study which showed that the use of direct and multisensory teaching improved dyslexic EFL learners’ word reading and spelling skills, especially in the making grapheme-phoneme associations. Similarly, in their study, Sparks and his colleagues (Sparks et al., 1998) found that multisensory structured language instruction (MSL) proved useful for high-risk Spanish EFL learners. The learners that were taught with MSL made significant gains on written and oral language proficiency compared to other group with which more traditional methods of teaching were used.

Because the aforementioned studies have taken place in actual classroom contexts, some of them have taken into account contextual factors (e.g. the education context) or personal elements (e.g. ethnicity, age) that impact on the processes of learning (Morfidi & Reason, 2000; Mortimore et al., 2012). For instance, Morfidi and Reason (2000), who conducted an intervention with poor EAL readers, examined their results with caution as the language of instruction and socio-economic factors influenced the pupils’ performance. This warrants further ‘context-sensitive’ research in the field of dyslexia and language learning and poses the need to explore the effects of
contextual factors (e.g. education system, societal and cultural characteristics) on dyslexic pupils' language development.

2.6 **Dyslexia and English language learning in Greece**

Bi-/multilingual contexts in countries such as the UK have explored dyslexia inclusion (e.g. Fernando, 2012) and provided a basis for further developments. However, limited research is found in the field of dyslexia inclusion in EFL/ESL/EAL settings (Martin, 2013). From a review of the relevant literature that originated from the Greek EFL education context, dyslexia inclusion in English classes is problematic and under-explored (see Rontou, 2010). The latter contrasts the fact that English is considered a major asset for future study and employment opportunities for Greek pupils (Tziava, 2003), who are usually excluded from Greek EFL classrooms.

**2.6.1 Learning English as a Foreign Language in Greece**

The EFL framework has been widely developed in Greece. Children in Greece start learning English when they are six years old (Nikolaidis & Matthaioudakis, 2008) and English classes are obligatory at all school levels (Chourdaki, 2003). Furthermore, in Greece, many pupils attend private English language institutes - along with the English classes they receive at school (Tziava, 2003). As a result, two school systems function in Greece regarding English language teaching: the private and state EFL context. However, in the private sector, the main objective is the acquisition of language certificates. As such, the private institutes have a higher status than the EFL classes in the state schools. In state schools, the focus of the EFL curriculum
lies in “the functions and the structures of language but not a near-native speaking proficiency” (Sifakis, 2008, p. 233).

The Greek state education system is highly centralized (Pigiaki, 1999); the EFL textbooks, curriculum and appointment of teachers in the state schools fall under the authority of the Ministry of Education (Chourdaki, 2003). English language assessments in state schools take place in the form of mid-term and final tests usually provided by the Ministry of Education (based on the textbooks). The results of these tests, together with each EFL learner’s profile (e.g. participation, homework), define the report that each pupil receives at the end of every term.

Private English language institutes are found in most towns in Greece. The materials and teachers are usually chosen by the head teacher/owner of the institute. The curriculum is exam-oriented (Tziava, 2003) and the acquisition of official language certificates\(^6\) usually takes place at the age of 15 or 16 (Gabrielatos, 2002).

In both the private and state schools in Greece, communicative language teaching is the predominant EFL teaching approach, which enhances language use for communicative purposes (Littlewood, 1981). However, in the Greek public schools, the EFL teachers are relatively free in terms of which approaches they use, since the responsibilities of the local advisors are limited and teacher assessment is rare (Pigiaki, 1999). What is more, in contrast to the private English language institutes, public EFL education in Greece does not lead to official language certificates.

\(^6\) e.g. The First Certificate in English (FCE) provided by Cambridge University.
2.6.2 Studies on dyslexia and EFL in the Greek context

Despite the limited training that Greek EFL teachers receive on learning difficulties (Petala, 2011; Rontou, 2010), studies have shown that Greek EFL teachers are interested in dyslexia (see Matthaioudakis & Nikolaidis, 2008; Lemperou et al., 2011). Rontou's (2010) case study is one of the few studies that have contributed to the field of inclusion for dyslexic pupils within Greek EFL education. Rontou (2010) explored the way in which EFL pupils with dyslexia are supported in secondary state schools in Greece and showed that the support for this group is limited due to the lack of teacher training on dyslexia. This was confirmed by a similar study by Lemperou and her colleagues, who also found that Greek EFL teachers experience frustration because of their inability to support dyslexic EFL pupils (Lemperou et al., 2011).

Two intervention studies for dyslexic pupils have been conducted in Greek EFL education (Goudi, 2010; Petala, 2011). Goudi (2010) explored the impact of an intervention programme on four dyslexic EFL pupils in a Greek state school. The programme targeted the pupils’ phonemic awareness skills through the use of multisensory techniques, modelling (the teacher modelled the sounds of a letter or word) and demonstration. Although the results showed that all four pupils’ reading ability increased, inclusion was not addressed since the tuition of these four pupils took place outside the mainstream EFL classroom. What is more, despite the fact that Goudi (2010) mentions that one of the study’s targets was to enhance pupils’ self-confidence, she fails to discuss this in her results section.
On the other hand, Petala’s (2011) study was conducted in two private English language institutes in Greece. Petala used multisensory instruction along with a specific course book (‘Team up!’) to explore how these two factors influenced dyslexic EFL pupils’ performance. Although the time limitation did not allow her results to provide significant conclusions (only 60 weeks of instruction rather than the intended 80), recommendations for teaching techniques were offered, and the data showed that short, focused activities that gradually increase in difficulty, combined with visual, auditory, and tactile/kinaesthetic activities, are helpful for Greek EFL pupils with dyslexia in mainstream EFL classrooms. Petala’s (2011) study is ground-breaking in that she used specific materials and teaching techniques within mainstream EFL education. However, the impact of these materials and the techniques she employed was not addressed in reference to the non-dyslexic pupils, as this lay beyond the scope of her paper (Master’s dissertation). Petala’s (2011) study is similar to that of Rontou (2010) and Lemperou et al. (2011), in that all three researchers suggest that EFL teacher training on dyslexia is a prerequisite for successful dyslexia support in Greek EFL education.

2.6.3 The dyslexia-friendly practices

The dyslexia-friendly schools (BDA, 2005) arose due to the problems associated with the identification and support of dyslexic pupils across the UK. The aim of the dyslexia-friendly schools was to fill the gap between policy and practice regarding dyslexic pupils’ inclusion. In the late 1990’s in Swansea, the high number of statements for dyslexia was rather worrying and the parents were
dissatisfied about the way in which their dyslexic children were being supported in school (Riddick, 2006). These matters led the Swansea Education Authority to review their current support on dyslexia and later organise a conference on dyslexia in collaboration with the British Dyslexia Association. This resulted in the creation of the Dyslexia-friendly Schools Forum, which worked towards developing a whole school policy that would enhance the inclusion of dyslexic children (1997-2001). Therefore, in 2001, the concept of the ‘dyslexia-friendly school policy’ was established (Riddick, 2006). Later, in 2004, the dyslexia-friendly quality mark launched a pilot project in which 25 LEA’s adopted the dyslexia-friendly approaches (Tresman, 2005) with the aim of providing a good model for effective dyslexia support in schools. Because the results of this initiative were positive, in 2005, the British Dyslexia Association adopted the dyslexia-friendly practices and released the ‘dyslexia-friendly schools pack’ (BDA, 2005).

The dyslexia-friendly schools pack (BDA, 2005) is a resource book in which advice, guidance and practices on how to develop a dyslexia-friendly school are offered. According to the dyslexia-friendly approach, students with dyslexia are recognised as having difficulties with some skills, before examining the extent to which these difficulties are affected by the environment (Riddick, 2001). The aim is not to ‘remediate’ dyslexic pupils’ difficulties, but to help them to achieve their full potential through a combination of targeted interventions and environmental changes (Riddick, 2001).

For a school to become dyslexia-friendly, a whole school approach is needed, whereby dyslexic pupils are identified, assessed and
monitored to ensure that reciprocity of policy and practice are promoted (McKay, 2004). What is more, in a dyslexia-friendly school, the use of dyslexia-friendly resources is required, parental involvement and teacher training are enhanced and dyslexia specialist teachers are appointed (Riddick, 2006).

The dyslexia-friendly schools are now considered as one of the main developments for the inclusion of learners with dyslexia in the UK (Reid, 2005). The teaching methods and materials that the teachers can use in a dyslexia-friendly classroom are designed based on dyslexic pupils’ strengths and weaknesses. The positive results of studies that employ the dyslexia-friendly practices in EAL contexts (Fernando, 2012; Mortimore et al., 2012) led to a new dyslexia-friendly resource pack that was published by the British Dyslexia Association in 2012. The new chapter in the BDA pack marks an important step towards multilingual pupils, as it explores the identification and support of learners with dyslexia who study English as an additional language (EAL).

An inclusive education for learners with dyslexia includes interventions and accommodations as both these elements allow learning to take place in spite of some learners’ difficulties with some skills (Shaywitz et al., 2008). The dyslexia-friendly approach (see section 2.6.3) has proved relatively popular in the UK for promoting the inclusion of dyslexic pupils. Studies that have explored the impact of dyslexia-friendly practices on dyslexic EAL learners in the UK showed that the dyslexia-friendly practices had positive effects on dyslexic EAL pupils and were experienced positively by the teachers (Fernando, 2012). This raises implications for exploring the
impact of the dyslexia-friendly practices on dyslexic pupils who learn English as a Foreign or a Second language.

The British Dyslexia Association proposes that practices designed to support dyslexic language learners have positive effects on all pupils (BDA, 2005). The breaking down of tasks, the use of games and other multisensory and explicit activities are techniques that benefit both dyslexic and non-dyslexic pupils, as "good dyslexic practice is good teaching practice" (Turner & Pughe, 2003, p. 89). However, little empirical evidence supports the positive impact of the dyslexia-friendly practices on non-dyslexic pupils, raising a demand for more research on the impact of the dyslexia-friendly practices in mainstream classroom contexts.

2.6.4 The dyslexia-friendly practices in the Greek EFL context

“There is a long tradition of educationalists looking overseas to ‘reference societies’ in order to learn and borrow effective practices” (Elliot, 2014, p. 28). In this study, practices from other contexts had to be sought to address the problematic area of dyslexic pupils’ inclusion in Greek EFL education, as argued previously (2.6.1). The inclusion class in which the dyslexic pupils are placed in Greek mainstream schools (see section 2.5.3) has not permitted the design of practices for mainstream classrooms within the Greek education system. Also, the prevalence of the medical model in Greek education has led to the widespread use of remediation approaches. The latter is in conflict with the inclusion model that this study follows, in which the right of the student to be in the mainstream classroom is acknowledged through the provision of a supportive
learning environment (Dale & Taylor, 2001) for EFL learners with dyslexia.

The primacy of Western education systems such as the UK and the US “in educational and psychological theorizing” (Elliot, 2014, p. 34), together with the extensive developments in the area of inclusion in the UK (see section 2.5.4), directed my attention towards examining inclusive practices within the UK education system. The mainstream character of the dyslexia-friendly practices and growing body of opinion about their positive effects on the dyslexic pupils resulted in their employment in the present study. Nevertheless, this borrowing is not uni-directional; new issues are raised about the nature of the dyslexia-friendly practices when these are employed in Greek EFL education (e.g. practices may appear less inclusive in EFL).

2.6.5 Greek EFL pupils’ performance and motivation

With this study, the dyslexia-friendly practices are introduced in three Greek EFL classrooms; the purpose is to examine whether inclusion is enhanced for dyslexic pupils with a focus on the effects of the dyslexia-friendly practices on dyslexic EFL pupils and their peers. These effects are explored in reference to all pupils’ performance and motivation while teachers’ experiences are also addressed.

Motivation and performance are explored as strongly interrelated concepts. The importance of exploring both these elements resides in the suggestion that the dyslexia-friendly practices support dyslexic learners in mainstream settings and promote ‘feel-good’ factors.
(BDA, 2005). The later is especially important for learners with dyslexia who tend to have low self-esteem (Peer, 2001). The exploration of teachers' experiences that arose is also considered an integral part of this study because of the significant impact teachers' experiences have on inclusive attempts (see section 2.5.2).

2.6.5.1 Motivation

The question that is posed in this study is whether and to what extent the dyslexia-friendly practices the teachers use have a positive impact on pupils' motivation. The exploration of motivation is influenced by literature that suggests that affective elements significantly influence dyslexic learners' inclusion (see section 2.5.1).

Extensive research on dyslexia has focused on dyslexic learner's conceptualisation of self. In the present study, the idea of self is addressed with the term 'self-related beliefs' as the term includes elements of 'self-efficacy', 'self-esteem' and 'causal attributions' previously discussed (see section 2.5.1). Influenced by the fields of both educational psychology (self-efficacy – Bandura, 1986, self-concept – Shavelson et al., 1976) and language learning motivation ('Motivational Self-Systems Theory' – Dörnyei, 2005), Kormos, Kiddle and Csizér (2011) first employed the term 'self-related beliefs' to refer to the self-related feelings of Chilean English language learners. The broader meaning of the term 'self-related beliefs' allows for the exploration of different affective elements such as self-efficacy, self-esteem and causal attributions, when examining the experiences and wellbeing of children with dyslexia in schools.
However, affective factors such as pupils’ attitudes towards their learning context also affect the learning process. In the field of language learning, researchers are concerned with the concept of motivation, an umbrella term, which refers to a number of affective elements that influence learning. Examples are learners’ anxiety, self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977), group-cohesion (see Clement, Dörnyei & Noels 1994) and numerous others. Researchers in the field of motivation have used social and general theories, theories from educational psychology, sociolinguistics and many others. This has resulted in extensive literature on language learning motivation and the design of various motivational models. Although motivation is a complex and dynamic term (Ushioda, 1996), it can be employed in dyslexia research. This will allow the integrated exploration of dyslexic pupils’ feelings in contrast to an exclusive focus on self-related elements that, so far, prevails in dyslexia research.

In this study, motivation is explored based on a questionnaire that Clement et al. (1994) had used to explore EFL learners motivation in a Hungarian setting (see Appendix 4). The elements that Clement and his colleagues were addressing were based on social psychological theories from two research traditions in the field of motivation: Gardner and Lambert’s work (1972), Gardner’s socio-educational model (1985) and Clement’s (1980, 1986) studies on self-confidence. A new element introduced in their study is the group dynamics of the classroom (Clement et al., 1994). Clement et al. (1994) explored the motivation and attitudes of English language learners towards learning English, with a special focus on learners’ desire to learn about the culture of the target language. This was based on Gardner
and Lambert (1972). In Gardner’s socio-educational model of language learning motivation (see Gardner, 1985; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993a), the desire to learn a language was later named ‘integrative orientation’ (e.g. see Appendix 4, item 1). According to Gardner, the motivation to learn a language is relevant to “the extent to which the individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so and the satisfaction experienced in this activity” (Gardner, 1985, p. 10). Gardner’s motivational model is “goal directed” (Gardner, 1985, p. 11) and entails the integrative and instrumental orientation. In contrast to the integrative motive, the instrumental motive refers to the professional or educational purposes that the learner aims to achieve through the new language learnt (e.g. see Appendix 4, item 10). Other elements, such as motivational intensity (effort) (e.g. see Appendix 4 item 41), the desire to learn the language (e.g. see Appendix 4 item 26), and attitudes towards learning the language (e.g. see Appendix 4 item 27), are also significant in conceptualising the integrative motive. Furthermore, Gardner’s model (1985) considers learners’ previous experiences, individual differences, language acquisition contexts and learning outcomes as important for exploring learners’ motivation. On the other hand, Clement (1980), in his theory on motivation, focused on attitudinal social issues (attitudes towards the culture of the language they learn - see Appendix 4, item 31), and second language acculturation processes (the extent to which they want to be acculturated - for an example, see Appendix 4, item 22). Learners’ self- confidence (e.g. see Appendix 4, item 51) is added, since Clement (1980) put forward the view that confidence in using the language (linguistic self-confidence) will be developed when learners
engage in fruitful and frequent contact with members of the community of the target language (Dörnyei, 2001). Although this contact is limited in foreign language contexts, this is not to suggest that linguistic self-confidence should not be explored in foreign language frameworks. This is common especially for world languages like English, since indirect contact with native speakers of English is enhanced especially through the media (the 'English media factor', Clement et al., 1994, p. 432)

To understand the motivation mechanisms in the foreign language classroom more fully, in their study on motivation, Clement et al. (1994) added a new factor that is relevant to the group dynamics of the classroom (e.g. group formation and development, group structure). A special focus was placed on group cohesion (e.g. see Appendix 4, item 54), which refers to the relationship among the members of a classroom group; "cohesion would be closely related to the evaluation of the learning environment, and, by extension, to lower anxiety and higher self-confidence" (Clement et al., 1994, p. 424). This, in turn, influences learners' motivation.

Learners' actions can also show whether language learners are motivated or not. With their 'process model of L2 motivation', Dörnyei and Ottó (1998) provide a framework with which we can examine language learners' motivational behaviour. The process model is based on the examination of three different stages of pupils' behaviour in class: the preactional stage (before a behaviour occurs), the actional stage (the behaviour) and the postactional stage (after the behaviour has occurred) (Dörnyei & Ottó, 1998). The actional stage refers to the observable behaviours a researcher can notice in
class. However, this stage is strongly linked to both the preactional stage and the postactional stages. These are concerned with elements such as wishes, hopes and desires (preactional) and causal attributions, elaboration of internal standards and strategies etc. (postactional), which lead to actions or follow actions at a specified time. Therefore, motivation does not only refer to abstract ideas but can be linked to actual observable behaviours that aid its exploration. The process model supports the examination of EFL learners' motivational behaviour in the present study as it provides a focus on certain aspects of behaviour on both the data collection and data analysis processes.

2.6.5.2 Performance

Performance and self-esteem are strongly interrelated, especially in the case of the dyslexic learners (Peer, 2001). Performance is another element that needs to be addressed in this study, as this will aid the understanding of the effects of the dyslexia-friendly practices in the EFL setting chosen. In a dyslexia-friendly school learners’ weaknesses are not barriers to achievement (BDA, 2005 - DFS pack) and the dyslexia-friendly approach has positive affects on all mainstream pupils (McKay, 2001). Therefore, the need to examine the impact of the dyslexia-friendly practices on EFL pupils’ with and without dyslexia is posed. Furthermore, the dyslexia-friendly practices support dyslexic learners that learn more than one languages (BDA, 2012- DFS pack). The question that arises is whether the dyslexia - friendly practices enhanced dyslexic learners’
access to the language curriculum in the Greek EFL setting from which learners with dyslexia tend to be excluded (see section 2.6).

In the present study, the pupils' performance is explored and described, but not defined by sets of measures. The main aim of the study is to understand dyslexic and non-dyslexic pupils' performance before the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices in order to explore whether any changes occurred after my intervention and, if so, to establish the nature of these. The descriptions the teachers and I are using are influenced by the Greek policy standards on pupils' evaluation in primary schools (MNER, 1991 -Law 462/91) and the guidelines the Greek Ministry of Education, Research and Religious affairs (MNER) provides for language learning in state schools. Following the guidelines from the Common Reference levels from the Common European Framework for Reference of Languages (CEFR, 2001) the Greek Ministry of Education suggests that EFL learners need to reach the A2 level (CEFR, 2001) at the last two classes of primary (state) schools (MNER, 2011- FEK A’ 97). Therefore, the A2 level descriptions were cross referenced with the Greek policy standards on pupils' performance and affected the performance explorations in both stages of the study.

2.6.5.3 Teachers' experiences

A common agreement among researchers is that inclusion is highly dependent on teachers' attitudes towards inclusive attempts (see section 2.5.2). The effects of the dyslexia-friendly practices are highly dependent on the teachers' response and on the way and the extent to which they used them in their classroom. In all school
contexts, teachers have the responsibility to secure learning through the achievement of lesson objectives (McKay, 2001). However, due to the limited training Greek EFL teachers receive on dyslexia (see also sections 2.6; 2.6.2) the support for dyslexic EFL learners in Greece is problematic. Based on the above, the study focuses on EFL teachers' response to my intervention. The aim is to explore teachers' experiences of the dyslexia-friendly practices and whether these supported them in the attempt to include learners with dyslexia in their EFL lessons.

2.7 Research Questions

The literature review section is guided by the study's research questions:

1. How do the dyslexia-friendly practices affect dyslexic EFL learners':
   
   a. motivation towards learning English?

   b. performance in English language tasks?

2. How do the dyslexia-friendly practices affect non-dyslexic EFL learners':

   a. motivation towards learning English?

   b. performance in English language tasks?

3. How do EFL teachers experience the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices in their classrooms?
2.7.1 Concluding points

It should be noted that, in this study, the dyslexia-friendly practices are not provided to the Greek EFL teachers as 'prescriptions', since key to inclusive learning is a flexible curriculum (O’Brien, 2001). Therefore, the host culture and the need for the practices to respond to "local and regional needs" (MacKay, 2004) are acknowledged. Also, it is not assumed that the dyslexia-friendly practices will maintain their original character when used in the Greek context. Besides, the dyslexia-friendly model is strongly influenced by wider education policies, which affect each school's ethos (Robertson, 2001). This poses implications for this study, given the differences that exist between the Greek and the UK education system and the different models of inclusion they follow (see sections 2.5.3; 2.5.4). Furthermore, classroom, learner and teacher characteristics are also considered. The way in which the dyslexia-friendly practices are used varies, as they are introduced in three different classrooms, in three different schools to three different teachers.

Another note worth mentioning at this point is that, although motivation and performance are explored as concepts strongly interrelated, it is acknowledged that other factors also interfere within this relationship such as cultural context, age, personal characteristics, background etc. and affect both the motivation and performance of language learners (based on Dornyei, 2001).

The study follows a 'bottom-up' approach and the practices are employed at a classroom rather than a whole school level (EFL classrooms). Despite the fact that the high centralisation of the
Greek education system has so far impeded inclusive developments (see section 2.5.3), it is a trait that allows teachers to enhance inclusion at a classroom-based level (e.g. teaching approaches). This flexibility benefited the present project since a whole school dyslexia-friendly approach would have to be referred to the Local Authority and later approved by the Greek Ministry of Education. This would be a long, painstaking process, and beyond the scope of the present study.

2.8 The next chapter

Further particulars on the cultural, educational, school and classroom characteristics are presented and discussed in the following chapter, which forms the methodology section of this thesis; it is concerned with the research design and methods I employed to answer my research questions. Apart from the methodological elements, the theoretical framework and practical issues (e.g. accessing schools) are also discussed, in order to help the reader to understand the context of the project and the data collection and analysis processes involved.
3 Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter is the Methodology chapter of this thesis and deals with the methodological issues of the present project. Philosophical considerations that influenced the research design of this study and the analysis of the results are discussed. I also present my role as a researcher and I provide insights into data collection processes and analysis. In the sections that follow, I describe the way I selected my participants along with the ethical considerations during their approach and recruitment. This chapter is divided into the following three sections: the research processes I followed before (section 3.2), during (section 3.3) and after (section 3.4) the study. The study's research questions are repeated below so as to help the reader make associations between the study's aim and the research design that I employed.

3.1.1 Research Questions

1. How do dyslexia-friendly practices affect dyslexic EFL learners'
a. motivation towards learning English?

b. performance in English language tasks?

2. How do dyslexia-friendly practices affect non-dyslexic EFL learners’:

a. motivation towards learning English?

b. performance in English language tasks?

The third research question added at the first stages of the study:

3. How do EFL teachers experience the introduction of dyslexia-friendly practices in their classrooms?

The term experience refers to teachers’ thoughts, beliefs, feelings, views and commitment and how these are translated into practice.

3.1.2 Study’s context

The present study took place in three Greek EFL classrooms in primary schools, comprised of dyslexic and non-dyslexic pupils. The primary focus was to create an inclusive EFL environment via the examination of the impact of the dyslexia-friendly practices. This was accomplished with the use of specific data gathering techniques that provided evidence on whether each classroom was or gradually became inclusive. Since the dyslexia-friendly practices employed in this study are considered to have positive effects on pupils with dyslexia, their effects were examined with a focus on dyslexic EFL learners’ performance and motivation. As a result, the data gathering techniques would also shed light on the influence of the dyslexia-
friendly practices on non-dyslexic pupils' motivation and performance. Besides, literature suggests “dyslexia-friendly practice is, in fact, good practice for all” (BDA, 2005 - DFS pack).

In addition, this study also set out to explore teachers' experiences of the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices; all the three EFL teachers that participated were asked to read documents on dyslexia I provided them with and select dyslexia-friendly practices to use in their classrooms. The third research question on teachers' experiences was added shorty before the initiation of the data collection process.

3.2 BEFORE THE STUDY

3.2.1 Theoretical framework

The way researchers view reality shapes the way a research project will be conducted, since "it is the choice of the paradigm that sets down the intent, motivation and expectations for the research” (Mackenzie & Knipe, 2006, p. 193). The quest for what is "true" or "real" has significant influence on the study's findings, the trustworthiness of the results and its contribution to knowledge. This 'quest' depends heavily on the way Realist researchers consider the nature of reality (ontology), whether and to what extent they believe this reality can be known (epistemology) and finally, the way this can be accomplished (methodology) (Guba and Lincoln, 1994).

Positivism, critical theory and constructivism are amongst the most popular ontological theories. Positivism supports the view that reality exists and can be known, while constructivism favours the exact
opposite perspective; that there are multiple truths in the minds of individuals since reality and knowledge are both socially constructed (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). On the other hand, although critical theory also emphasises social realities it is suggested that a 'virtual' reality also exists though influenced by these social realities (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

In the present thesis, I find myself "between the poles of positivism and relativism" (Pawson & Tilley 1998, p. 158) since I followed a Realist stance (ibid) which determined the appropriate research, data collection methods and analysis for the study (based on Mackenzie & Knipe, 2006). Realism has various versions and it is a term closely related to 'critical Realism' (Maxwell, 2012). Roy Bhaskar (1979) first introduced the term Realism, to which he was later referring as 'Critical Realism' (Bhaskar, 1979). Various other terms have been used in the literature, such a constructive realism (Giere, 1999), natural realism (Putnam, 1999) or experiential realism (Lakoff, 1987). However, in the present thesis, the term 'Realism' will solely be employed.

Realists borrow, as well as reject, assumptions from both paradigms and propose that there is a reality that we cannot entirely apprehend (Godfrey & Hill, 1995). They accept that social issues affect the way we view things - an aspect similar to critical theory - but are different in that their aim is to not to critique or change these realities (Guba & Lilincoln, 1994). In the realist view of reality, there is a distinction between the real world, the actual and the empirical (Sayer, 2000). The 'real' world refers to the powers of objects while the 'actual' is focusing on what happens when these powers are
activated. Finally, the empirical world, although contingent (Sayer, 2000), can be both the real and the actual. The world is an ‘open system’ (Bhaskar, 1979) “characterised by emergence” (Sayer, 2000, p. 12) and realist science is to provide ‘a family of answers’ (Pawson & Tilley, 1998, p. 152) for context dependent situations. However, truth is not rejected like researchers in the constructivism paradigm suggest. Sayer (2000) asserts that Realist researchers are able to observe what exists, though inadequately. However, some structures are not observable (Sayer, 2000) and truth can only be imperfectly apprehended through participants’ reflections (Pawson & Tilley, 1998). These reflections provide a window to reality but not the reality itself, since “the ontology of Realism assumes that research is dealing with complex social phenomena involving reflective people” (Healy & Perry, 2000, p. 121). The part of the reality we can see is the one that depends on mechanisms that are triggered under specific situations (Nash, 2005). The various outcomes that are produced each time from the activation of mechanisms are heavily dependent on contextual conditions.

Realism was chosen because it is a theoretical framework that embraces diversity (Maxwell, 2012). Diversity is essential in realism and differences among members of groups (e.g. communities, schools) should be shared. Differences should not create division among people in a group but can be sources of solidarity relationships (Maxwell, 2012). This principle can and should be applied in educational settings where there is a tendency to assume that learners are homogenous (Martin, 2013). Both the ideas of solidarity
and diversity are key principles in inclusive education systems and school environments that embrace different learner characteristics.

Solidarity is essential for the realist researcher who tries to identify how solidarity is created in contextual conditions and how and whether these conditions embrace diversity. This study embraced diversity and solidarity relationships in that it tried to respond to dyslexic learners' diverse needs by taking into account all the different participants' perspectives about the intervention (teachers', dyslexic and non-dyslexic pupils', researcher's). Besides, in realism, the different perspectives and accounts of people constitute our understandings of this world (Maxwell, 2012). The task of the realist researcher is to explore these understandings in the spheres of the real (what exists), the actual (what occurs) and the empirical (what we observe) (Bhaskar, 1979). This is accomplished with the use of different instruments of data collection (quantitative and qualitative) (Maxwell, 2012).

Realist researchers try to understand action through the actors (people) and their own views (Sayer, 1992). Therefore, when interventions occur in a situation and the context changes, the aim is not to exclusively focus on the outcome of the intervention. The realist researcher also explores the processes by which changes occurred (Maxwell, 2012). This was central in the present study where the main focus was the processes of change that occurred with the use of the dyslexia-friendly practices. Explanations of change can lead to a progressive body of scientific knowledge and promote diversity among communities (Maxwell, 2012). In this case,
the term 'communities' refers to language settings where dyslexic learners' diverse needs need to be acknowledged and embraced.

The choice of the paradigm researchers adhere to is also influenced by their “beliefs about the nature of knowledge and the process of knowing” (Hofer & Pintrich, 1997, p. 117). This refers to the principles of epistemology. Based on this, the focus of the present project was on the identification and work of mechanisms and on whether and under what conditions these were activated (Sayer, 2000). The questions that are usually posed by realist scientists are why something works (e.g. a program), for whom and under what conditions (Pawson & Tilley, 1998) so as to investigate what can be known (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

\[
\text{mechanism + context = outcome}
\]

Figure 2: Mechanisms, context and outcomes according to Realism (adopted from Pawson & Tilley 1998, p. xv)

Based on the above figure (Figure 2), it is made clear that in Realism every research project are strongly influenced by the contextual features (i.e. situations) that surround it. Scientific knowledge is produced by the explanatory strategies used to explore the function of mechanisms that are triggered in specific contexts (Pawson & Tilley, 1998). In social science research, these mechanisms can be triggered by special programs designed to be applied in specific situations, in order to explore whether or not and in what way the
predictable outcomes have been produced. Realist researchers attempt to explore what it is about a program that may reinforce a reaction from the participants and how the workings of a program are contingent and conditional (Pawson & Tilley, 1998). The assumptions that are made about the way this program will function, are based on pre-existing theories and help the researcher make hypotheses about their relation with specific situations. Various methods of data collection are used to explore hypotheses and conclusions are drawn based on the findings. The aim is to produce transferable knowledge (Pawson & Tilley, 1998) while the mechanism, context and outcome links are always present. Realist research is a matter of context; therefore it is important that the researcher takes into account the pre-existing structures of the situation he explores before a program is applied. In this way, the effects of a programme are appreciated and the researcher explores whether the pre-existing structures 'enabled' or 'disabled' the intended mechanism of change (Pawson & Tilley, 1998).

The Realist paradigm determined the data collection methods selected and the data analysis process I followed during the study (based on Mackenzie & Knipe, 2006). The study had two parts: the pre-intervention (first part) and the intervention stage (second part). At the pre-intervention stage, the aim was to explore the context of the study and the events that were taking place before the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices. This allowed me to explore the changes, when the dyslexia-friendly practices were introduced (intervention stage). The research questions were examined and analysed from the data that were gathered in both
stages of the research project. In both stages, I assumed the possibility of pre-existing generative mechanisms in the EFL contexts. The generative mechanisms in this study were pupils’ (dyslexic and non-dyslexic) motivation. The word ‘generative’ means something that is “related to or capable of production or reproduction” (Oxford dictionaries). In this regard, the events or outcomes produced in each context were pupils’ performance, which was the result of the activation of certain mechanisms. Because mechanisms are “established as real” (Bhaskar, 1979, p. 12) “under certain conditions” (ibid), these conditions were different before and during the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices. Therefore, in the second part, the possibility of activation of new or different mechanisms, the elimination of others (not activation) and the production of new or different outcomes (e.g. performance, practice, behaviour/action) was assumed, since new causal structures (dyslexia-friendly practices) were introduced.

The realist framework that connects causal structures, mechanisms and outcomes that influenced both parts of the study led to the focus being on themes of performance, motivation and experiences as this was directed by my research questions (section 3.2.2). Examples of the events that I was focusing on were: pupils’ participation (e.g. participation in classroom tasks), pupils’ level in English (e.g. number of correct answers in a grammar exercise) etc. More detailed description of these events is given in later sections (e.g. section 3.3.7). Furthermore, because different interacting causes produce different events (House, 1991), an exploration of the school context, wider education policies and the school characteristics were in some
cases examined. However, this was not always possible due to ethical
issues or time constraints.

Although, House (1991) proposes that in educational research,
programmes should be viewed more as events rather than as causal
entities, in the present project, the dyslexia-friendly practices were
considered as causal structures that I, as a researcher,
recommended. The aim was to explore whether these triggered
generative mechanisms (and which) (e.g. motivation), which in turn
gave certain outcomes (e.g. performance). As already mentioned,
realists base their assumptions on pre-existing theories (Pawson &
Tilley, 1998). The pre-existing theory in my study, was the
suggestions that the dyslexia-friendly practices have positive
effects on dyslexic and non-dyslexic learners (Mackay, 2004) and are
experienced positively by the teachers (Mortimore et al., 2012). Also,
the positive effects they have shown to have on EAL learners
(Fernando, 2012; Mortimore et al., 2012) led to the assumption that
the dyslexia-friendly practices will enhance dyslexic pupils' inclusion
in the Greek EFL classrooms (that participated in the project). Based
on this theoretical basis, I set out to explore whether these
practices positively influenced all EFL pupils' (dyslexic and non-
dyslexic) motivation and performance. The focus was on the
activation of mechanisms and the outcomes produced with a focus on
the potential processes of change that could occur in the second
part. Influenced by a realist view where the importance of contextual
conditions is enhanced, I also took into consideration that the chosen
context (Greek EFL) must have had a significant influence on the
workings of the practices. Therefore, the question that I posed in
this study was whether the introduction of the practices in the Greek EFL context produced positive outcomes (through the activation of certain generative mechanisms) for all pupils or whether the results questioned this assumption.

Based on the realist paradigm I will be posing the following queries, which will govern the present study:

What was happening in the context (EFL classroom) when the practices were being used? Were the practices triggering different mechanisms and as a result, different responses from the pupils towards English language learning?

(Following the sub-questions of the main research area)
Were these responses positive or negative? Was there a change in pupils’ motivation and performance? If yes how? Was this a positive or a negative change?

"Methodology is the overall approach to research linked to the paradigm or theoretical framework" (Mackenzie & Knipe, 2006, p. 195). After answering epistemological questions and selecting the paradigm I would adhere to in this study, I decided to explore how Realism is linked to my study and the issues I was setting out to explore. Later, the methodological issues of the study were addressed.

3.2.2 Linking Realism with my research questions
The three themes I was exploring in my research questions were pupils’ motivation and performance and teachers’ experiences at the pre-intervention and intervention stages of the project. Therefore,
before moving on to my research design, I tried to associate the themes I was exploring with the 'generative mechanisms, context, outcome' concept so as to have a clear idea on how these three elements fit within my two research questions (Figures 3 & 4).

![Figure 3 Literature on Realism (Blumer 1969, Maxwell 2012)](image1)

![Figure 4: Language learning motivation (Csizér & Dörnyei 2005)](image2)

Establishing a link between Realism and the motivation - performance themes was guided through an association of literature on Realism (Pawson & Tilley, 1998; Healy & Perry, 2000; Maxwell, 2012) with literature that has explored motivation and performance relationships (Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005; Dörnyei, 2001; Tremblay &
Gardner, 1995) (see Figures 3 and 4). Realist researchers assert that the way people act is based on their perceptions (Blumer, 1969). In the field on motivation, the view that motivation is an antecedent of behaviour is put forward: “motivation explains why people behave as they do” (Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005, p. 20). As such, motivation is a generative mechanism that refers to pupils’ thoughts, beliefs and feelings that lead to action (outcomes). These generative mechanisms (motivation) are triggered by the context (Pawson & Tilley, 1998) (see Figure 4), which, in this study, is the EFL classroom. Though, other elements outside the classroom context could be possibly to be addressed (e.g. pupils’ attending evening EFL classes, background).

Figure 5: Realism and motivation theories brought together

Figure 5 is bringing together Realism and motivation-performance relationships (see also Figures 3 & 4). Based on this figure we can infer that motivation is central on the way learners behave in the
processes of learning. In a language classroom, this behaviour is mainly related to pupils practicing their language skills (based on Kanfer, 1996), or other things such as their behaviour in class (e.g. offering to help a classmate, being constantly distracted). Performance is strongly related to the practice of pupils' skills in specific tasks; continuous practice might improve pupils' performance (Kanfer, 1996) and vice versa. However, the relationship of motivation and performance is indirect (Dörnyei, 2001) and motivation does not explain whether pupils' performance is going to be successful (Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005). According to Csizér and Dörnyei (2005) pupils' actions do not depend solely on motivation but on various other factors such as learner's ability, the learning situation (e.g. quality of instruction) (Csizér & Dörnyei, 2005, p. 20) (see Figure 5) and beyond school elements (e.g. social influences).

As Kanfer (1996) suggests, "for practice to have a positive effect on performance, additional motivational mechanisms are required..." (Kanfer 1996, p. 405). For instance, if a learner starts a writing task but does not want to put a lot of effort (generative mechanism), the task will be abandoned and no practice on the writing skill will occur. If this behaviour is recurrent, then the practice of his writing skills is limited and performance is not improved. In this study, Kanfer's (1996) 'motivational mechanisms' are realist researcher's generative mechanisms which are essential in sustaining "...attention and effort over time in the face of difficulties and failures" (Kanfer, 1996, p. 405).

Based on the above, the methods of data collection I chose, explored (Realism terms in bold) pupils' motivation (generative mechanisms),
as well as pupils' performance (outcomes). This was accomplished in two stages in three EFL classroom contexts (context).

3.2.3 Teacher's experiences

After my initial contacts with the EFL teachers, I started realising that their views and response to the introduction of the resources on dyslexia and the dyslexia-friendly practices later, were providing significant information for my study. This was also shown from the beginning of the data collection processes (see Appendix 8e, 8f, 8g). Many studies on inclusion have addressed teachers' views of inclusive practices (e.g. Clark et al., 1999, Avramidis et al., 2002) since these significantly affect inclusive attempts (see also Literature Review chapter section 2.5.2). However, literature that has looked into teachers' experiences of employing dyslexia-friendly practices in their classrooms is sparse. Most of the papers that refer to the dyslexia-friendly practices focus more on what the teachers should be doing rather than the way teachers' experience the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices in their classrooms. Collins (2005) explored the development of a dyslexia-friendly school and suggested that teachers need support and rewards in the process of a dyslexia-friendly development. This influenced the design of my third research question about teachers' experiences. Realism guided me into writing this question. Therefore, based on the realist paradigm I was posing an additional query, which will also govern the present study:
What was happening in the context (EFL classroom) when the practices were being used? Were the practices triggering different mechanisms and as a result, different responses from the EFL teachers?

(Following the sub-questions of the main research area)

Was there a change in teachers' beliefs, views, thoughts, feelings of their practice, of dyslexia and possibly other issues? If yes, how? Was this a positive or a negative change? How did the teachers cope with the new program (causal structure) introduced? How did the teachers respond to the change that occurred?

Realist researchers (e.g. Healy & Perry, 2000; Maxwell, 2012; Pawson & Tilley, 1998) assert that people's beliefs, reasons and motives (mental statements) are generative mechanisms that explain people's actions. These actions are the 'outcomes' of the triggered mechanisms in specific contexts (see Figures 6 & 7) (Maxwell, 2012). If we link the aforementioned explanation of Realism with my third research question we could place teachers' beliefs, feelings, attitudes, views and commitment under the concept of generative mechanisms. The activation of these generative mechanisms depends on the context and results in teachers behaving in certain ways and perhaps altering their practice. Teachers' practice and behaviour were the outcomes of this activation (see Figures 6 & 7). The context (EFL classroom) would possibly be different in the pre-intervention and the intervention stage since, after some point, teachers were introduced into the dyslexia-friendly practices. This could result in activation of different or new mechanisms (e.g. teachers' new
knowledge of dyslexia) or deactivation of others (e.g. reduced negative attitudes) which would in turn lead to different outcomes.

The themes I was exploring regarding the teachers were their attitudes, beliefs, views, feelings and commitment (affective experiences) and how these were shown in action inside (e.g. towards dyslexic pupils) and outside the classroom (e.g. attending our meetings). For example, I wanted to look into how the teachers were viewing dyslexic pupils and how they were behaving towards them before and during the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices. In this way, I could later compare them and see if there have been any changes in both matters (teachers' views, teachers' behaviour).

Based on the above, the third research question was:

3. How do EFL teachers experience the introduction of dyslexia-friendly practices in their classrooms?

Figure 6: Literature on Realism
The next step was the choice of the methods of data collection with which I explored these elements.

3.2.4 Research design

The research questions of this project were approached using a case study design (Yin, 2013), since case studies are one of the methodological approaches realist researchers can employ to investigate their relationship with reality (Healy & Perry, 2000). Furthermore, the study poses 'how' and 'what' types of inquiry which correspond to a case study design (Yin, 2013). The 'what' types of questions demonstrate that this is an exploratory project (see Research Questions). Because the time-scale of this study was limited (two or three months) the case study design allowed me to examine in depth the issues in question (Bell, 2005).

Therefore, this exploratory case study seeks to answer questions about 'how' dyslexia-friendly practices worked in EFL classrooms for both dyslexic and non-dyslexic pupils. The research questions defined the units of analysis (Yin, 2013), which were three Greek EFL
classrooms located in three different primary schools. For this reason, a multiple case study design was adopted. According to Stein (2005), in a case study, it is important to select the cases well so as to understand the phenomenon of interest as better as possible. In this regard, the cases were seen as typical (Teddlie & Yu, 2007) of the state Greek EFL context (see Literature Review section 2.6).

The examination of the dyslexia-friendly practices in the three EFL classrooms (Winterfell, Riverlands, Highgarden) was focused on understanding the workings of these practices, since “the case facilitates our understanding of something else” (Stake, 2005, p. 445). The study was an instrumental case study (Stake, 2005) because, the primary interest was to provide insights into a particular phenomenon; that of dyslexia inclusion in an EFL environment. The case (classroom) is of secondary to that phenomenon and instances of that phenomenon will be examined so as “to provide an in-depth account of events, relationships, experiences and processes occurring during that particular instance” (Denscombe, 1998, p. 32).

Many cases can be studied together to explore the phenomenon of interest in a multiple case study design (Stake, 2005). Although data from one classroom could address the research questions the decision to include three classrooms was due to three reasons; the first reason was epistemological. I believed that it would be challenging to apply the same practices in different classrooms since the different contexts produced different outcomes: “even the same programme can produce different results because of the complexity and interaction of all the structures that affect the results” (House, 1991, p. 7). The second reason was methodological since the collection
of data on the workings of the practices from more than one classroom was probable to provide richer data. Besides, the evidence that is gathered through multisite projects can make a study more robust (Herriott & Firestone, 1983). Finally, the third reason was to diminish the problems that arose in case some of the teachers, pupils or schools dropped out. Fortunately, all the participants, apart from the case of two pupils, kept being involved until the end of the project.

After the results of each classroom were obtained, a cross case comparison (Yin, 2013) of the findings was accomplished. Similarities and differences among the findings led me into reaching my final conclusions and answering my research questions. The detailed analysis I provide for each case and the cross case comparisons make my conclusions robust (Eisenhardt, 1989). The differences among the cases provided me with significant information on how the dyslexia-friendly practices were influenced from learner, school, classroom and teacher characteristics.

3.2.5 Research plan (overview)

Although Realism is compatible with various research methods (Sayer, 2000), the methods that were used in this project were qualitative because qualitative data provided in-depth understandings of the cases (Maxwell, 2012) and the phenomena under study. The original aim to use questionnaires was abandoned due to the small sample size. Because a Realism researcher's knowledge about the world requires an exploration of multiple perceptions about reality, the triangulation of data is a necessary requirement for them to
become 'value-aware' (Healy & Perry, 2000). As a result, my own perceptions along with pupils' and teachers' perceptions were explored with teacher and pupil interviews as well as focus groups with all the classroom pupils. My views were recorded through classroom observations and a personal research diary.

3.2.6 Sampling

After I decided on the research design, I started planning the steps that I followed for the realisation of the project. The sampling strategies I used were purposive, typical case and convenience sampling techniques (Teddlie & Yu, 2007). The research questions were addressed by undertaking the study in an EFL context (purposive sampling). Also, I decided that the study would take place in typical cases of public Greek EFL education since it was my personal area of expertise (typical case sampling). I had worked in the region in the past and the familiarity with the context facilitated my access to the schools (convenience sampling) (Teddlie & Yu, 2007).

I started planning the actualisation of the study before the approval from the University of Manchester Ethics Committee was obtained (January 2012) so as to start the study in March 2012- see timeframe Appendix 6). Being "experientially acquainted with the case" (Stake 2005, p. 455) (previous employment in the Greek EFL context) made the case 'embraceable' (ibid). Furthermore, in a qualitative case study researchers need to gather data on the nature of the case, the background and the physical setting (Stake, 2005). Moreover, they need to explore other contexts (e.g. economic, political), other cases relevant to the ones examined and "those
informants through which the case can be known" (Stake, 2005, p. 447). Some of these background issues had already been addressed before the study began since I had been informed about the political and economic setting of the cases. For instance, I knew from the beginning of the project that the financial hardships the country was experiencing had influenced the Greek education system. These problems had hampered the provision of resources to schools and affected the project in case the practices required the use of specific materials. The teachers' significant salary reductions were also taken into account since their material needs were not being met; this could influence the teachers' willingness to take part in my research (based on Bennel, 2004). Moreover, it was correctly predicted that the Greek legislative elections that took place during the study slightly changed the study's timeframe.

3.2.7 The exploration of motivation and performance

3.2.7.1 Motivation

At this stage, I started thinking about the instruments of data collection I used. The first focus was on motivation and on the way I could explore this as motivation is an abstract term and difficult to explore. Literature on motivation (see also section 2.6.5) aided this process and the design of the data collection instruments. The interview and the focus group questions for the pupils were based on Clement et al.'s (1994) questionnaire (Appendix 4) and the items of this questionnaire were transformed into interview questions. For instance, the item: “studying English is important to me because it allows me to learn about the current intellectual trends of the worlds
and thus broaden my view” (see Appendix 4, item 13) was refined into the following question: “I guess everybody tells you that you should know English and some of you may go to a private language institute in the afternoon because you have to learn English well. Why do you think it is so important to learn English? Why do you think everybody is saying that you have to learn?” (e.g. Appendix 15a - question 1). Therefore, elements of instrumental (e.g. Appendix 4a, item 2) and integrative orientation (e.g. Appendix 4a, item 4) and attitudes towards learning the language (e.g. Appendix 4b, item 3) (Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Gardner, 1985; Gardner & McIntyre, 1993a) were addressed together with attitudes towards the learning situation (e.g. Appendix 4b, item 10), linguistic self-confidence (e.g. Appendix 4a, item 9) and group cohesion (e.g. Appendix 4a, item 12) (based on Clement, 1980; Clement et al, 1994).

The ‘actional stage’ of the ‘process model of L2 motivation’ (Dörnyei & Ottó, 1998) aided the exploration of pupils’ motivation during the observations. The process model was not subserviently followed as my observations focus on pupils’ behaviour (motivated or not) in class in a more general sense rather than in reference to specific goals on which the process model is focusing. During the observations the focus was on pupils’ behaviour on the actional stage. Elements of the preactional stage (plans the learners make for completing an action, the action plan, intention, start condition) could not be tackled as they were not observable. The same applies for the elements at the postactional stage (e.g. learners’ further planning). Therefore, based on the process model, I was focusing on specific actions such as subtask generation and implementation and actional outcomes (see
Figure 8). In this study, the word 'task' refers to “activities involving any of the four language skills” (based on Ellis, 2003, p. 7). Subtask generation and implementation are the actualisation of tasks the learner has planned to address at the pre-actional phase. During the observations, the actions, and not the plans, were explored. For example, I was able to see the learners underlining words in a text (subtask implementation). However, in the interviews I had with the learners I did not ask them about specific tasks since I addressed more general issues (e.g. attitudes towards target language). The fact that the learner was using a subtask was considered as a motivated behaviour since the learner was seeking for alternative ways to understand a text. Other elements I was not able to observe were pupils’ appraisal (generative mechanism) (see Figure 8), which refers to learners evaluating their progress (e.g. negative attitudes towards the task because of failure to do it) and their action control (generative mechanism). The latter refers to a self-regulatory strategy learners employ to keep doing a certain task (Dörnyei & Ottó, 1998). However, the outcomes of these strategies were observable behaviours (actional outcomes). For instance, I was able to see some learners pertaining into a task, but I could not know the self-regulatory processes they had employed to do this. I was also able to observe whether an actional outcome was leading to a dead end (e.g. pupil could not write a word) and whether this resulted in abandonment of the action (e.g. stop writing). Where possible, instances of employing different strategies to accomplish action (e.g. ask the teacher/classmate for help) were also observed while instances of redefining the goal and forming a new intention (e.g. completing some parts of the exercises and not all) were addressed
too. In Figure 8, the above elements in all the three stages (preactional, post actional, actional) are linked to Realism (see arrows Figure 8). The model is similar to Realism, in the sense that the strong influence of the context is also acknowledged (see Figure 8) in all the three stages (e.g. opportunities, means & resources, assigned tasks) (Heckhausen 1991, cited in Dörnyei & Ottó, 1998). The elements in the preactional and the postactional stages are generative mechanisms (desire, hopes etc.) and therefore cannot be directly observed (see Figure 8). Therefore, aspects of the model such as the preactional and postactional stages were not addressed through the observations (see Figure 8). In case I was addressing these elements other methods of data collection would have to be used (e.g. interviews).
Figure 8: Action Sequence – Realism (based on Dörnyei & Ottó 1998)

*Pink arrows: generative mechanisms at the preactional stage*

*Green arrows: outcomes observed*

*White arrows: generative mechanisms at the postactional stage*

Examples of behaviour I was observing based on the actional stage were volunteering answers, extend of task engagement, completing home assignments, actively listening to teacher’s instructions, failing to complete class work, not being prepared. These elements guided me into devising an observation schedule (see Appendix 5) influenced by the process model (Dörnyei & Ottó, 1998). In this way, I was able to identify instances of specific behaviours on the part of the
dyslexic and the non-dyslexic pupils. Apart from the observation schedule, I also kept notes while a red pen was used for note taking for the dyslexic learners and a black pen for the rest of the pupils and the teacher.

The classroom observations did not allow me to explore pupils’ motivation per se (since motivation is a generative mechanism) but to look for specific aspects of motivational behaviour (see also section 2.6.5). Besides, a focus on pupils’ actions per se enlightens the area of motivation and shows what lies behind those actions (Williams, 1994).

3.2.7.2 Performance

Exploring performance was easier than exploring motivation since performance (pupils’ academic achievement) is a less intricate term and can be addressed with several measures such as pupils’ assessment tools and classroom observations (see Appendix 18). However, the limited assessment tools available lead to performance being explored solely qualitatively. Performance was explored at both stages of the study (before and during the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices) through the use of classroom observations, teacher interviews and a review of the pupils’ assessment tools. Notes from my personal research diary that refer to pupils’ performance were also used.

The study involved pupils from the last two stages of primary school. According to the Greek Ministry of Education guidelines (MNER, 2011), it is required that, by the end of primary education, pupils
should have reached upper elementary level in English (A2, equivalent to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR)). Therefore, the pupils' performance in English in Greek primary education is interpreted with the use of these descriptions and evaluated against the A2 level skills (e.g. reading, writing, listening) the Greek EFL learners are required to have at this stage. Since, in this study, pupils' performance is described rather than defined, the descriptions that the teachers and I were using are influenced by the guidelines provided by the Greek Ministry of Education for evaluating pupils' performance at the primary levels (MNER, 1991, Law 462/91) (see Table 1). The fact that both the teachers and I were familiar with these descriptions was due to my experience in working in EFL classrooms in state schools in the past.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent: the learner fully responds to the demands of the lesson</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good: the learner responds at a great extent to the demands of the lesson</td>
<td>8 - 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good/mediocre: the learner responds well enough to the demands of the lesson</td>
<td>6 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory/ low: the learner responds to the basic demands of the lesson</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail/ very low: the learner does not respond to the demands of the lesson</td>
<td>below 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Performance evaluations in Greek primary education (state schools) (MNER, 1991- Law 462/91)
The terms such as 'Excellent', 'Very Good', 'Good', 'Satisfactory/Low' and 'Fail/Very Low' are the terms that were used to describe pupils' performance against the expectations of the A2 level. The description 'Fail/Very Low' refers to the pupils being below the A2 level in English. In Greek education descriptions of what 'Excellent' or 'Very good' are based on the teacher's judgement according to what the pupil is doing in class, at home (e.g. homework) as well as from the information gathered from the pupil's assessment tools. So, the terms 'very good', 'good' etc. the teachers and I are using in our descriptions are showing pupils' performance against the A2 level in English. In cases where the pupils' assessment tools are sometimes including the grade (e.g. 9 out of 10) these was changed into the equivalent description as the original intention to explore pupils' performance via their assessment tools was abandoned due to the lack of these (see Table 1- based on the Law 462/91, paragraph 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Basic User</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Common Reference levels: Learning, teaching and assessment - A2 (Common European framework for reference of languages 2011, p. 24)
Table 2 refers to a general description of an A2 learner’s abilities. The references the Common European framework makes for specific language skills such as reading, writing, listening and speaking for A2 learners (Appendix 10a) also aided the exploration of performance at some instances. Similar descriptions were also found in the data (see also Data Analysis chapter). The grid on specific skills (Vocabulary and Grammar) also aided addressing pupils’ performance as some teachers were focusing extensively on these (Appendix 10b).

During the classroom observations, pupils’ performance was examined through the use of descriptions that refer to pupils’ skills in classroom tasks. The classroom tasks involved reading aloud, answering exercises from the book, replying to teachers’ questions (e.g. when teacher was asking about the meaning of a word), spelling activities (e.g. writing words on the board). Although students’ performance in classroom tasks is not one of the most psychometrically sound assessments commonly used to evaluate students’ academic performance (Stiggins & Bridgeford, 1985), they are also important in performance explorations as students spend a lot of classroom time on task (e.g. seatwork assignments, essays, quizzes etc.) (ibid). The data from the classroom observations were later triangulated with the descriptions the teachers were using, the teachers’ feedback in the pupils’ assessment tools.

3.2.8 Approaching the participants

The next critical step was to approach the participants. Apart from my familiarity with the Greek EFL context (EFL teacher in that district), the geographical area I finally selected to conduct the
study were state schools in a district area I had previously been employed. The assistance of a link person in Greece while I was waiting for the official approval to start the study from the University of Manchester was considered essential. The link person I contacted was chosen based on her good professional knowledge of the area since she had been working in primary schools in that district for more than twenty years (former head teacher in one of the schools). What is more, I had established a good personal relationship with her and I knew from the start we could collaborate well. The link person initiated contact with some schools before my arrival in Greece. She could also provide me with preliminary information on the potential participants. Because I had decided on a multiple case study design, I was planning to include an average of three or four schools. This was heavily depend on the number of schools the link person could access. After she brought me in contact with the head teachers and the EFL teachers in some schools I started sending the information sheets via email. The consent forms (University of Manchester, Hellenic Data Protection authority) for the head teachers, the EFL teachers, parents and pupils were provided only to the schools that agreed to participate.

“People are sometimes concerned with what kind of person the researcher is than with the research itself” (Silverman & Marvasti, 2008, p. 309). This applies in the Greek culture. Furthermore, the information sheets and the consent forms (University of Manchester) were well structured following guidelines from an English context; these would be well appreciated in an English school. However, due to the differences in interaction between the English and the Greek
culture (Sifianou, 1999) the use of a similar formal style was possible to alienate the Greek participants during our conversations. Based on this, extra care was given to the initial telephone conversations I had with the head teachers since I started building a relationship with them. By the time I arrived in Greece the participants chosen (head teachers, EFL teachers, pupils, parents) had read and signed the sheets and the forms and the study commenced.

At the pre-intervention stage of the study I explored EFL teachers' experiences, pupils' motivation and performance and the context before the teacher started using the practices. I also provided the teachers with information on dyslexia (e.g. articles). At the intervention stage, the teachers were given with a list of the dyslexia-friendly practices to use in their lessons'. The comparisons I made between the two stages of the study helped me answer my research questions. The research started on March 2012 and finished at the end of the same school year (June 2012).

The above chapter is an overview of my plans for the study before its initiation. Although I mentioned before that my familiarity with the context helped me predict some events the unpredictability of human behaviour (Czarniawska, 2004, p. 13) led to some unexpected incidents such as the repetition of Greek national elections. The following chapters aim to demonstrate which parts of my original plan were actually accomplished, the issues that arose during the research process and the way I dealt with these issues.
3.3 ACTUAL STUDY

3.3.1 Approaching the participants

The schools the research took place in a small town in Greece in the middle of the school year 2011-2012 (see Table 3) the link person that acted as factor for gaining accessibility, visited seven schools in the town so as to inform the head teachers and the EFL teachers and gauge their willingness to take part. Soon after I received approval from the University of Manchester and the University’s ethics committee and the necessary forms were signed by my supervisor (February 2012), I emailed the information sheets to the link person (see Appendix 7). She passed them to the head teachers and the EFL teachers of each school. The study was ‘open democratic’ (Scott & Usher, 2011, p. 137) since information about the data collection, the data analysis and the results of the study were provided to the potential participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>February 2012</th>
<th>March 2012</th>
<th>April 2012</th>
<th>May 2012</th>
<th>June 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-intervention stage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaching the participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil interviews/focus groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Diary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention stage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil interviews/focus groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research diary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: The process of data collection

The school visits of the link person lasted two weeks, at the end of which, she informed me that four out of the seven schools were willing to talk to me and learn more about the study. A basic requirement for schools to be included in my study was the attendance of officially recognized learners with dyslexia. Although all four head teachers confirmed that they had learners with dyslexia the link person was not able to clarify whether they had been officially recognised due to the limited time she could stay in the schools during her visits. In the telephone conversations I later had with the head teachers I was informed about the EFL learners with dyslexia and the classroom levels they were at. I also gave them additional information about my project. In some cases, the head teachers also asked me about whether or not expenses would arise during the project (see Appendix 8a). The schools’ specialist teachers were also involved in some of these telephone conversations so as to give me details on the number and the level of the officially recognised learners with dyslexia found in the school.

One week later I was informed that in one of the four schools the learners that were considered as having dyslexia had not been provided with an official certificate. As the specialist teacher stated (for more details on specialist teachers’ role in schools see literature review section 2.5.3), the belief that these pupils had dyslexia was based on the children’s parents. Consequently, the specific school did not meet the requirement of having officially recognized learners with dyslexia and was excluded from the study.
One classroom from each of the three remaining schools was chosen depending on the year and the attendance of dyslexic learners that were holding a certificate from CDDS centres (see Literature Review section 2.4.1). The size of the schools and the classrooms varied. The class in Riverlands School was constituted by eighteen pupils. Winterfell and Highgarden classrooms were smaller with eleven and thirteen pupils respectively. As will be shown in the data analysis section, the school and the classroom conditions had several similarities and differences. The level of the students in all cases was between an upper elementary or low-intermediate level (between A2 or B1 according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages - Council of Europe) since pupils at this stage start to be more independent in reading, spelling and writing activities. A2 or B1 level pupils also start to understand and communicate in simple language and understand simple texts (Council of Europe). This level provided a better picture of the possible changes the practices produced in English language tasks in contrast to pupils at earlier stages of language learning. All the pupils were at the final stages of primary school and their ages ranged from nine to twelve years old. Only one officially recognised dyslexic pupil was found in each classroom. After some short discussions with the specialist teacher in Highgarden School he confirmed that an immigrant pupil from Bulgaria that had not yet had obtained an official statement for dyslexia should be considered as a pupil with dyslexia. Therefore, he was also included in the study as a pupil with dyslexia (see Figure 9).
Figure 9: The classrooms and the dyslexic pupils

3.3.2 Ethical considerations

After the cases (classrooms) had been selected, I sent all the consent forms (University of Manchester, Hellenic Data Protection authority) to the head teachers of the schools via email (consent forms for pupils, head teachers, parents, EFL teachers) (see Appendix 9). In the consent forms justifications of the project, the ways by which the data were interpreted and analysed were presented (BERA 2004). Because in every research, anonymity is essential and "information provided by the participants should in no way reveal their identity" (Cohen et al., 2000, p. 61), the use of pseudonyms protected the names of the participants. Finally, access to any kind of electronic data was password protected. Due to time constrains, the head teachers agreed to pass the information sheets and the consent forms to teachers, pupils and parents (see Appendix 9). Although the pupils’ parents did not take part in the study, consent was sought because the direct contact I had with the pupils was an ethical issue. These documents addressed the danger of ethical problems arising in the process of the project (Cohen et al., 2000). It was clarified that I should receive the consent forms in a week’s time from the time the parents received them so as to start the classroom observations upon my arrival in Greece. This time
allowed the participants to understand the aims and the processes of the study and decide on whether to participate or not.

The consent forms were acknowledging the participants' right to withdraw from the study at any point. At this stage, I also decided to ask from one of the pupils in Winterfell classroom not to participate in the study because she was a family member and including her was creating a conflict of interest.

The telephone conversations that followed were mainly with the EFL teachers of the three remaining schools after the head teacher had provided them with the consent forms. These were taking place mainly during school breaks or at times where the teachers had some free time while at school. Fortunately, all the teachers were willing to talk and learn more about the study. After some point it was agreed with two of the EFL teachers that exchanging emails would be an easier procedure at this stage while all three of them wanted to meet me in person when possible (see Appendix 8b). The third EFL teacher said that he preferred telephone calls because he had no Internet connection at home and he could check his emails only when he was at school. Based on my preliminary notes in my research diary at this stage I was concerned about the willingness of this teacher to participate in the project (see Appendix 8b). The exchange of emails and telephone calls that informed the teachers about the study lasted a week.
3.3.3 Introducing teachers to dyslexia

The first step after the participants (teachers, pupils) agreed to participate in my study was to introduce the teachers to the dyslexia-friendly practices. However, an understanding of dyslexia is essential for the teacher to be able to develop inclusive practice in the classroom and to develop a dyslexia-friendly environment; all teachers need to be “empowered through training, policy and ethos” (BDA, 2005, p.2). As already mentioned in the research plan (see Methodology chapter), before the study began materials were be provided to EFL teachers so as to raise their awareness of dyslexia. Besides, if someone wants to implement change “then one has to provide the educational agents with new knowledge” (Freire & César, 2003, p. 344) as well as new strategies and methods so that they are able to implement this change (Freire & César, 2003).

Although the teachers were familiar with the term dyslexia they suggested that their knowledge of dyslexic pupils’ difficulties and of dyslexia support was limited. It was therefore agreed that they would start reading the resources on dyslexia I gave them. The teachers chose and read the materials provided. In case they had any questions they were contacting me via email or arrange a telephone call. This started before my arrival in Greece. The link person received and passed the resources in print form to the teacher that did not have Internet connection at home. During these arrangements, two of the teachers mentioned that they needed my support when reading the resources. However, one of the teachers was slightly more confident than the other two the due to a seminar on dyslexia she had attended (see Appendix 8c).
Because the teachers suggested that they needed my presence when they were reading the resources on dyslexia, I explained that this would happen after my arrival in Greece (see Appendix 8b). I also encouraged them to contact me by phone or email in case they had any concerns and explained that they would have my support throughout the project.

After I was reassured that the dyslexia resources had been distributed to all the three EFL teachers I decided to contact them via email to ask for their views and whether they had any questions. In this way, I could also check if they had read them (see Appendix 8e). This part of the study was significant for the research process. It showed the extent to which the teachers were motivated to be involved in the project despite the fact that no material rewards were given (expectancy theory- Johnson, 1986). It also showed whether the teachers were viewing my project as a enriching their job (job enrichment theory - Johnson, 1986). To enhance this, in the initial meetings with the teachers I stressed that although the research process could be demanding, it would enhance their professional development: the information on dyslexia and the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices could augment their knowledge of dyslexia and make them more responsive to dyslexic learners’ needs.

It was crucial that the EFL teachers read at least some of the resources on dyslexia so as to be better able to conceptualize the dyslexia-friendly practices that they later used. The resources could either enhance their motivation in using the practices or intimidate them and decide to withdraw. Furthermore, the importance of
teachers' time availability was taken into consideration. Suslu (2006) suggests that teachers are very often faced with emotional and physical exhaustion because they have to do many things in a limited time. The latter, in combination with the significant salary reductions the EFL teachers had experienced could make them view my research as an additional burden (based on Vlachou & Barton, 1994).

The EFL teachers' reactions to the provision of dyslexia resources varied. At this point, I was hoping that the teachers would spend some time reviewing the resources. After a few days, two of the teachers informed me that they had skimmed the resources. One of them said that she was going to print them first and then start reading while the other one said that she would start at the end of that month (February 2012). The teacher who had received the printed materials complained about the amount of the documents he had received. I clarified that he had the option to choose and read some of them. However, after a few telephone conversations the same teacher said that he would start studying them when he would start implementing the practices (see Appendix 8f). Although this was different from the research process I had planned, at this point I decided to discuss with the teacher upon my arrival in Greece.

3.3.4 Arrival in Greece

Most of the consent forms were gathered a few days before the classroom observations started. At this point, I asked teachers' permission to add their experiences of the study in the research questions of the project. Two of them agreed promptly while the third teacher (Winterfell School) asked me for more details before
she finally gave me her permission. The study initiated soon after all of the forms were gathered (first week I was in Greece).

The EFL teachers that took part in my study were Myrtle, Penelope and Minos in Riverlands, Winterfell and Highgarden schools respectively. In our first meetings Myrtle and Penelope informed me that they had started reading the resources. On the other hand, Minos said that he was planning to read the resources after the practices had been introduced. At this point, I felt that I had to explain to Minos the importance of the resources one more time at a meeting. Also, the next time I visited Minos’ school, I brought with me the shortest of these documents and asked Minos if he could understand all the dyslexia terms I had underlined. Minos suggested that most of them were unfamiliar. After I stressed that Minos could get my support any time he wanted he agreed on starting reading the resources and said that he would start with the short articles I had given him (see Appendix 8g).

During the study I was indirectly checking if the teachers were reading the resources by asking them their views of the documents. Penelope and Myrtle appeared to be more collaborative at this point. Minos admitted that he was not reading the resources at this stage, and that he was more interested in the dyslexia-friendly practices.

3.3.5 My role

This study was designed in a way that gave the EFL teachers the freedom to work independently of my presence and select the
dyslexia-friendly practices that they used in their lessons. Support was mainly provided when the teachers were reading the resources as all the three EFL teachers suggested that their awareness of dyslexia was limited. However, when the teachers started employing the dyslexia-friendly practices their need for advice and constant support was shown, as they were constantly seeking for my advice. Therefore, instead of being an observer and an interviewer in the whole process, I took the role of a consultant as well, as the teachers' limited awareness of dyslexia was making them feel insecure towards employing the dyslexia-friendly practices (see also section 3.3.7 and 3.3.10). This resulted in the teachers sharing their experiences, feelings and concerns not only in during the interviews but even in our short encounters at school (e.g. before the observations).

Penelope and Myrtle showed this need for support from the beginning of the study, when they started reading the resources on dyslexia. They were very often asking for us to meet and discuss about some issues that were unclear to them. In contrast, Minos' need for support and discussions was mainly shown during the intervention, as his interest towards reading the resources on dyslexia was not triggered.

During the intervention stage, the teachers were asking my views of the dyslexia-friendly practice they were intending to use in their lesson and whether I had any recommendations to make. This was happening in almost every lesson and this resulted in the dyslexia-friendly practices chosen, being highly influenced from what I had recommended to the teachers. The teachers were also seeking my
views after the lesson or during the interviews about the way they were employing the dyslexia-friendly practices. Examples of the issues the teachers were feeling insecure with were whether the dyslexia-friendly practice that they selected was appropriate for their class, at which stage of the lesson it was best to introduce the practice and whether a specific dyslexia-friendly practice was appropriate for the pupils' level. My feedback certainly affected their practice and the way they were introducing the dyslexia-friendly practices in their lessons. However, it must be noted that the teachers were not subserviently following my advice. Fruitful discussions were taking place when the teachers wanted us to discuss about the dyslexia-friendly practices as the they were also giving me important information about their class and how they thought a specific dyslexia-friendly practice could be employed in their classroom or not. Teachers' experiences were noted in both my research diary and in some notes I was making in class.

Based on the above, the interview and the observational data had influences from this consultancy role I took during the study (for my influence in the classroom observations see also section 3.3.7). So, the fact that I was not distancing myself throughout the process impacted on the processes of change more than what was originally planned. Information on teachers' experiences was gathered more 'informally' than in an interview setting and the dyslexia-friendly practices were influenced by my recommendations.
3.3.6 Data collection

The data collection methods form an integral part of every study since they are the “systematic modes, procedures or tools used for collection and analysis of data” (Mackenzie & Knipe 2006, p. 195). The data collection processes I followed were the same in both stages of the project.

Accepting the fact that there are structural properties, which can influence action, the realist researcher’s task is to identify these mechanisms and the way they work (Scott, 2000). Because the realist paradigm “is implicit in much qualitative research” (Healy & Perry, 2000, p. 118), the qualitative methods that were used for the purposes of this study, were classroom observations, focus groups, teacher and pupil interviews as well as reviews of the pupils’ assessment tools. My personal research diary was included into the data collection processes from the beginning (approaching participants) until the end of the data collection processes. This helped me gather contextual information that was relevant to the research topic and the research site (based on Silverman & Marvasti, 2008). The research diary also helped me triangulate my data through the researcher’s, the teachers’ and the pupils’ views. According to the realist theory, the methods being utilised, focused on issues of “relations and structural properties, the interpretations of those relations by relevant social actors and relations and perceived relations between different structures at each time point” (Scott, 2000, p. 34). I also explored the intentions and the actions of the social actors in the research setting (based on Scott, 2000).
The following sections discuss the data collection methods followed in the two stages of the study. Because no problems arose with the recruitment of the participants, the interviews, the focus groups and classroom observations started the time that was originally planned (middle of March 2012).

3.3.7 Classroom observations

According to Cohen and Manion (1980), “the case study researcher observes the characteristics of an individual unit” (Cohen & Manion, 1980, p. 99). As such, classroom observations were one of the methods of data collection I used. The classroom observations before the use of the dyslexia-friendly practices allowed me to examine relations or structural properties and to understand the context of action (Scott, 2000). Observing the classroom setting helped me gather information about the setting and each EFL teacher’s classroom practice. This later allowed me to understand better the potential changes, if and when the teacher started using the practices. In the classrooms, I was conducting direct observations (Yin, 2013). I was a ‘complete’ observer (Cohen et al., 2000, p. 35) completely detached from all the classroom activities and avoiding contact with the pupils. However, the ‘observer effects’ (Robson, 2002) could not be totally eliminated as during the first set of observations pupils were constantly looking at me or asking me questions.

My presence also affected the teachers’ behaviour since I was perceived as a dyslexia specialist. For instance, in the first
observation in Highgarden School, Minos possibly started behaving differently to the dyslexic pupil as most of the classroom pupils appeared surprised with his behaviour (see Appendix 11). However, I was not sure on whether Minos' behaviour was common or not and whether it was influenced by my presence. At this stage, I felt that I had to revisit with the teachers the purposes of the study and my role in the class. However, two or three weeks after the first observations, the observer effects (Robson, 2002) started to diminish. The pupils stopped asking me questions while the teachers were looking at me less often during the lesson.

The classrooms observations were taking place three or four times a week (in every EFL lesson). During the observations I was looking into pupils' behaviour and participation in tasks. This behaviour was showing me their performance levels directly and their motivation indirectly (see section 3.3.7 above). Regarding their performance, my notes were focusing on their level of English through the answers they were providing in exercises, their difficulty or ease when reading texts, understanding texts, pronunciation, vocabulary knowledge etc. Their extent of participation in the activities was also explored (e.g. raising hand when knowing the answer). The notes from the classroom observations were written in English because the pupils were at times looking at my notes and English made it more difficult for them to understand.

The observation schedule that was designed specifically for pupils' motivation was used only for the first two observations since I was missing lots of data by reading the type of behaviour that was in each
box so as to note it down. Therefore, the observations resulted in being unstructured (Bell, 2005) since I was trying to record everything I could possibly observe happening in the classroom. The duration of each activity was also recorded so that I could later see whether the teacher was following a specific pattern or not (Appendix 11). Further details on my data from the observations are discussed in the data analysis chapter (Chapter Four).

A first review of the notes after my fieldwork indicated that the notes from the classroom observations provided me with useful information about the context of each classroom, each teacher's practice, teacher-pupil relationships, pupil-pupil relationships and pupils' motivation and performance. The observations helped me understand each EFL teacher's philosophy and general teaching approach. Moreover, I was focusing on whether teachers' behaviour was different towards the learners with dyslexia. Other issues such as the way the learners were sitting were also noted down while the names of the dyslexic pupils were later underlined.

At the intervention stage, the notes were still focusing on classroom processes and on whether the teacher had used any of the dyslexia-friendly practices. More general issues relevant to the classroom setting were also mentioned (e.g. number of computers in class). Literature suggests that teachers sometimes recognise some children's problems with spelling and writing difficulties and adapt their teaching methods naturally (Kirby et al., 2005). Based on this, I decided to design a document in which the teachers could reflect on whether they were already using some practices similar to the dyslexia-friendly practices I had given them (see Appendix 2). During
the classroom observations, I was underlining the dyslexia-friendly practices being used each time. My classroom observation notes at this stage were describing similar issues as before (pupils performance, teachers’ and pupils’ behaviour). They also helped me notice changes that occurred during the use of the dyslexia-friendly practices relevant to the classroom setting, teachers’ practice etc.

3.3.8 The dyslexia-friendly practices employed

The classroom observations and short discussions I had with the teachers before the lessons helped me trace and note down the dyslexia-friendly practices used. There were similarities and differences among the practices each teacher employed and the way they employed these. However, in all the classrooms, a dyslexia-friendly practice was employed in nearly every lesson at the intervention stage.

3.3.8.1 Highgarden classroom

Minos started doing a lot of group-work and pair-work activities at the intervention stage (e.g. observation at 23/04/12 - Table 4). He also used the activity where all the classroom pupils sit in a group and have to say something positive about the pupil sitting next to them. One of the first changes noticed in Minos’ lesson was to give instructions in a much slower pace than before the intervention. In one of the lessons he also started reading the text from the book sentence by sentence (14/05/12- Table 4) while at some instances he was explaining the exercise the pupils were asked to do twice.
The way the pupils were organised changed as paired reading and group writing were also embedded in the lesson. During a reading exercise, Minos also started using images to explain the task and tried to elicit their thoughts about what they thought the text was about. Cumulative, direct teaching and multisensory techniques were also employed (11/05/12; 14/05/12; 16/05/12 – Table 4). Overall, Minos was focusing extensively on vocabulary teaching. At the intervention stage, when teaching new vocabulary items, he started using different colour chalk and requested from the pupil to write the new vocabulary items with big letters on the board. He also reduced the number of words that he was asking from the students to learn for next time. For example, in one lesson at the intervention stage, Minos only gave the pupils six words to learn in contrast to the ten words per lesson the pupils were usually given at the pre-intervention stage. Also, in one of the dictation tasks, more time was given to all the pupils (extra five minutes than usual).

One of the lessons at the intervention stage was structured around the United Kingdom, the different flags used and famous people from England. This lesson was mainly focused on a discussion with pupils and on images the teacher had brought (e.g. images of flags). Based on this discussion, the teacher wrote words on the board for the students to learn and asked the students to write a short paragraph about England for homework. In one of the final lessons, Minos tried to elicit pupils’ views of their EFL class and write these on a piece of paper.
Furthermore, Minos started approaching Albert and Ken at the intervention stage and was asking them to participate in the exercises (e.g. ask them to read the text, the meaning of a word) more than he did before. Positive reinforcement towards Albert was also noticed (11/05/12- Table 4). Albert was paired with a non-dyslexic pupil twice, ('study buddy') during a reading and a dictation exercise. During the dictation exercise, Albert had to co-operate with his pair and write the words and their translation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dyslexia-friendly practices used</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Pupils sit in groups</td>
<td>23.04.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teacher is giving instructions in slow pace, explains the exercises twice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teacher sets a 'study buddy' for Albert asks them to sit together during the lesson.</td>
<td>11.05.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teacher starts a reading exercise in the book, asks for the pupils to look at the pictures first and what they think the text is about</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cumulative teaching, teacher reads bits of text and asks from the pupils to repeat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teacher provides positive feedback to Albert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teacher asks from the pupil that writes vocabulary on the board to use different colour chalk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teacher reads a text from the book sentence by sentence. Pupils repeat</td>
<td>14.05.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dictation: Teacher gives all the students extra five minutes to finish writing the words and their translation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teacher approaches Ken and Albert. Asks them to read and the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
meaning of some words
- Pupil writes big font letters on the board when writing vocabulary
- Small chunks of information: teacher gave them only 6 words to learn for next time.
- Direct teaching: the teacher reads the words from the board and ask the students to repeat, they then have to repeat this on their own.

- Pupils sit in a circle, they have to say something positive about the person sitting next to them
- Teacher writes the words on the board in big letters and focuses on some letters of the words. He makes the shape of these letters with his hand.

- the teacher repeats twice the words during dictation
Discussion about England, interactive activity, images of the English flag, famous people from England. Teacher tries to elicit some English from the pupils by asking them questions for England in English.
- A girl writes some words on the board dictated by the teacher: Queen, Big Ben, fish and chips, Manchester United, Chelsea. Teacher Sets homework to write a short paragraph about England using these words.

- Slow dictation pace
- Paired writing, study buddy for Albert. Teacher asks them to do the exercise for England in class. Pupils sit in pairs, Albert sits with a study buddy.

- Teacher reads a text pupils repeat. Teacher explains the meaning of each sentence

Paired dictation: pupils cooperate with they pair during dictation
3.3.8.2 Riverlands classroom

Similar to Minos, Myrtle also used the technique where all the pupils sit in a circle and have to say something positive for the person next to them. In one of our discussions, where Myrtle was asking for my views of the dyslexia-friendly practices she could use, she noted that this technique would probably help her address the big division between boys and girls that existed in the classroom. This is probably the reason the second time this practice was used boys and girls were sitting interchangeably (16/05/12). The confusion and noise that were prevailing in Riverlands classroom were the reasons Myrtle introduced relaxing background music in two lessons. It must be noted that she brought her own laptop to do this (see 23/04/12, Table 5). Group work activities, games as well as highlighters, flashcards and images were also used (e.g. see 11/05/12, Table 5). What is more, Myrtle was linking the activities with previous learning. For example, the words the pupils were writing in a game used in the lesson on 11th May were taught and practiced in the following lesson (see 11/05/12 and 22/05/12 - Table 5).

Kinaesthetic (e.g. 14/05/12 - Table 5) and cumulative techniques (22/05/12 - Table 5) were also employed while the students were being frequently asked to work in pairs at this stage (e.g. 06/06/12 -
Furthermore, to teach the comparatives and the superlatives Myrtle used a song in three different lessons. She was also presenting information in small chunks (e.g. 22/05/12 - Table 5) and was explaining the exercises slowly. Similar to Minos, Myrtle started approaching Carol and Tim more than the pre-intervention stage (18/05/12, 21/05/12 and 22/05/12 – Table 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dyslexia- friendly practices used</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Pupils sit in a circle, they have to say something positive about the pupil sitting on their right</td>
<td>15.04.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teacher brings her own laptop to put some relaxing background music during the lesson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Group work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary Game with images: teacher has designed a photocopy that looks like a board game. Looks like a path pupils have to 'follow' and draw on it. It is a game about pictures and words. Pupils will have to follow the path by guessing what each word means. Pupils are divided in two groups.</td>
<td>23.04.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Vocabulary game with images, link to previous learning: teacher explains what each word means, pupils in groups have to write down the translation and then see how correct their path was. Flashcards: teacher has designed flashcards with the words on, each flashcard has one word. Teacher calls some names to come and pick up the cards from her desk and share it with their group. Teacher asks for the cards back and tells them to learn the words for next time.</td>
<td>11.05.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF materials, kinaesthetic activity: In a recycling project</td>
<td>14.05.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the teacher has planned, the products for recycling are placed in flashcards in big images. Students have to stand up and place one of the products in the correct bin the teacher has drawn on the board.

- Pupils sit in circle boy-girl-boy-girl alternately and have to say something positive about the pupil sitting on their right.
- Teacher puts on relaxing music in her laptop.

Teacher approaches Carol, checks if she knows what the words mean.

- Song with missing words to teach comparatives and superlatives. The song is called 'The fighter'. Pupils have to listen to the song and fill in the gaps.
- Teacher approaches Carol asks her if she can listen to the song. Does the same with Tim.
- Photocopy with superlatives, written in big letters.
- Kineesthetic: teacher is showing with her hands the different levels of -er, -est and draws lines at different levels on the board.

- Recapping from previous lesson, song 'the fighter' to teach on comparatives and superlatives. This time teach new vocabulary from the song.
- Teacher is doing some movements to elicit from the students the meaning of some words (e.g. word stronger teacher is showing her fist).
- Cumulative teaching: Teacher tries to explain the meaning of the song in small bits: stops the song in every sentence, asks/explains the meaning.
- Teacher approaches Carol asks her if she understood the expressions.

Song (link to previous learning): pupils have to listen to the
song and circle the -er, -est suffixes in their photocopies with the lyrics. Teacher explains the exercise very slowly.

- Link to previous learning, photocopy with big letters on comparatives and superlative. Pupils are asked to look at the board and complete a grammar exercise in their books.
- Highlighters: teacher is explaining some expressions (e.g. call someone’s bluff, I’ve had enough etc.) orally and asks the students to highlight these expressions in an exercise in the book.
- Teacher is explaining the exercise twice and asks if everyone has understood.

Highlighters: pupils have to highlight the -er, -est suffixes in the song. They have to look in the photocopy with the big board on comparatives and superlatives

Cumulative teaching: a) teacher explains what the words vowel and consonant mean
b) writes on the board rules about vowels and consonants 
(C+V+C, C+V+C+V)
c) Gives them a photocopy on these rules
d) Places the photocopy on the board surface and points where the students have to complete the letters C and V based on the rules she has explained

Link to previous learning, testing superlatives through pair work and in photocopies with images: pupils sit in pairs and they have to fill in an exercise on comparatives and superlatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.05.12</td>
<td>- Link to previous learning, photocopy with big letters on comparatives and superlative. Pupils are asked to look at the board and complete a grammar exercise in their books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.06.12</td>
<td>Highlighters: pupils have to highlight the -er, -est suffixes in the song. They have to look in the photocopy with the big board on comparatives and superlatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.06.12</td>
<td>Cumulative teaching: a) teacher explains what the words vowel and consonant mean. b) writes on the board rules about vowels and consonants. c) Gives them a photocopy on these rules. d) Places the photocopy on the board surface and points where the students have to complete the letters C and V based on the rules she has explained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.06.12</td>
<td>Link to previous learning, testing superlatives through pair work and in photocopies with images: pupils sit in pairs and they have to fill in an exercise on comparatives and superlatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Dyslexia-friendly practices in Riverlands classroom
3.3.8.3 *Winterfell classroom*

The 'study buddy' technique that Minos and Myrtle used was also employed by Penelope (e.g. 15/04/12 - Table 6). Penelope's lesson also became less teacher-centred than before as she was trying to engage the pupils in discussions (e.g. 24/04/12 - Table 6) and stopped focusing on working with only two pupils. In one lesson Penelope also asked for the pupils' views of their EFL class and whether there was something they would like to change (15/05/12 - Table 6). She started using images, giving step-by-step instructions (24/04/12 - Table 6) and repeating the instructions twice. In one of the lessons, Penelope asked from the pupils to write and at the same time pronounce the words (31/05/12 - Table 6). Altered materials (e.g. coloured chalKS), flashcards, photocopies (see 11/05/12 - Table 6) and a short part of a film (01/06/12 - Table 6) were also used in some of Penelope's lessons.

Similar to the other two teachers, Penelope also started approaching the dyslexic pupil more than before (e.g. 15/04/12 - Table 6). In one of the lessons she provided Albert support during a dictation task (24/04/12 - Table 6) while in another lesson more time was given to him to write up the dictated words (11/05/12 - Table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dyslexia-friendly practices used</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher approaches Alexander asks him if he can read from the board</td>
<td>03.04.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher asks for Alexander to sit with another pupil as a 'study buddy'</td>
<td>24.04.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Teacher approaches Alexander asks him to write dictation, provides some support, tries to spell some verbs for him
- Teacher gives step by step instructions

- Teacher takes the students to a room with computers. Lesson is structured around one activity "the world tour in two days". Pupils try to find games, images, songs relevant to this theme for a project

- Pairwork: pupils talk about their parents' jobs. They then have to work together and read a text on jobs. Teacher asks them to look at the photos next to the text to try and understand some of the jobs that are mentioned in the text. Asks them to underline these.
- Teacher approaches Alexander shows him the pictures, asks him some questions in English.
- Teacher repeats instructions of an exercise twice

- Teacher dictates in a slower dictation pace
- Allows more time for Alexander during dictation
- Coloured chalks, big letters on the board

- Teacher tries to engage pupils in a reading activity with the use of images from the book
- Teacher asks pupils' views of the EFL lesson, if and what they would like to change

- Teacher gives pupils a photocopy and flashcards with the vocabulary they are going to have for next time. Asks them if they prefer this instead of writing.

- Links to previous learning: teacher shows the pupils the flashcards from last time and asks them to say the words.

- Flashcards, photocopies with new vocabulary

26.04.12
10.05.12
11.05.12
15.05.12
17.05.12
22.05.12
31.05.12
- Teacher writes words on the board and asks the pupils to silently try and pronounce them while writing them in their notebooks.

- Pupils watch the first ten minutes of a movie they start watching called 'Despicable me.' Teacher asks them what happened in these first minutes 01.06.12

- Pupils watch a few more minutes of the movie. Teacher asks them what they think despicable me means based on the information they have gathered so far by watching it. 05.06.12

- Teacher uses the movie to teach new vocabulary to the pupils. Gives a small piece of text from the dialogues in the movie, says if they have time they are going to do a role-play next time. 12.06.12

Table 6: Dyslexia-friendly practices in Winterfell classroom

**3.3.9 Researcher's diary**

Robson (2002) suggests that having a research diary can be valuable for a study. Researchers’ reflections can help them understand relationships that influence the process, the purpose and the product of the research (Kuzmic, 2002). The research diary I used was a complementary source of evidence for my views about the whole process and supported me in triangulating my data.

Although writing a research diary initially seemed as a 'smooth' way of collecting data it "places a great deal of responsibility on the respondent" (Robson, 2002, p. 258). In this regard, the researcher has to be careful about what constitutes potential data (Bogdan & Bicklen, 1992); as such, I realised that I had to be mindful about the content of my notes. Although my research diary was 'unstructured'
(Robson, 2002) I noted down some themes that were reminding me on what to focus on when writing (e.g. performance, motivation, teachers’ experiences) throughout the whole process.

I started writing some notes on my reflective diary soon after I gained the Ethical Approval for my data collection (University of Manchester Ethics committee). Although the original purpose of my research diary was to write issues relevant to my research questions it also aided me into reflecting about the research process in general. The notes I have from the first stages of the project mainly refer to the processes I followed for approaching the participants and establishing access in schools (see Appendix 12). Because real world research involves an investigation of generally 'messy' situations (Robson, 2002) my feelings about the progress of the study are also apparent in some cases (see Appendix 12b).

3.3.10 Teacher interviews

Scott and Usher (2011) state that “Interviewing is an essential tool of the researcher in educational inquiry” (Scott & Usher, 2011, p.117). The interviews were conducted in Greek, which was the teachers’ mother tongue. Semi-structured interviews were designed as they allow participants and the researcher to engage in a dialogue (Smith, 2015) and help the realist researcher explore an outside reality (based on Healy & Perry, 2000) through the different perceptions, in this case the teachers'. In the teacher interviews I was exploring the teachers' views of the way the dyslexia-friendly practices were affecting pupils' performance and motivation and how they were experiencing the whole process. In our discussions, other issues were
in some cases tackled such as the classroom context, changes in the overall education system in Greece dyslexic pupils' background etc. As in all qualitative interviews the themes of our discussions were guided by what I, as the researcher, was seeing as relevant and important for my study (based on Bryman, 2012). In the interviews with the teachers I was encouraging them to 'tell their stories' (Smith, 2015) about particular events or experiences that helped me answer my research questions. Teacher's views, attitudes, feelings, beliefs and commitment towards the whole process were generative mechanisms (see also Figures 6 & 7). The outcomes of these generative mechanisms were teachers actions and where mainly explored using classroom observations. I had designed the interview questions in a way that prevented any bias on my part especially in the second part of the study. In the opinion of Silverman (2001), if the questions are asked properly the information will be undistorted. Based on relevant theory, I believed that the practices positively affected all pupils and that they would enhance dyslexic pupils' inclusion. However, the way the interview questions were designed and posed to the participants were not influenced by my views. The interview questions were the same in both the intervention and the pre-intervention stage so that I could later trace any potential differences. The questions aimed at exploring teachers' experiences (see Appendix 13 - question 12). The issues that were raised were asking the teachers to reflect on their teaching practice in both parts of the study. Teachers' views of pupils' performance and motivation were also explored. In the second part, I also asked the teachers on how they viewed the practices, whether they had noticed (possible) changes in pupils' performance and motivation and whether their practice had
changed after the introduction of the practices (see Appendix 13 - question 12). However, I was open to the emergence of other themes that were possibly relevant to my research questions.

The time and the place for the interviews were always agreed with the teachers. The interviews were taking place in their school usually on a day when an observation was scheduled. These would be usually in the staff room at times where no other teachers were there or in the arts class because it was usually empty. The only exception was the last interview with one of the EFL teachers, which took place through skype because I had returned back to the UK. Throughout the whole project the teachers were all co-operative in scheduling an interview.

Two interviews were carried out in both phases of the study so as to deal with problems that could arise (e.g. teacher being available for a short time because of another class). All three teachers gave their consent for a recorder to be used.

Repeating the same interview twice was a good decision as in some cases, the teachers started saying their own 'stories' (Silverman, 2011) and the interviews were lasting long (sometimes one hour). For example teachers were very often complaining for pupils' behaviour, the lack of school support or government funding. After the first interviews were conducted, before starting with the questions, I started showing my main research themes to the teachers as a reminder about the issues we would be focusing on. Because of this technique, the data from the second set of interviews were less in amount that the first set but more relevant to my study.
The second interviews also helped me to revisit with the teachers the issues that were discussed in the first set of interviews and check with them if I had understood correctly what had been raised (member checks- Robson, 2002). The member checks were usually taking place at the beginning of the interviews.

At times where the teachers were providing short answers I was using probes (Robson, 2002) and when the teachers were showing or noting that the question was not clear to them prompts (ibid) were used (example see Appendix 13- question 10). The teacher interviews provided fruitful insights on the teachers’ views and their response to the resources and the practices. For this reason, I had to establish that what the teachers had said was what they really meant (Descombe, 2003). After the first set of interviews in the first part, I started thinking the possibility that I understood some issues differently from what the teachers had asserted. To resolve this, the member checking strategy (Robson, 2002) was used after every interview. I was listening to the interview from the tape recorder and I was noting down some themes that arose to check with the teachers if I understood correctly what had been discussed.

Although at the pre-intervention stage the teachers seemed to feel nervous, in the second part they seemed more comfortable during our discussions. This is perhaps because, by the time the dyslexia-friendly practices were introduced my role from being solely an observer and an interviewer changed. By the intervention part of the study, the teachers had started viewing me as a researcher that was supporting them during the intervention and as someone that satisfied their need for support. I noticed that this allowed the
teachers to express their feelings more freely, discuss their views of the resources I had provided them with and of the dyslexia-friendly practices. For example, although at the beginning of the study the teachers were avoiding to express their views of the articles on dyslexia, at the second part they were not hesitating to make negative comments about the resources or the dyslexia-friendly practices.

From an interview with Myrtle at the pre-intervention stage:

R: Has anything changed from my first interview? How did you find the articles I gave you?

M: I must say I only had a quick look so far... they look alright, they will help me with my practice. I know that I have to start reading them soon...

From an interview with Myrtle at the intervention stage:

R: 13. Tell me what things have you done differently since we last met..? How are these going?

M: Well, I have used loads new practices from the ones you suggested. These were good, helpful... well, some of them. Some of these I could not do. However, they were much more helpful than the things you gave me before... when I first saw these I started panicking a bit...

R: You mean the resources?

M: Yes, there was a huge document there...
The data from the teacher interviews (what the teacher was saying) were compared to the classroom observation data (what the teacher was doing) and the reflections written in my diary (what I was seeing as a researcher).

3.3.11 Pupils' assessment tools

Assessment is a way of measuring pupils' performance (Harlen, 2005). For this reason, I went through dictations and tests of the students from the beginning of the school year since these were the only assessment tools available in the schools. This was an ongoing process until the end of the study so as to examine any possible differences in pupils' performance. An examination of their grades from the first and the second semester was also be helpful. However, the only grades I received were from Myrtle (Riverlands school) since Penelope and Minos were not willing to provide them. Because I had acquired a high status among the teachers they were at first sceptical of me reviewing the assessment tools they had used and the way they were marking students' work. At this point, I had meetings with the teachers in which I was explaining to them that the aim of my research was not to assess their work but to explore the classroom setting and the results of my intervention.

After a few discussions with the teachers, I received the tests and the dictations that had been used in Highgarden and Winterfell classrooms. From Riverlands classroom, Myrtle, gave me the pupils' grades and the tests she had used at the end of the semester. These grades and tests were photocopied. I also kept notes of pupils' grades from their dictations. Descriptions of their mistakes were
also included (example see Appendix 14). The number of the assessment tools varied as this was dependent on the teacher rather than the curriculum.

The assessment tools were in some cases designed by the teacher (Highgarden School) (see Appendix 17a) or were the copies of the course book suggestions (Riverlands and Winterfell schools) (see Appendix 17b). The pupils' spelling mistakes were examined in the process of looking at their dictations. When looking at their tests, mistakes in all types of exercises (reading comprehension, listening, grammar, writing and vocabulary exercises) were noted as well. The latter provided me with information on the skills the teachers were focusing more on.

Although I collected a number of assessment tools during the pre-intervention stage of the study, at the intervention stage limited assessment tools were available. This is because the intervention stage lasted seven and a half weeks. Moreover, some exercises the pupils were doing on their course books for homework could not be reviewed (the pupils denied to give me their books).

3.3.12 Pupil interviews

The interviews with the dyslexic and non-dyslexic EFL pupils were critical for the study. The pupil interviews allowed me to explore the classroom context and the impact of the dyslexia-friendly practices from a different perspective than the teachers' views and my views. Similar to the teacher interviews, the pupil interviews were also conducted in Greek. In a realist interview, the interviewer and the
respondent discuss 'factual questions' (Pawson & Tilley, 1998) and the research subjects describe some aspect of their behaviour (ibid). I already had a preliminary view of pupils' behaviour through the initial classroom observations since the interviews took place two weeks after the study began. Although the pupil interview questions had been designed to explore pupils' motivation (see Appendix 15a) some issues on their performance were sometimes arising (e.g. question on how they see themselves as language learners, see Appendix 15a - question 26).

In the interview record, apart from the questions, prompts were added in case the pupils could not fully understand the question. I was frequently rephrasing the questions during the discussions while probes were also used when the children seemed hesitant to speak. All these techniques were used in most cases and especially during the interviews with pupils that were not speaking Greek very well (e.g. immigrant pupils). Adopted from a study by Martin and Stuart-Smith (1998) in which bilingual learners were asked to point the picture of a happy and a sad face that was reflecting their constructs about bilingualism and biliteracy. In this case, cartoon and emoticon pictures were provided (see Appendix 15) at the end of each interview. These pictures proved useful especially with the dyslexic pupils since some of them were hesitant especially in the first set of interviews. The pupils were usually asking me to tick the pictures that were describing their feelings as EFL learners (e.g. sad, stressed etc.) (see Appendix 15). A red pen was used for the interviews with the dyslexic pupils. There were also cases where I had to explain
what each picture was showing since this was not always clear to the pupils.

The pupil interviews were taking place in the school, which was rather difficult because the pupils had classes all day and the longest break in schools lasted fifteen minutes. Because some of the interviews took place during the English class I missed some classroom observations. As a result, I decided to negotiate with some of the other subject teachers whether and when I could withdraw pupils to interview them individually during their class. The Physical Education and the arts teachers were more willing in most schools perhaps because the curriculum in these classes is more flexible and no tests are used. However, a small number of interviews took place when pupils had these subjects because I had limited time availability to schedule interviews among three schools.

In the school, the pupil interviews were taking place in a room which I had agreed with the head teacher before each interview. Because in Highgarden School the head teacher did not want any further involvement in the study after the ethical issues had been resolved, I felt that I had “an obligation to disturb that context as little as possible” (Oliver, 2010, p. 53). Therefore, in this school I was usually liaising with the EFL teacher about space availability. This resulted in various problems as there were instances that the only spaces available for the interview was either the schoolyard or the school’s nursery school. These places were usually noisy while there were cases some pupils from the nursery school were interrupting and wanted to come and join the interview. This also proved to be time
consuming during the study and during the interview transcriptions because the recordings involved a lot of noise.

3.3.13 Focus groups

The data from the pupil interviews were further supported with the focus group data. "Focus group methodology is a way of collecting qualitative data, which - essentially- involves engaging a small number of people in a formal group discussion (or discussions), 'focused' around a particular topic or set of issues" (Silverman, 2004, p. 177). Focus groups were used as a means of capturing pupils' motivation. The focus groups were also conducted in Greek.

Because the focus group questions were tackling similar issues with the interview questions, some issues on pupils' performance were also raised.

I had decided that the focus groups would not be a mixture of dyslexic and non-dyslexic pupils. Due to their difficulties, the dyslexic learners could feel uncomfortable in discussing about learning and their feelings. These matters can be sensitive for learners that have difficulties and especially for learners with dyslexia who tend to have low self-confidence (Humphrey, 2003). Engaging pupils with dyslexia in a discussion about learning English or how good they thought they were doing at school could drigger feelings of discomfort in front of their mainstream peers. For instance, if a dyslexic pupil was in the same focus group with the best performing pupil in the classroom he might be hesitant to speak about how he sees himself as language learner (example see Appendix 15b-
question 4). However, because one dyslexic learner was found in each classroom a pupil interview was accomplished with each of the learners. In the case of Highgarden where two pupils were found (Ken and Albert) I decided to interview them separately because Ken was sometimes showing instances of aggressive behaviour.

Therefore, two focus groups were conducted with the non-dyslexic pupils at both stages of the project. These were also conducted in Greek. Because Winterfell classroom had nine pupils participating, one focus group was conducted each time. A recorder was used during the focus groups since the pupils and the parents had given their consent. The focus group questions were similar with the ones asked in the interviews with the aim to enhance the trustworthiness of the results. Although the same questions were used in the first part (pre-intervention) of the study at the intervention phase an additional question was added. The purpose of this question was to tackle whether the pupils saw any differences in their EFL classes and teachers’ practice. In case the pupils were saying that they had noticed any differences I was asking for their views on this. Emoticon pictures were also used at the end of a focus group discussion (see Appendix 15b). However, the cartoon pictures that had been used in the interviews (see Appendix 15a) were not used in the focus groups because of time limitations (no time availability for all pupils in the focus group to tick the pictures). During the focus groups I was acting as a 'moderator' “posing the questions, keeping the discussion flowing enabling group members to participate fully” (Silverman, 2004, p. 177, 178) and the focus group discussions were normally flowing well. However, there were instances where I had to resolve
controversies among the pupils that were sometimes inhibiting the discussion.

3.4 **AFTER THE STUDY**

3.4.1 Data analysis

Because several qualitative methods were used (teacher and pupils interviews, observations, focus groups, notes from pupils’ assessment tools) large amounts of data have been generated. Thematic analysis techniques (Braun & Clarke, 2006) were employed in the process of reviewing and transcribing the data, which helped me into tracing possible preliminary themes. Moreover, computer assisted data analysis has helped into the organisation, access and handling of materials by developing consistent coding schemes (Robson, 2002, p. 462). More specifically, NVivo software assisted me into retrieving the data easier (Document Explorer), by developing and exploring ideas about them (Node Explorer). The use of memos helped me capture insights that would have been otherwise forgotten or neglected. As shown in the data analysis chapter (Chapter Four) the final codes resulted from a combination of data-retrieved (nodes that emerged from the data) and researcher-retrieved (preliminary nodes created by the researcher and relevant theories) nodes (Braun & Clarke, 2013).

In both phases of the project the data was triangulated to establish the trustworthiness of the results. An examination of pupils’ assessment tools, the field notes from the classroom observations, the teacher interviews and in some cases the pupil interviews
provided insights on all pupils' performance. The teacher interviews, my research diary and some themes that emerged from the classroom observations were cross referenced and addressed the third research question that was about teachers' experiences of the dyslexia-friendly practices. Triangulation was also used in the case of pupils' motivation (focus groups, pupil interviews, classroom observations, teacher interviews).

In the first phase of the study I was focusing on gathering information about the context from my point of view (research diary) and the point of view of all the participants. The notes from the member checks with the teachers were also an additional source of evidence about the emerging themes. Although this technique should have been used with the pupils as well, time constraints did not allow it. The data analysis procedures in the second part of the study were not different. However, the instruments and the context slightly changed; this happened because additional questions were used in the interviews and the focus groups and the teachers started employing some of the dyslexia-friendly practices. This, in turn, resulted in some new nodes and the deletion of others that could not be addressed at the intervention stage. For example, the teacher interview question on how the teachers viewed the practices at the intervention stage gave rise to a new node: 'teacher- DF (dyslexia-friendly) practice. On the other hand, the node 'teacher-training' which refers to teachers' experiences of the resources on dyslexia I had given them was in most cases deleted at the intervention stage (part B) since no data supported it (teachers stopped reading the resources and were focusing more on the practices). As it will be
shown in the results section (see Data Analysis chapter), the codes that emerged in the intervention stage differ from the first part of the study. All these codes were linked so as to answer the research questions.

As already mentioned, the data were analysed following a realist view which focuses on mechanisms that work under specific conditions and in turn, the outcomes these mechanisms produced (based on Sayer, 2000). This focus guided me into the process of exploring how dyslexia-friendly practices worked in an EFL environment which represented the overall focus of the study. After the final nodes (Braun & Clarke, 2013) were derived (Chapter Four), they were organized according to Realism paradigm into the nodes ‘generative mechanisms’, ‘outcomes’, ‘context’. A thorough discussion of the data analysis process that I followed for each classroom is presented in the following chapter (Data Analysis chapter).

3.4.2 Establishing Trustworthiness

As already mentioned in previous sections, the criteria for establishing trustworthiness in the present study will be judged according to the realist paradigm (Bhaskar, 1979; Sayer, 2000). These criteria are relevant to case studies since they are a form of empirical research (Yin, 2013). In Realism, the goal is to produce answers about contingent contexts and reflective participants (Pawson & Tilley, 1998). Unlike positivist researchers who focus on constant conjunctions of events, in realism causality is a matter of mechanisms possessed by things, which can or cannot be activated (Maxwell, 2012). Therefore, powers can exist without being
exercised but also exercised without being realised (Bhaskar, 1979). The researcher can construct the contexts in which these powers can exist but this does not mean that these contexts are closed systems. The researcher, and especially the social scientist, is not simply examining these events but is isolating mechanisms in the mind to explore them and reflect on them. These events are not experiments but abstractions. However, this can only be accomplished imperfectly (Pawson & Tilley, 1998). So, Bhaskar's real level (1979) (see also section 3.2.1) refers to the relatively constant things (mechanisms and potential powers) and the actual level refers to the events that are produced. Finally, the empirical level is our perceptions of these events.

A detailed overview of realist paradigm based on which a case study can be considered trustworthy is provided by Healy and Perry (2000). According to Healy and Perry (2000), the realist researcher explores “generative mechanisms and the contexts that make them contingent” (Healy & Perry, 2000, p. 123). As a result, a realist study addresses questions of how and why. The present project corresponds to Realism's ontology about complex social phenomena and provides detailed descriptions of the EFL classroom contexts. The query of why (or why not) the dyslexia-friendly practices worked (or didn't work) and the way this occurred was central. Therefore, in this study, the term internal validity was replaced by the term 'contingent validity'. This was met with the production of in-depth descriptions of what was happening in each case via all the data collection methods that were used (observations, interviews, focus groups, research diary, review of pupils' assessment).
The realist scientists' knowledge about the world requires an exploration of multiple perceptions about reality (Healy & Perry, 2000). Data triangulation helped me become 'value-aware' (Healy & Perry, 2000, p. 122) and answer my research questions based on data from pupils', teachers' and my views in both stages of the study. Also, data triangulation enhanced the rigour of this project so as to "counter all the threats to validity" (Robson, 2002, p. 175). The multiple interviews and focus groups provided insights into participants' perspectives about the issues in question while my research diary recorded my views of the whole process. My presence in the classrooms for nearly three months aided me into building good rapport with the participants and reduced the possibility of them giving me responses that were socially desirable (Krefting, 1991) in the interviews.

By carefully describing the methodological procedures of the research and the selection of the three cases, methodological trustworthiness was enhanced. Moreover, the member checks with the teachers and the research diary that was also used as an audit trail were proved to be valuable research techniques. As Healy and Perry, (2000) claim, "methodological trustworthiness refers to the extent to which the research can be audited by developing a case study database and by the use of quotations in the written report" (Healy & Perry, 2000, p. 123). The latter addresses the issue of dependability, since it allows the study to be "repeatable under the same circumstances in another place and time" (Guba & Lincoln, 1982, p. 377).
Realism adopts Yin’s ‘analytic generalisation’ (Yin, 2013) in which “a previously developed theory is used as a template with which to compare the empirical results of the case study” (Yin, 2013, p. 32, 33). However, Realism focuses more on theory building rather than testing the applicability of a theory to a population (Healy & Perry, 2000). The study adhered to the theory that the dyslexia-friendly practices successfully support dyslexic learners in mainstream education and have positive effects on all pupils. This was used as a template against which the empirical results of the study were examined (study’s analytic generalisation). Apart from data triangulation the study’s construct validity was addressed with a case study data base that was influenced from literature from dyslexia and language teaching. Therefore, “established operation measures” (Yin 2003, p. 34) were used to explore and measure the constructs I was studying in the theory being built.

3.4.3 Conclusions

The methodology section of this thesis provided the reader with insights into the realist paradigm, which influenced the choice of the selection of methods and the data analysis process. A detailed overview is presented on my role, the participants’ role along with descriptions on the way the participants were recruited, to describe the study’s processes. The comparison of my original plan and the actual study that took place illustrated the changes that occurred during data collection. The next chapter discusses the data analysis process I followed.
4 DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the data analysis process I followed for the three cases (EFL classrooms). The three schools' context is firstly presented to provide the reader with information on the characteristics of each school (the head teacher, EFL classroom setting, EFL teacher). This information is based on data from my research diary. Later, the data analysis process for all three classrooms is discussed, followed by a discussion of the findings.

The main research area of the study was to explore how dyslexia-friendly practices 'work' in an EFL context and whether they are 'friendly' towards dyslexic and non-dyslexic EFL learners. Based on this and the realist paradigm (Bhaskar, 1979; Sayer, 2000), the main question that influenced my data analysis was:

“What was the impact of the dyslexia-friendly practices in the three EFL classrooms that took part in my study?”

I also rephrased the above sentences based on realist terminology:
Which mechanisms were triggered in both parts of the study? Did the dyslexia-friendly practices trigger any new mechanisms? Did they reshape/influence the existing ones? What were the outcomes of these processes?

The data analysis process aimed to answer the following research questions:

1. How do dyslexia-friendly practices affect dyslexic EFL learners’:
   a. motivation towards learning English?
   b. performance in English language tasks?

2. How do dyslexia-friendly practices affect non-dyslexic EFL learners’:
   a. motivation towards learning English?
   b. performance in English language tasks?

3. How do EFL teachers experience the introduction of dyslexia-friendly practices in their classroom?

4.2 Research Location

This study was conducted in three primary schools in a small town in Greece. The three participating schools were located in the town centre and were run by the same Local Educational Authority (LEA). My previous employment in this district equipped me with knowledge of each school’s context.
4.3 The three classrooms

Three classrooms participated in the study: one at Highgarden School, one at Riverlands School and one at Winterfell School. My analysis started with the data I had collected from the Highgarden classroom. This school appeared to me as more challenging than the other two after I familiarised myself with the data (Braun & Clarke, 2013) through the transcription process. Solely based on my initial assumptions, the EFL pupils in the Highgarden classroom seemed more highly motivated in contrast to their less motivated EFL teacher.

4.3.1 Highgarden School

This school was considered to be one of the largest in the town, with an average of 12-15 pupils per classroom. The Greek Ministry of Education had appointed all of the subject teachers usually required in a Greek primary school: an English Language teacher, a physical education teacher, an art teacher and a second foreign language teacher. A specialist teacher for the inclusion class (see literature review section 2.5.3) and another teacher for the welcome class (for immigrant pupils) were also found in the school. As in all state schools in Greece, the curriculum, books, teachers’ appointment as well as timetable were based on Ministry of Education guidelines (see literature review chapter section 2.5.3).

4.3.2 The head teacher at Highgarden School

The head teacher at Highgarden School had been recently appointed to this position and had extensive teaching experience of fifteen
years. However, during our initial meetings, he admitted that he was not motivated by his job because of the workload he had to cope with and the salary reduction he had suffered.

4.3.3 The EFL teacher in the Highgarden classroom

Minos, the EFL teacher at Highgarden School, had worked for four years in public schools in afternoon supportive EFL classes, where EFL teachers help pupils with their homework in English. Minos was a substitute teacher, which means that he would get a permanent place after he had completed a certain number of teaching hours in public schools. Minos had also suffered a significant salary reduction and admitted that this had negatively affected his motivation towards his job. I realised this during the first few times I visited the school as he was very often late for class. He was also indifferent about learning more about my research and was late for our scheduled meetings. This behaviour made me question his motives in agreeing to participate in my research.

4.3.4 The Highgarden classroom

The classroom observations helped me to gather data that were relevant to the classroom setting. The Highgarden classroom may be described as a typical Greek classroom in a state school (Appendix 16), in which the desks are usually organised in rows, the pupils sit in pairs and the teacher’s desk is at the front. Although Greek legislation had recently promoted the use of whiteboards in class (ESPA 2007-2013), most state schools were still using blackboards or whiteboards at the time when my study was conducted. The
Highgarden classroom contained thirteen pupils, of whom one had an official statement for dyslexia. According to the specialist teacher, another pupil from Bulgaria was also considered to have dyslexia and was placed in the inclusion class. Although he had not been officially assessed, I decided to treat him as a pupil with dyslexia for the purposes of my study and examine his motivation and performance separately from the rest of the pupils.

4.3.5 Riverlands School

Although Riverlands School was situated in the suburbs of the town where this study was conducted, it was one of the most popular schools in the area. Despite the fact that, in the Greek education system, pupils are usually placed in their local school, there are cases where parents can choose to register their child at a school of their choice (e.g. at another school in the same area). This was the case with Riverlands School which was chosen by many parents in the area due to its high status. The school catered for a high number of pupils, with each class containing eighteen to twenty pupils.

The school was participating in a programme called 'The Network of School Innovation’, which promoted educational innovation within the school environment. This innovation was mainly related to teacher development, school partnerships, the production of educational resources and other relevant initiatives approved by the Greek Ministry of Education. Although the school's curriculum, materials and appointment of teachers were still defined by the Hellenic
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7 http://www.protovoulia.org/diktyo/Network-School-Innovation (site no longer available, 20/03/15).
Ministry of Education, some curricular changes had taken place. Therefore, although the Ministry advises that there should be three English language classes per week in primary schools, at this school, most levels received four EFL classes a week.

At Riverlands School, a welcome class (immigrant pupils) and an inclusion class for pupils with learning difficulties had been formed. The number of pupils in both of these classes varied, as the pupils were placed there based on their level. The school included one or two teachers per subject (e.g. an English language teacher, French/German language teacher), while one teacher was appointed to the welcome class and another to the inclusive class.

4.3.6 The head teacher at Riverlands School

The head teacher at Riverlands School was eager for the school to participate in my study and seemed excited about it. He also mentioned that he was in favour of innovative projects. Similar to what was mentioned at Highgarden School, the head teacher of Riverlands School also mentioned at our first meeting the significant salary reductions he had suffered, although he did not state that these had reduced his motivation to perform his job. He had been the school's head teacher for several years and was aware of the school's high status. At our first meeting, he also mentioned that the school catered for many immigrant pupils.

4.3.7 The EFL teacher in the Riverlands classroom

Myrtle was one of the two EFL teachers at Riverlands School. When the study was conducted, she had three years of teaching experience
in private language institutes and public schools. Her placement at Riverlands School was not permanent, although there was a possibility that it would become so in the next few years. At that time, she was also teaching in other schools in the area, which was wearing her out. She also mentioned that the high number of pupils in the Riverlands classroom was causing her stress. Similar to Minos, she also mentioned that she had suffered salary reductions. All of these factors were negatively affecting her morale, but she suggested that she was interested in my research and wished to learn about dyslexia.

4.3.8 The Riverlands classroom

The class at Riverlands School was similar to that at Highgarden School, discussed previously. The pupils and teacher’s seats were arranged in the same manner, and there was no computer in the classroom. Although the ‘Network of School Innovation’ programme was enhancing the use of technology, no such development appeared in the classroom setting. This was probably the result of the austerity measures that were operating in Greece when the study began.

The Riverlands classroom consisted of eighteen pupils, two of whom had been officially recognised as having dyslexia (Carol and Tim). However, these were not the only different learners in class. According to the inclusion class teacher, another pupil (Mark) had Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) while nine of the classroom pupils spoke Greek as their second language. Some of them had native-speaker proficiency in Greek while others had only a basic level.
4.3.9 Winterfell School

Winterfell School was the oldest primary school in the town. The link person informed me that it had acquired a low status in the area because of its large number of immigrant pupils (mainly from Albania and Bulgaria). Many locals considered this a negative trait.

Although the number of pupils in the school was small, the school had a large site. The classrooms consisted of eight to twelve pupils on average. There were eleven teachers in the school, including the subject teachers (physical education teacher, the English and German language teachers), the welcome class teacher (for immigrant pupils) and the inclusion class teacher (for SpLD pupils). From the telephone conversations I had with the head teacher before the study began, the SpLD pupils in the inclusion class had dyslexia and no other difficulties. Because of the large size of the school building, the inclusion class as well as the welcome class were housed in separate rooms in contrast to Riverlands and Highgarden Schools described previously, which shared rooms with other classes. The inclusion class at Winterfell School had computers and various materials that Jaime, the inclusion class teacher, had prepared.

4.3.10 The head teacher at Winterfell School

The head teacher at Winterfell School was very approachable, and eager for his school to participate in my research. During our initial meetings, he also described the school as relatively small and was aware of its low status. However, he supported the view that this was inconsistent with the school’s high achievement rates.
### 4.3.11 The EFL teacher at Winterfell School

Penelope, the EFL teacher at Winterfell School, had four years of teaching experience. When the study took place, she was in her first year at this school. She was a substitute teacher and was teaching at other schools in the area. Like Minos and Myrtle, Penelope also mentioned the low salary she received, but was happy in her job and motivated to participate in my study. She also suggested that she was eager to learn more about dyslexia (she had attended a seminar about it in the past).

### 4.3.12 The Winterfell classroom

The setting of the Winterfell classroom was similar to that of the Riverlands and Highgarden classrooms. The desks were organised in rows and no computer was found in the classroom. There were thirteen pupils in the Winterfell classroom. Six were bilingual: two of them had a native-like proficiency in Greek while two spoke and understood Greek well. The remaining two bilingual pupils did not speak Greek and, on the head teacher's suggestion, did not participate in my study. These pupils were mainly taught in the welcome class.

A pupil with Special Educational Needs (Irene) and one with behavioural and emotional difficulties (Theon) were also found in the Winterfell classroom. Although both of these pupils and their parents consented to participate in the study, this was not feasible for Theon, as he refused to participate in the interviews or the focus groups. Another pupil was not involved in the study either because
this would have created a conflict of interest. As a result, eight of the eleven pupils finally participated in the study.

The dyslexic pupil was one of the immigrant pupils who spoke Greek well. Alexander was from Albania and had arrived in Greece at a relatively young age (three years old).

The data analysis process I employed for the Riverlands and Highgarden classrooms guided the one I employed for the data collected from the Winterfell classroom. However, the differences between the cases (school, teacher and pupils) altered some of these processes. Further details on each classroom’s context are presented throughout the data analysis procedures that follow, as contextual conditions play a central role in the theoretical framework that this study adopted.

4.4 Coding

4.4.1 Approaching the data

The multiple data collection methods that were used (interviews, focus groups, classroom observation, research diary) resulted in a vast amount of data. Although an extensive period of time was spent on their organisation and transcription, this proved to be a useful ‘immersion’ process (Braun & Clarke, 2013, p. 204) because it helped me to understand the content of my dataset. Prior to the data analysis, I attended some training and familiarised myself with NVivo9, the qualitative data analysis software that I used. The decision to use this software was taken during the very initial stages of this project and it proved helpful in handling the large dataset I
acquired. However, the limitations of using NVivo for the data coding are acknowledged (e.g. focusing more on quantity than meaning, over-coding) (Braun & Clarke, 2013), as it requires an extensive period of training (Braun & Clarke, 2013, p. 219).

The process that was followed with NVivo was similar for each school. Continuing my analysis from one classroom to the next, I realised that I was gradually gaining more experience and confidence with regard to using NVivo. For example, before I imported data from the intervention stage at Highgarden classroom, which was the second case I analysed, I used different colours for the various groups of pupils involved (immigrant, dyslexic, non-dyslexic). This was because, when I first tried to analyse them and create codes, I faced problems in distinguishing from where the data originated. For example, in the Winterfell classroom, the data from the dyslexic, non-dyslexic and immigrant pupils were coloured red, blue and green respectively:

Alexander: “I speak English with tourists…”
Keith: “I like learning English”
Ida: “The exercises are hard…”

The links between the colour and the name were written in my NVivo diary:

“One step. Used different colours for immigrant pupils, but when I was adding what they were saying to the other nodes, the colours helped: Al: green, Danielle: blue, Adam: red, Neil: black…”
4.4.2 Bilingual data

Another issue that arose at the beginning of the data analysis process was the language used. The data were in Greek and English for all three schools; the teacher and pupil interviews as well as the focus groups were in Greek, while my classroom observations and my research diary were written in English. If I had used English for the teacher interviews, the data analysis would have been easier because I could have avoided the translation stage. However, language influences the way in which reality is perceived and what can be expressed (Chapman 2006). Based on this, I decided to conduct all of my teacher interviews in Greek as this allowed me to collect qualitative data with meanings as close as possible to the respondents' meanings. The participants also felt more comfortable when using their mother tongue (apart from some immigrant pupils).

The focus groups and pupil interviews were also conducted in Greek. Being a native Greek speaker proved to be a significant advantage here, as it allowed me understand and interpret the teachers and pupils' answers more clearly and to minimise the possibility of meanings being lost during the data analysis (Pavlenko, 2005). It should be noted that, in the Riverlands classroom, the strong presence of immigrant pupils resulted in limited data being obtained from the interviews and the focus groups with these pupils, as some of them could not completely understand and answer my questions. Although the use of emoticons assisted this process, the content of these data was limited due to my lack of knowledge of my participants' mother tongue (based on Pavlenko 2005).
“Talking and reading in English leads to thinking in the English language as well” (van Nes et al., 2010, p. 315). Living in the UK for an extensive period of time and studying in an English University allowed me to use English for my research diary. Greek was mainly used when I was recording my thoughts and feelings about the process because it was easier for me to express them in my first language. English language was employed in all of the classroom observations although there were instances where Greek was employed as well. This was because the exact meaning of what I was noticing or what others were saying in the class could not be conveyed by using an equivalent English word or expression.

From a classroom observation of the Highgarden classroom (19/03/12):

– “The teacher asks the pupil to bring his book next time για τα μάτια του κόσμου.”

The use of two languages in my data posed challenges. The data in Greek were not translated. However, the codes that were created were in English. Although translating and coding the findings in multilingual research is an intricate procedure (e.g. due to the non-translatability of certain expressions) (Holmes et al., 2013), my near-native proficiency in English allowed me to convey the meanings of my findings as best as possible and limit the effect of any language differences that arose. As in most multilingual data analysis processes, I was also faced with software limitations (Holmes et al., 2013). Although NVivo9 recognised Greek characters, I was

---

8 The translates literally as ‘for the world to see’ which means (bring your book) at least for others to see.
constrained in retrieving and looking for specific expressions and words in the Greek language (e.g. word frequency queries).

4.4.3 First stage: Familiarisation and data coding

Since the research aim was to provide rich and detailed descriptions of the data, thematic analysis was the analytical method I employed as “a method for identifying themes and patterns of meaning across a dataset in relation to a research question” (Braun & Clarke, 2013, p. 175). After the transcription process was completed, an additional overview of my data sources strengthened my understanding of what I had collected. This allowed me to trace possible items of interest. Both ‘bottom-up’ (data-retrieved) and ‘top-down’ (researcher-retrieved) processes were used to analyse the themes (Braun & Clarke, 2013) and create the codes. The ‘bottom-up’ (inductive) nodes created were based on the repetitiveness of certain patterns across the data that appeared relevant to my research questions.

4.4.4 Second stage: ‘top-down’ nodes

The initial, very general, ‘top-down’ (deductive) codes that I created for each classroom were based on the themes that were relevant to my research questions. These were the general themes of motivation, performance and teachers’ experience. Parts of the data collected from the pre-intervention and the intervention stages were imported in the first instance. A complete coding process (Braun & Clarke, 2013) was followed, during which I examined everything in the dataset that might have been relevant to the themes of performance and motivation for dyslexic and non-dyslexic pupils and teachers in
general (‘Teacher node’). The nodes were both semantic and latent (Braun & Clarke, 2013, p. 207), since there were instances that reflect the semantic content (semantic nodes) of my data but also my interpretations (latent nodes). These were originally placed at the ‘top-down’ themes:

Minos (teacher in the Highgarden classroom): “They have a good level of grammar” (semantic node: grammar performance)

Minos (teacher): “Some pupils will not even bother doing the exercises” (latent node: they assign a low value to learning English placed under the theme ‘NDP motivation A’)

Using the predefined codes on pupils’ performance and motivation and the ‘Teacher node’ that would address the teachers’ experience, I initially followed a ‘top-down’ (Braun & Clarke, 2013, p. 178) approach. This enabled me to trace the codes that would correspond to these pre-determined research issues.

“A theme captures something important about the data in relation to the research question and represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 82). During the data collection process, the predefined themes of pupils’ performance and motivation were addressed using the instruments I had designed based on the relevant literature (see Methodology chapter section 3.2.7). During this stage, these themes were mainly used as memos that helped me to retrieve codes that were relevant to the pupils’ performance and motivation. However, the focus was not exclusively on these nodes, as ‘bottom-up’
processes (Braun & Clarke, 2006) were also followed in the later stages.

In the first instance, the data I introduced into NVivo were organised into two large general groups, named ‘performance’ and ‘motivation’. Because, in NVivo, codes are called ‘nodes’, the terms ‘code’ and ‘node’ will be used interchangeably in this chapter and will have the same meaning. The exploration of the teachers’ experience was based mainly on a ‘bottom-up’ approach, as no predefined themes had been created for this element. Therefore, the code ‘teacher’ was created for the third research question on the teachers’ experience, from which I would later extract codes relevant to the teachers’ thoughts, beliefs, feelings, views, commitment and actions in both the pre-intervention and intervention stages of the study.

The letters A and B were placed in the initial nodes of ‘pupils’ performance’, ‘pupils’ motivation’ and ‘teacher’ to show whether the data were drawn from the pre-intervention (letter A) or intervention stage (letter B) of the study. Also, the letters ‘NDP’ indicated that these codes referred to the non-dyslexic pupils (e.g. ‘NDP pupils’ performance A’, ‘NDP pupils’ performance B’). Separate codes were created for the performance and motivation of the pupils with dyslexia, for which the letters ‘DP’ were used.

4.4.5 Pupils’ motivation

The ‘top-down’ nodes on motivation that were created for all three schools at this stage were: goal salience, valence, self-efficacy (self-related beliefs), language anxiety, causal attributions, instrumental
orientation, antecedent factors, language acquisition contexts, attitudes towards the learning situation, effort and integrativeness. These were based on Gardner's socio-educational model (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993a) in accordance with the new model for motivation construct by Tremblay and Gardner (1995) (see also Appendices 19, 20 and 21). These nodes were altered as much as the performance nodes previously discussed (Figure 10). For example, some nodes related to motivation were not supported by the data. In the Winterfell classroom, the node 'causal attributions' (the extent to which pupils attribute their success or failure to internal or external factors) (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995) was not supported by the data for either the dyslexic or non-dyslexic pupils, and was therefore deleted at this stage.

Figure 10: generic 'top-down nodes related to motivation
Furthermore, the node ‘attitudes IN class’ was also created for instances of motivational behaviour (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995) (see Figure 11 below). The ‘process model of L2 motivation’ (Dörnyei and Ottó, 1998) helped me to focus on motivational behaviour during the data collection. For example, a description of a pupil writing in class could describe if the pupil was voluntarily writing (information on motivation) and the fact that he had difficulty writing (information on performance). The node ‘attitudes IN the learning situation’ arose in all three classrooms.

Behaviour that was relevant to pupils’ motivation was cross-referenced with the pupils and teachers’ beliefs, views, feelings and attitudes to demonstrate whether the pupils were motivated or not. So, for example, the ‘effort’ node includes data from the pupil interviews and focus groups, the teacher’s comments about the pupils’ efforts in the language classroom or at home and the classroom observation notes (e.g. pupils trying to read and underlining unknown words in class are behaviour that shows effort in action). This is because the motivational element ‘effort’ is found in Gardner’s socio-educational model as a theoretical concept but also in Tremblay and Gardner’s (1995) elements on motivational behaviour.

The ‘attitudes IN class’ node was divided into negative and positive attitudes (see Figure 11). This node was influenced by the process model of L2 motivation (Dörnyei and Ottó, 1998) which refers to elements such as pupils’ persistence, attention and motivational intensity. The description ‘negative’ refers to behaviour that disrupted the lesson and caused discomfort to the teacher and pupils. Examples of negative attitudes were mainly related to behavioural
problems, such as pupils being disruptive, failing to follow the teacher's instructions, shouting, playing and chatting during the lesson, asking what time the lesson ends, not sitting in their seats, and moving around. These attitudes demonstrate that the pupils were not engaged in the lesson and were disinterested. On the other hand, the description 'positive' refers to pupils' compliance with the classroom processes and engagement in the classroom activities. Examples of positive attitudes included pupils listening attentively, remaining in their seats, following the teachers' instructions, being receptive to the teacher's feedback and support, and collaborating well with their classmates.

Figure 11: The node 'attitudes IN class' node
The difficulty I faced at this stage was whether some data referred to motivation or performance or both. For instance, in an interview, Minos stated:

*R (researcher):* “What would you say about their reading abilities?

*M (Minos):* “When I ask them the meaning of a word in the text, they will usually find the correct answer...others just don’t care...”

The statement “just don’t care” refers to motivation while the statement “they usually find the correct answer” refers to performance.

From another classroom observation (pre-intervention) in the Riverlands classroom:

From a classroom observation (first part) (27/03/12):

- “The pupils keep working on the exercise (effort: motivation node), they check everything (effort), the girl next to me with Carol, they re-check (effort) (one girl works more than others).”
- “The pupils ask what ‘cheat’ means (vocabulary skill: performance node, effort: motivation node).”

In cases like this, the sentence was placed in both the motivation and performance nodes.
4.4.6 Pupils' performance

The original themes of the pupils' performance nodes were mainly related to reading, writing, listening and speaking skills (Ellis, 2003) (see also section 3.2.7). However, because I had to review the data and place them in these predefined themes, I could not disregard the fact that some data could not be matched with some of the pre-defined themes. Besides, a thematic analysis can also shed light on other features of a research topic (Boyatzis, 1998). Therefore, the 'top-down' nodes were slightly reshaped at this stage. This is because the skills that each teacher was exploring led to the alteration or deletion of the 'top-down' performance nodes. For example, Minos was not practising the listening skill so the node 'listening A' was deleted, as it was not supported by data. More specific skills such as grammar and vocabulary also emerged in some but not all the three classrooms (e.g. Winterfell), as these emerged repeatedly from the data.

Myrtle, in the Riverlands classroom, also employed a lot of grammar, vocabulary and spelling tasks and had used more assessment tools than Minos (see Appendix 17c). So, based on this, in the Riverlands classroom, the nodes 'Non Dyslexic Pupils' grades' and 'Dyslexic pupils' grades' were created (see the different coloured nodes, Figure 12). In these nodes, apart from the pupils' grades, descriptions of the data related to the pupils' mistakes and teacher's comments were also included (Appendix 14).
Penelope in the Winterfell classroom also extensively practised dictation. As a result, the node 'dictation skill' emerged in both parts of the study. The data associated with 'dictation skill' were distributed into spelling, writing, vocabulary and listening skills, as the dictation process involves a combination of these. For instance, based on a teacher interview in the first part, statements (a) and (b) below were added to the 'vocabulary skill' node while statements (c) and (d) were added to the 'spelling skill' node. Also, because the teacher uses the word 'write' in (d), this reference was also added to their writing abilities ('writing A' node).
P: “There are instances where I ask them to do a lot and they cannot respond to this...to learn all the words...they think this is a lot for them to do. However, some pupils have a. extensive vocabulary knowledge from the language school...the level of b. vocabulary knowledge for (two immigrant pupils) is five though their c. spelling ability is excellent, d. they can write and spell the word correctly as they hear it...”

In addition to the teacher interviews, the classroom observations also gave me insights into the pupils’ performance (see Appendix 17). At this stage, the general node ‘attitudes IN the learning situation’ was created to include information on the pupils’ performance.

4.4.7 Third stage: ‘bottom-up’ nodes on motivation

The predefined themes on motivation (based on Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993a; Tremblay & Gardner, 1998) supported me in organising and review the data on pupils’ motivation. They also guided me on the themes I could focus on the data. Each of the motivation nodes that arose was reviewed again and these ‘bottom-up’ themes emerged, describing their corresponding ‘top-down’ node. However, at this stage, the data altered some of these predefined themes. For example, the ‘motivational intensity’ node was not supported by references while the node ‘persistence’ that was created from the first examination of the motivational nodes was merged with the ‘effort’ node in both parts of the study, as they had a similar meaning. Similarly, the node ‘attention’ was merged with the node ‘attitudes towards the learning situation’ because they were
describing similar issues. For example, I considered that, if a learner was paying attention, his attitudes towards the learning situation were positive and this was added to the 'attitudes towards the learning situation node'.

Most of these predefined nodes on motivation appeared in relation to dyslexic and non-dyslexic pupils' motivation in both parts of the study. The only exception was the node 'attention', which did not arise in the second part for either group (see Figure 13).

As thematic analysis is a flexible analytic process that "can potentially provide a rich and detailed, yet complex, account of data" (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 78), several nodes that were not exclusively related to motivation and performance were retrieved whilst reviewing the data drawn from all three cases. Some of them were kept as they provided data that helped me to address my research questions.
4.4.8 Third stage: 'top-down' on performance

The 'bottom-up' process that I followed in creating the nodes and categorising the data in nodes was similar for all three schools in both the pre-intervention and intervention stages of the study. This section discusses the processes I followed for Highgarden School.

In the first review of the data drawn from the Highgarden classroom, I created 'bottom-up' nodes that included data on pupils' performance (the pre-intervention stage). In the first instance, forty-nine new sub-nodes arose (see example Table 7 below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good grammar levels A</th>
<th>Know already from language school A</th>
<th>Some weak in grammar A</th>
<th>Premature grammar levels A</th>
<th>Different levels in grammar A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better in grammar than other skills A</td>
<td>Bad classroom environment A</td>
<td>Different levels in reading A</td>
<td>Mood affects performance A</td>
<td>No response reading A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher no effort A</td>
<td>Pupil quiet when sb reads A</td>
<td>Pupil interested in good pronunciation A</td>
<td>Effort in reading A</td>
<td>Albert can't read A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good speaking levels A</td>
<td>Outside influences A</td>
<td>Noisy classroom A</td>
<td>Might be noisy because they don't understand A</td>
<td>No more speaking exercises now A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom conditions important A</td>
<td>No writing exercises A</td>
<td>Mediocre writing levels A</td>
<td>Writing needs hard work A</td>
<td>Premature writing levels A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different levels in reading A</td>
<td>Keep writing simple A</td>
<td>Low grammar level A</td>
<td>Use English A</td>
<td>Pronunciation problems A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level depends on Igl/school A</td>
<td>Use vocabulary A</td>
<td>No vocabulary knowledge A</td>
<td>Mediocre vocabulary levels A</td>
<td>Different vocabulary levels A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low vocabulary knowledge A</td>
<td>Good reading levels A</td>
<td>Low reading levels A</td>
<td>Mediocre reading levels A</td>
<td>Different speaking levels A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in vocabulary A</td>
<td>Good response to vocabulary A</td>
<td>Spelling mistakes A</td>
<td>Limited vocabulary skills A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: 'Bottom-up' nodes on 'Performance' for Highgarden (pre-intervention stage)

Some of the nodes had similar meanings and were at this point merged. The performance descriptions that the teachers and I employed (e.g. 'mediocre', 'good') were influenced by the Greek standards and the A2 level that the EFL learners are required to have (see also section 3.2.7). For instance, the node 'low grammar
levels' showed that the pupils were responding to the basic demands of the A2 level in the grammar task that the teacher was using (based on Table 1). The sentence: “Aria has very good reading skills,” meant that the pupil had a very good A2 level at her reading skill in English and was responding to a great extent to the demands of the lesson (Tables 1 & 2 and Appendix 10). In another example, Minos notes that one of the pupils “cannot even read basic, very simple texts but only this”. This is very similar to the description provided for the reading skill of A2 level learners: “I can read very short, simple texts” (see Appendix 10a, Reading description). Expressions such as ‘cannot read’ or ‘no vocabulary knowledge’ were inferred as being below the required A2 level that the learner should possess with regard to the reading and the vocabulary skills respectively. Based on the data, the term ‘weak’ was inferred to be similar in meaning to the ‘low’ level description. The node ‘different grammar levels’, that contained the nodes ‘good grammar levels’ and ‘low grammar levels’, showed variability in pupils’ performance.

The descriptions of the pupils' assessment tools also aided the process of reviewing their performance (Appendix 14). For example, in one of the dictations, I noted that ‘the pupil has written most of the words and their translations correctly’. This shows that the pupil had responded to a great extent to the demands of the task and, therefore, his performance in this dictation task was ‘Very good’ (see also Table 1). The teacher's description/mark was also ‘Very good’. The words that refer to the pupils' performance levels (e.g. low) provide a summary of what the data in each code demonstrate. For instance, if the review of a node showed that the majority of the
pupils showed 'Very Good' levels of dictation skills, the description 'Very good' was then added to the name of this node.

During the review of the performance nodes, some nodes on motivation also arose (e.g. node 'pupils interested in good pronunciation). These were moved to the motivation nodes. The second review of the initial nodes created led to them being reduced to fourteen (Table 8):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Different levels in grammar - good</th>
<th>Mediocre writing levels</th>
<th>Teacher no effort</th>
<th>Albert can't read</th>
<th>Outside influences</th>
<th>Noisy classroom</th>
<th>Level depends on language school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Premature level</td>
<td>No effort</td>
<td>Different levels in reading - low</td>
<td>Spelling problems</td>
<td>Different speaking levels</td>
<td>Pupils effort</td>
<td>Different vocabulary levels - low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Second stage of 'bottom-up' nodes on 'Performance' at Highgarden (pre-intervention stage)

Although the nodes 'Albert can't read', 'outside influences', 'noisy classroom' and 'spelling problems' (Table 8) had only a few references, I decided to retain these in case they were related to other nodes. For example the 'Albert can't read' could be added to Albert's performance nodes.

Similarly, from the second part of the study thirty-four initial 'bottom-up' nodes on pupils' performance arose (Table 9):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>different levels in grammar B</th>
<th>low grammar levels B</th>
<th>Ken grammar problems B</th>
<th>Albert grammar problems B</th>
<th>good difference in grammar B</th>
<th>teacher no effort B</th>
<th>noisy classroom B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mediocre grammar levels B</td>
<td>df listening practice B</td>
<td>positive slight improvement in reading</td>
<td>slight improvement in reading B</td>
<td>positive influences reading B</td>
<td>premature reading levels B</td>
<td>good reading levels B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive practices speaking B</td>
<td>premature speaking levels B</td>
<td>liked practices B</td>
<td>mediocre speaking levels B</td>
<td>positive practices in classroom climate B</td>
<td>low levels speaking B</td>
<td>good levels speaking B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken positive response to practices B</td>
<td>spelling problems B</td>
<td>different writing levels B</td>
<td>more participatio due to practices B</td>
<td>positive influences vocabulary practices B</td>
<td>different vocab levels B</td>
<td>different levels in reading B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grammar improvements with practices B</td>
<td>premature grammar levels B</td>
<td>mediocre reading levels B</td>
<td>different speaking levels B</td>
<td>partial positive response to the practices</td>
<td>positive response writing practices B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: First stage of the 'bottom-up' nodes on 'Performance' at Highgarden (intervention stage)

As before, the above nodes started being reduced as some of them were merged, moved or placed under other nodes. For example, the node 'good differences in grammar B' was merged with the 'grammar improvements with practices B' node, as they both referred to data that showed improvements in pupils' grammar skills. The rest of the nodes that were relevant to the pupils' grammar levels (low grammar levels, mediocre grammar levels) were placed under the node 'different levels in grammar B Low'. All of the nodes that referred to speaking level (e.g. low levels in speaking, good levels in speaking) were placed under the node 'different speaking levels B', showing the pupils' different levels of speaking skills.

The node 'premature levels B' arose in both stages of the study for the Highgarden classroom and could not be placed in any of the performance levels descriptions (e.g. 'very good', 'good'). Although the
teacher used this description to refer to pupils’ performance, I could not infer its meaning and its relation pupils’ performance. Similar to stage A, this node was kept as ‘premature levels B’ and was added to the teacher node as it reflected the teacher’s views of the pupils. Furthermore, the node ‘different levels in reading good’ was created to show the variability in the pupils’ reading levels, with the majority of pupils having good reading skills for the A2 level. Regarding the dyslexic pupils’ performance, the nodes ‘Albert grammar problems’ and ‘Ken grammar problems’ were placed under the node ‘DP pupils grammar problems B’. Based on the data placed under this node, this node was indicating that the dyslexic pupils had below the expected A2 level in grammar (see also Appendix 10b).

Because many nodes on the positive impact of the dyslexia-friendly practices were found in the data at the intervention stage, I created the node: ‘positive changes DF practice performance’ for references that were relevant to pupils’ performance: ‘grammar improvements with practices’, ‘positive influences vocabulary practices B’, ‘positive response writing practices B’, ‘positive practices speaking B’, ‘positive influences reading practices B’, ‘slight improvement in reading B’, and ‘DF listening practice positive B’. So, the term ‘positive’ referred to improvements that had been noticed in the pupils’ skills. Other nodes that remained were:

a) different levels in grammar low B  
b) limited time the practices were used B  
c) spelling problems B  
d) different writing levels B  
e) different vocabulary levels B
f) different speaking levels B

g) different levels in reading good B

h) Positive response due to DF practices B

The nodes 'different levels in grammar low B', 'spelling problems B', 'different writing levels B', 'different vocabulary levels B', 'different vocabulary levels B', 'different speaking levels B' and 'different levels in reading good B' were added to the 'top-down' 'NDP performance' nodes previously added. The 'limited time the practices were used' was merged with the 'time issues' node created earlier (Figure 14).

Figure 14: Merging inductive nodes (NDP Pupils' performance B) with deductive codes (Time issues B)

Because I was mainly using the more general 'NDP performance node', the 'a priori' nodes referring to the pupils' performance of grammar, writing, reading, speaking and vocabulary were at this stage deleted from both stages of the project. However, the sub-node 'Listening B' (under the 'NDP performance B' node) was kept because it demonstrated a change in the teacher's practice; the teacher started using listening exercises at the intervention stage in contrast to the first stage where no listening exercises were used.
The nodes that could not be linked or merged with others at this stage were:

1\textsuperscript{st} part (pre-intervention): level depends on language school A

2\textsuperscript{nd} part (intervention): positive changes due to DF practice B

However, the 'positive changes due to DF practice B' node was later merged with the 'positive attitudes in the learning situation' node (relevant to pupils' motivation). The node 'level depends on language school A' was retained, as it indicated characteristics of the overall EFL context. This node was later added to the nodes that were grouped based on Realism.

Although the data gave rise to Albert's performance, Ken's performance could only be described using the following nodes (due to the limited data):

1\textsuperscript{st} part: Ken's performance low A

2\textsuperscript{nd} part: Ken's performance low B

Similar processes were followed for the 'bottom-up' nodes on performance for the Winterfell and Riverlands classrooms. Numerous nodes on performance were created and later merged to reach the final 'bottom-up' performance nodes. Stages A and B indicated the pre-intervention and the intervention parts respectively.

4.4.9 Fourth stage: other data retrieved nodes

In the fourth stage of my analysis, I decided to review the nodes again in case I could trace more nodes that might help me answer my
research questions. The following section discusses the data retrieved nodes that were used in the data analysis process and that arose from the purely 'bottom-up' processes.

4.4.10 The Highgarden classroom

In the Highgarden classroom, one of the first inductive nodes that I started noticing in the data from the pre-intervention stage was relevant to my influence in all three classrooms. This was noticed in each classroom and was placed under the title 'my presence A' node. The review of this node also showed whether the changes in teachers' practice and pupils' behaviour were due to the training (in the first part) and the dyslexia-friendly practices (in the second part) or whether they were occurring because of my presence. This node was also created based on several statements made by both the pupils and teachers about my presence. The pupils and teachers' behaviour in class also enhanced the creation of this node:

From a classroom observation at the pre-intervention stage at Highgarden (16/03/12):

- "Some pupils keep looking at me."
- "A boy asks me the spelling of a Greek word."

From an interview in the second part:

P: "Miss, as I have told you before, when you are in the classroom the classroom situation is different."

P: "We are doing more things now that you are here."
Apart from the observer effects (Robson, 2002) that were shown by the 'my presence' node, other 'bottom-up' nodes that arose at Highgarden and in fact all of the classrooms that followed were the nodes 'attitudes in class', which described the dyslexic and non-dyslexic pupils' attitudes in the classroom (e.g. “some pupils move”, “one pupil has taken another pupil’s notebook”, “another pupil talks about the richest man in the world”). The 'attitudes in class' node is different from the 'attitudes IN the learning situation’ node, which referred to the pupils' motivation and, in some instances, performance, as previously discussed (see section 4.4.7). The 'attitudes in class' nodes were created in both parts of the study for all three classrooms to include more general behaviour than motivational behaviour or performance. However, where the data were similar in both these nodes, these nodes were merged. The 'attitudes in class' node mainly entailed pupils’ positive (e.g. ‘the classroom is quiet’) or negative attitudes (e.g. ‘two pupils interrupt the teacher to ask about their grades’) in the classroom setting. No characterisation was placed in the name of the node if the behaviour could not be described as positive or negative (e.g. ‘Ken attitudes in class A’). The data that described the classroom context (e.g. seating arrangements) were placed under the 'classroom context' node. Furthermore, at the intervention stage, the nodes 'NDP pupils’ attitudes to DPs' (inclusion) and 'NDP pupils' response to DPs' inclusion' that arose for the Highgarden and Riverlands classrooms respectively described how the non-dyslexic pupils responded to the inclusion of dyslexic pupils in the lesson. However, a similar node did not arise for the Winterfell classroom.
4.4.11 The Riverlands classroom

Similar processes were followed for the creation of 'bottom-up' nodes in the Riverlands classroom. The 'bottom-up' nodes that appeared at the pre-intervention stage were:

a) division in class A
b) noisy class A
c) problematic materials A
d) context A
e) mixed abilities A
f) difficult language A
g) homework not done A
h) DP participation A
i) NDP pupils distracted A
j) Pupils in class A
k) immigrant pupils A
l) Dpupils distracted A
m) Carol in class A
n) NDPresponse (to dyslexic pupils inclusion) A

The 'bottom-up' nodes created for the second part of the study varied. However, some of them were similar to the first part: 'noisy class', 'my presence', 'immigrant pupils'. However, the node 'my presence B' was only supported by seven references at this stage in contrast to the first part, where twenty-two references were placed under this node.

The new 'bottom-up' nodes that arose from the Riverlands classroom at the intervention stage were:
a) DPupils DF practice B  
b) Pupils DF practice B  
c) DP differences noticed B  
d) difficult language B

From the above list, we can infer that most of the new nodes that arose in the data from the second part of the study were relevant to the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices and the pupils' response to these. The nodes 'pupils DF practice B' and 'DP pupils DF practice B' described this while the node 'DP differences noticed B' described the changes that the pupils noticed in the teacher. However, this node arose only for the pupils with dyslexia.

A new node that arose in this part in the Riverlands classroom (but not in the Highgarden classroom) was the 'difficult language B' node. This node was based on the comments the non-dyslexic pupils were making about the English language. These comments were traced in in the interview and the focus group data.

The 'bottom-up' nodes that arose and were considered useful for the data analysis were added to the 'Part A' and 'Part B' sections respectively (see the example in Figure 15). The 'bottom-up' nodes (indicated with an arrow in Figure 15) refer to the 'bottom-up' nodes related to the classroom context, the pupils (dyslexic and non-dyslexic), the teacher and the classroom situation.
Figure 15: ‘Bottom-up’ nodes at the intervention stage shown by an arrow (the Riverlands classroom)

### 4.4.12 The Winterfell classroom

The nodes (Braun & Clarke, 2006) that were created from the data in the Winterfell classroom were influenced by the analysis I had carried out related to the Riverlands and Highgarden classrooms. The nodes that arose from the first part of the study at Winterfell were:

a) DPKeith A  
b) DPimmigrant A  
c) DPgroup cohesion A  
d) language school A  
e) the class A
f) context A
g) group cohesion A
h) immigrant pupils A
i) my presence A
j) noisy class A
k) pupils dpupil A
l) SEN pupil in class A
m) the lesson A

The 'bottom-up' nodes for the intervention stage were influenced by the 'bottom-up' nodes from the intervention stage (data-retrieved and researcher-retrieved) as the data in the second part of the study supported the creation of similar nodes. Therefore, the nodes that follow for part B were not purely 'bottom-up' nodes but a combination of 'bottom-up' and 'top-down' nodes:

a) DPchanges noticed B
b) DPdf practice B
c) DPincreased motivation
d) changes in motivation B
e) slight changes in performance B
f) reading improvement B
g) changes noticed B
The Riverlands and Winterfell classrooms had high pupil variability due the presence of immigrant pupils and pupils with other learning difficulties than dyslexia. The concern when reviewing the data from the Riverlands and Winterfell classrooms was whether I should retain the immigrant pupils, the pupil with ADHD (Riverlands) and the SEN pupil (Winterfell) as separate groups or consider them as part of the non-dyslexic pupils. I decided to view them as part of the non-dyslexic pupil group because my study's focus was not on how the practices affected the different groups of pupils in the classroom but specifically the dyslexic and the non-dyslexic pupils. Furthermore, my query was whether the dyslexia-friendly practices enhanced inclusion, not whether they were inclusive for immigrant or other SpLD learners. So, the two main groups of nodes under motivation and performance were the same as in the Highgarden classroom: dyslexic and non-dyslexic pupils.

4.4.13 Fifth stage: combining the 'bottom-up' and 'top-down' nodes

The combination of 'bottom-up' and 'top-down' nodes took place at the fifth stage of the coding, starting with the Highgarden classroom.
The analysis of the data relating to the Highgarden classroom gave me more confidence about combining 'bottom-up' and 'top-down' nodes simultaneously for the Riverlands and Winterfell classrooms. Therefore, the creation of 'top-down' and 'bottom-up' nodes took place at the same stage for Riverlands and Winterfell. A diary - 'memo' - (Braun & Clarke, 2013) was used and included my decisions during the analysis of all three classrooms. This memo provided a detailed description of the analysis processes and allowed me to form a well-structured report that was relevant to my findings. It also helped me to be consistent in the analysis procedures I followed across the three cases.

So, in the Highgarden classroom, after creating the 'top-down' and the 'bottom-up' nodes, I began by examining both the data-retrieved and the 'top-down' nodes on performance for dyslexic and non-dyslexic pupils that were relevant to the first part of the study in order to trace any similarities or differences (see Figure 16).

Figure 16: Combination of 'bottom-up' and 'top-down' codes.
After reviewing both the 'bottom-up' and 'top-down' nodes at Highgarden, I noticed that, although some nodes were named differently, they contained similar data. For instance, the 'Albert can't read' node that was created solely based on Minos' views of Albert's performance was first added to the 'Albert reading A' performance node and later merged with the 'Teacher - Albert' node. Moreover, the 'spelling problems A' node was added to the 'top-down' 'NDPperformance A' since the 'top-down' nodes on performance did not originally include the spelling skill. In cases where the "bottom-up" node 'attitudes in class' was referring to performance, the data were placed in the performance nodes. In cases where the node was referring to motivation, the data were placed with the 'top-down' node on motivational behaviour: 'attitudes in the learning situation'. For example, the sentence:

- "Pupils are distracted, move around, do not pay attention to what the teacher is saying and ask the teacher questions about how to complete the exercise"

Half of this sentence (pupils are distracted, do not pay attention to what the teacher is saying) was placed under the node 'attitudes in the learning situation', which was concerned with motivational behaviour. The other half of the sentence (ask teacher questions about how to complete the exercise) was data on pupils' performance. In this case, the exercise was a writing task and was placed under the node 'NDP pupils' writing B'.

Further combinations of 'bottom-up' and 'top-down' nodes took place during the analysis of the Highgarden classroom, and the data
retrieved nodes that did not share any similarities with any of the 'a priori' codes were:

a) Outside influences A  
b) Noisy classroom A  
c) Level depends on language school A  
d) Premature level A

The 'noisy classroom A' node was irrelevant to the pupils' performance, as it indicated that the pupils were unmotivated and this was shown in their behaviour. Therefore, this node was merged with the 'top-down' node on motivation: 'attitudes in the learning situation A'. In addition, the 'outside influences' node was merged with the 'valence A' node because they contained similar data. For example, the teacher described how the pupils sometimes show interest because they are seeing things online (outside influences) and consider it important to speak English (valence). The premature levels node was added to the teacher's views of the pupils.

4.4.14 Final nodes on pupils' motivation

The data from the 'top-down' nodes on motivation that were examined did not support the 'motivational intensity node'. However, some of the data from the classroom observations supported the 'persistence' and 'attention' nodes. I decided to link these nodes on motivation with those that arose from the interviews and focus groups because they were closely related. The node 'persistence' indicated whether a pupil was putting in effort or not and therefore was merged with the node 'effort' in both parts of the project. Similarly, the node 'attention'
was merged with the node 'attitudes towards the learning situation' because they were describing similar issues. For example, I considered that, if a learner was paying attention, his attitudes towards the learning situation were positive and so this was added to the 'attitudes towards the learning situation node'.

Each of the motivation nodes that arose was reviewed again and these 'bottom-up' themes came up, describing their corresponding 'top-down' node (Table 10):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NDP Motivation A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>effort: more effort than no effort +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goal salience: to get certificates- professional purposes +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antecedent factors: positive experiences +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>causal attributions: teacher’s malpractice -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language anxiety: yes and no =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrumental orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integrativeness: want to meet foreigners +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language acquisition contexts: LG school +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high self-efficacy +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valence: slightly higher than lower +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitudes towards the learning situation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative attitudes towards the teacher -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Non-dyslexic pupils motivation (pre-intervention stage)

I used the symbols plus (+) for positive motivation elements and minus (-) for negative ones, so that I could have an indication of the pupils' motivation at this stage. Furthermore, some nodes were similar and
some subcategories could be merged with the 'bottom-up' node from which they were drawn:

1) The 'goal salience' node is the same as the 'instrumental orientation' node because learners' goals were referring to instrumental motives.
2) The sub-nodes 'certificates- professional purposes' were merged with the 'goal salience' node.
3) The 'integrativeness' node was merged with the sub-node 'want to meet foreigners' node.
4) From the 'causal attributions' node and the 'language acquisition contexts', the 'time pressures' ('bottom-up') theme arose. I decided to add this node to both themes.
5) The 'language anxiety' node was deleted because it was not supported by sufficient references.

The nodes and their descriptions from the second part of the study are shown in Table 11. For example, the node 'language anxiety: yes and no' indicates that some of the pupils felt anxious while others did not. The symbol (=) next to it indicates that the same node was indicated in the first part (Table 11):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NDPMotivation B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>effort: more effort +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goal salience: professional purposes +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>antecedent factors: negative experiences -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>causal attributions: no explanations, language school -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language anxiety: yes and no =</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Integrative orientation: want to meet foreigners +

language acquisition contexts: LG school influences +

higher self-efficacy +

More valence now +

attitudes towards the learning situation:
Negative attitudes towards the teacher -
changes noticed by pupils POSITIVE B

Table 11: Non-dyslexic Pupils motivation (intervention stage)

The teacher nodes remained the same, as a combination of 'bottom-up' and 'top-down' nodes that occurred simultaneously. Other nodes that did not change were the 'attitudes in class, 'classroom context’ 'my presence’ nodes in both parts as well as the 'attitudes to 'DPs' inclusion’ (second part).

Similar nodes emerged for the dyslexic pupils’ motivation. These nodes were similar for both parts of the study. The only exception was the node 'attention’, which did not arise in the second part for either the dyslexic or non-dyslexic pupils.

As the above inductive and deductive processes were mainly distinguished for the Highgarden classroom, the combination of 'top-down' and “bottom-up” nodes in the Riverlands and Winterfell classrooms took place while reviewing the data. In the analysis of the Winterfell classroom, some of the final nodes were re-reviewed after they were placed in the 'mechanism, context, outcome’ themes on Realism (Bhaskar, 1979).
4.4.15 Final nodes on pupils’ performance

The final nodes that resulted from the non-dyslexic pupils’ performance in both parts of the study are presented in the table below. These nodes resulted from the inductive and deductive processes discussed above. The descriptions ‘good’, ‘mediocre’, etc., are a summary of the information that the specific node was providing (Table 12):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NDP performance A</th>
<th>NDP performance B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Different levels in GRAMMAR A GOOD A</td>
<td>Different levels in GRAMMAR B LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIocre WRITING levels A</td>
<td>DIFFERENT WRITING LEVELS B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPELLING PROBLEMS A</td>
<td>SPELLING PROBLEMS B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different levels in READING LOW A</td>
<td>different levels in READING GOOD B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different SPEAKING LEVELS LOW A</td>
<td>different SPEAKING LEVELS B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different VOCAB LEVELS LOW A</td>
<td>different VOCABULARY LEVELS B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level depends on language school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Nodes on Non-Dyslexic Pupils’ performance

Similarly, the ‘bottom-up’ nodes on the dyslexic pupils’ performance are shown in Table 13):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Albert’s performance A</th>
<th>Albert’s performance B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low reading levels A</td>
<td>improvement reading more participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaking levels A (limited knowledge)</td>
<td>speaking improvement B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no use of GRAMMAR A</td>
<td>no use of Grammar B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no writing A</td>
<td>writing improvement B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Nodes on Albert’s performance
Although some data arose on Albert's performance, Ken's performance could only be described with the following nodes (due to the limited data):

1\textsuperscript{st} part: Ken's performance low A  
2\textsuperscript{nd} part: Ken's performance low B

4.4.16 The 'Teacher' nodes

The interviews with the teachers, my research diary and, in some cases, the short discussions I had with the teachers at the schools helped me to address my third research question about the teachers' experience. In contrast to the nodes on motivation and performance, the teacher nodes were primarily created via 'bottom-up' processes ('Teacher' nodes – Figure 17).

4.4.17 Teacher nodes in the Highgarden classroom

The initial nodes 'teachers' experience' were mainly described as positive or negative. The terms 'positive' and 'negative' were mainly based on the teachers' comments. For example, during an interview, Minos stated:

- "If these practices (dyslexia-friendly) help me to deal with Alexander (a dyslexic pupil), I will use them!"

This statement was inferred as positive as the teacher is suggesting that the practices supported him in teaching a pupil with dyslexia. However, in another interview, Minos said:
- "The (dyslexia-friendly) practices need a lot of effort on my part...this can be tiring"

This was described as a negative statement, as Minos notes that he experienced negatively the dyslexia-friendly practices ('a lot of effort', 'tiring').

The description 'neutral' referred to incidents where the teachers' experience could not be described as positive or negative. For example, in the following answer, I could not infer whether Minos felt positively about the resources on dyslexia as the words 'were alright' has neither a positive nor a negative connotation:

From a teacher interview:
- "What did you think of the resources of dyslexia I gave you?"
- "The resources on dyslexia were alright but I preferred the list with the practices."

Figure 17: Teacher nodes at Highgarden School (pre-intervention stage)
The node on ‘teachers’ experience’ (positive, negative, neutral) was different in that, in the first part, the teacher was introduced to the dyslexia resources while, in the second part, he started employing the dyslexia-friendly practices. This was the case in each classroom.

The nodes that arose from the data were relevant to the practices the teacher was using, as well as the teacher’s views of the dyslexic (e.g. the node ‘teacher- Albert’) and the non-dyslexic pupils (e.g. the node ‘premature levels’). A node that arose from the data in Highgarden school was the ‘teacher no effort’ node, which was mainly based on the data from the classroom observations, the pupils’ interviews and the focus groups.

In the second part of the study in Highgarden, similar ‘bottom-up’ nodes were created. However, these were influenced by the ‘bottom-
up' nodes created in the first part (see Figure 18). All of the codes related to the use of the dyslexia-friendly practices the teacher had selected to employ, the way he was employing them and everything relevant to the teacher and the dyslexia-friendly practices was put under the node 'teacher – DF practice'. This node addressed how the teachers were experiencing the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices. A comparison with experiences from the first part would also allow me to trace any possible processes of change in their attitudes, views, beliefs and commitment compared to the first part. With the 'teacher's practice B' node, I would also be able to compare whether the teacher changed his teaching approach after the introduction of the resources for dyslexia. For example, the node 'teacher's practice' in the second part also includes the listening skill, which was not found in the first part.

The node on the teacher's attitudes towards Albert in the second part showed whether the dyslexia-friendly practices had had any effect on Minos' views of Albert. Furthermore, although the data did not give rise to a theme on the teacher's views towards Ken in the first part of the study, in the second part, the teacher's descriptions of his performance and motivation arose:

From a classroom observation in the first part (26/03/12):

- "All the pupils write the words apart from Ken."
- "....."
- "Ken has a dart and makes noise."

From a classroom observation in the second part (23/04/12):
4.4.18  Teacher nodes in the Riverlands classroom

The nodes that were originally been created for the Highgarden classroom influenced the processes that I followed when creating the teacher nodes for the Riverlands and Winterfell classrooms. The general nodes ‘teacher’s attitudes’, ‘teacher’s practices’, ‘teacher df practice’ and ‘teacher’s response to training’ that arose in the analysis of the Highgarden classroom during the first stage were originally used as ‘top-down’ nodes for the Riverlands and Winterfell classrooms. These nodes provided significant information for my third research question and were supported by data from all three classrooms.

However, the differences among the teachers resulted in differences in the ‘bottom-up’ nodes among the schools. An example is the node ‘premature levels’ that arose in the Highgarden classroom that did not arise in either the Winterfell or Riverlands classrooms.

The teacher nodes that arose in the Riverlands classroom were the ‘Teacher- Dpupils’ node that describes the teacher’s views of the dyslexic pupils as well as the ‘Teacher uses English’ node. This second node was mainly based on my classroom observations since the teacher’s use of English as a language of instruction in class was a recurrent theme in the data. What is more, Myrtle differentiated
some materials for Tim (‘teacher differentiation for Tim’) while the ‘Teacher in class’ node contained data relevant to Myrtle’s behaviour in class.

In the Riverlands classroom, the ‘teacher’ nodes during the intervention stage of the study varied. The ‘bottom-up’ nodes that were similar to the nodes from the pre-intervention stage were the nodes: ‘teacher uses English’, ‘teacher in class’ and ‘teacher DPupils’.

The new teacher ‘bottom-up’ node during the intervention stage were:

a) Teacher uses English and Greek
b) Teacher ADHD pupil

From the above, we can infer that most of the new teacher nodes that arose from the data during the intervention stage of the study were relevant to their responses to the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices (see also Figure 19). Nodes that referred to descriptions of their practice also arose (e.g. ‘teacher uses English and Greek’). The ‘teacher ADHD pupil’ node was added because a recurrent theme in the data was the teacher’s relationship with the ADHD pupil. At this stage, I decided to retain this node, as it would give me information on the teacher’s practice.
4.4.19 Teacher nodes in the Winterfell classroom

At Winterfell, the new ‘teacher’ nodes that arose from the data during the pre-intervention stage that differed from those obtained for the previous two classrooms were:

e) teacher dpupil (dyslexic pupil) A

f) teacher dyslexia awareness A

g) teacher in class A

h) teacher research A

The data from the second part of the study supported the creation
of similar nodes as in the first part. Therefore, the nodes 'teacher dpupil', 'teacher in class', 'teacher research' and 'teacher dyslexia awareness' were also created in the second part, as these were supported by the data. The new node that arose at this stage was 'teacher dpupil B', which contained data related to the interactions of the teacher with the pupils with dyslexia.

4.5  **Introducing Realism in NVivo (the Highgarden classroom)**

As already mentioned in the Methodology chapter, the data were analysed based on Realism (Bhaskar, 1979). The focus was on the identification and workings of mechanisms, including whether or not these have been activated and under what conditions (Sayer, 2000). Realism helped me to identify any possible processes of change that might have occurred because of my intervention in the context. The focus during the data analysis was on a “process-oriented approach to explanation” (Maxwell & Mittapalli, 2010, p. 3); that is, exploring the processes of change within the 'context-generative mechanisms-outcomes' concept.

My analysis focused on the “causal processes by which some events influence others” (Maxwell, 2012, p. 36). The qualitative methods employed helped me to consider the causal powers that objects and social relations have and examine whether these causal powers would produce regularities or not (Sayer, 1992).

After the creation of the final nodes, the next stage of my data analysis involved identifying which nodes would be considered generative mechanisms, which would be regarded as outcomes and
which referred to contextual factors. As my analysis started with the Highgarden classroom, the nodes that were originally placed in the Realism groups for Highgarden influenced the analysis of the Riverlands and Winterfell classrooms that followed. The analysis follows the realist framework, according to which the causal processes that are due to the activation of certain mechanisms by the context are explored (Pawson & Tilley, 1998).

Therefore, a new general node was created in NVivo called 'Realism', which consisted of the 'generative mechanisms', 'outcomes' and 'context' nodes, while the letters A and B corresponded to the pre-intervention and intervention parts of the study respectively. The various nodes that had been previously created from a combination of the inductive and deductive approaches were placed under these three general nodes based on the issues they addressed. Although thematic analysis and coding is not enhanced in Realism because many contextual relations can be missed (Mishler, 1984; 1986), the use of a case study allowed for coding techniques to be employed in my research because "the unique context of each case is retained and the data are interpreted within that context, to provide an account of a particular instance, setting, person, or event" (Maxwell, 2012, p. 114).

4.5.1 The Realism nodes

4.5.1.1 Context

The three elements of mechanism, context, and outcome were examined, as these are closely related to each other. In the present
study, the ‘context’ element refers to the contextual features of each EFL classroom before and during my intervention. According to the realist explanation, the activation of generative mechanisms depends on contextual features and whether and how contextual characteristics activate these mechanisms. Identifying the contextual characteristics of the situation under review is an essential requirement for the realist researcher to identify causality (Maxwell, 2012). This is a way of exploring an individual’s beliefs, motives, thoughts and values, and meanings, as these are elements that cannot be directly observable (Maxwell, 2012). The data I collected provided me with rich descriptions of the classroom context in both stages. In my analysis, these data were viewed as causal factors for the generative mechanisms that were being activated. For example, in the Highgarden classroom, the ‘my presence A’ node was one of those that were placed in the context due to my presence in the lessons from the beginning of the study (see Figure 20). My presence as an observer influenced the classroom processes and activated, deactivated or introduced new generative mechanisms in the classroom. It must be noted that the node ‘my presence’ appeared in each classroom context.
Examples of other nodes that were placed in the 'context' node were those referring to Minos’ practice and behaviour (e.g. 'teacher no effort' at Highgarden), the classroom setting (e.g. 'immigrant pupils' at Riverlands) as well as elements that were relevant to my intervention (e.g. 'my presence', 'teacher training').

4.5.1.2 Generative mechanisms

The generative mechanisms in this study were pupils’ motivation and teachers’ experiences. This was based on the realist assumption that generative mechanisms are elements that we cannot directly observe such as beliefs, reasons and motives (Healy & Perry, 2000). However, these elements can be explored with other methods, such as interviews. The activation or deactivation of the generative mechanisms was examined in close connection to the context nodes. The focus was on whether and how the pupils’ motivation and teachers’ experiences were influenced by the different contextual conditions at the pre-intervention and intervention stages of the study. Because of the complexity of the term ‘motivation’, this node
consisted of the sub nodes that had been created based on the relevant literature (valence, goal salience, language anxiety, etc.) (e.g. Gardner & Tremblay, 1988). These were pupils' attitudes, beliefs, feelings and, influences, which were seen as explanations of the pupils' actions in class (based on Maxwell 2012).

The conditions in each classroom triggered and deactivated certain motivation elements. These elements were the pre-defined nodes on motivational theories (valence, goal salience, language anxiety, etc.) while separate nodes were created for dyslexic and non-dyslexic pupils in all three classrooms. However, due to the different contextual conditions in each classroom, differences between the generative mechanisms were also found. For example, the node on the generative mechanisms that arose only in the Winterfell classroom was 'group cohesion' in the area of dyslexic pupils' motivation (see Figure 20).

Teachers' experiences were also activated and deactivated under the contextual conditions present during the pre-intervention stage. These were seen as fundamental in the production of certain behaviours (outcomes). The teachers' experience referred to the teachers' thoughts, beliefs, views, commitment and attitudes. These were altered from the beginning of the study with the introduction of the dyslexia resources and, later, through the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices.

As expected, the teachers' experiences differed among the three cases due to contextual, personal and background differences. Although in the Highgarden classroom, the general node 'Minos-
teachers B’ attitudes was shown at the intervention stage, Myrtle’s (Riverlands classroom) and Penelope’s attitudes contained several sub-nodes, as I later decided that these would help me with my data analysis. Also, ‘parents A’ and ‘teacher low-self-efficacy A’ were shown for the Riverlands classroom and ‘teacher need for assistance’ for the Winterfell one. The node ‘teacher response to training’ was shown for both of these classrooms although, at Riverlands, this node included the description ‘positive’ based on the data.

Figure 21: Generative mechanisms at the intervention stage in the Winterfell classroom
4.5.1.3 Outcomes

In realism, the category 'outcomes' refers to the elements that result from the activation of generative mechanisms (Pawson & Tilley, 1998). As the generative mechanisms are elements that are not directly observable (e.g. people’s thoughts, feelings), the 'outcomes' that a realist researcher observes provide a 'window' on these generative mechanisms (Maxwell, 2012). An example of the outcomes that a realist researcher observes is the exploration of people's actions. In the present study, the teachers' actions and practices and pupils' performance and attitudes were placed under the 'outcomes' category. The data from the nodes on motivation and experiences were explored and seen as fundamental not only in the production of certain attitudes (e.g. 'attitudes in the learning situation A' node at Riverlands) but also in terms of performance outcomes. Because of the strong relationship between motivation and performance, the pupils' performance was explored as a result of the activation (or not) of specific motivation components. The pupils' performance was categorised in this way as it was based on the associations between motivational theories and realism (see also section 3.2.2). In Realism, the focus is on the exploration and function of mechanisms under certain conditions and on the production of certain outcomes (Pawson & Tilley, 1998). In the literature, motivation is regarded as a “central mental engine” (Dörnyei, 2001, p. 49), consisting of various elements, which are stimulated in order to achieve certain goals (Gardner, 1985). Therefore, the outcomes node was constituted by the nodes that were relevant to the pupils' performance, resulting from the activation (or not) of specific motivation components. Furthermore, the pupils' attitudes in class were also explored and some instances of
pupils' behaviour enlightened their motivation (learners' motivational behaviour). For example, if a learner kept doing a task, this was considered motivational behaviour and was cross-referenced with the motivation nodes.

Examples of nodes that appeared at this stage were the 'pupils-dpupil work together' and 'teacher-dpupil' nodes, which described the interactions of the dyslexic pupil with his classmates and the teacher respectively (in the Winterfell classroom).

Teachers' practices (e.g. the 'grammar node' at Riverlands) and behaviour in class were outcomes stemming from the activation (or not) of generative mechanisms that were relevant to their actions (e.g. 'teacher attitudes node' at Highgarden, 'Teacher differentiation for Ken' at Riverlands – see also Appendix 23).

The categorisation of all of the nodes was flexible, as some elements could be placed in more than one 'realism node' (context, generative mechanisms, outcomes). As seen in Figures 21 and 22, the nodes 'antecedent factors', 'causal attributions', and 'language learning contexts' are found in the context and the generative mechanism section. For example, the pupils' attribution of their low English level to the context (motivation node) also contained data relevant to the classroom context. For example, the sentence: “it is the teachers' fault...she never asks me to say anything” shows that the teacher was excluding some students from the activity (this was cross-referenced with other data as well). So, apart from the pupil attributing his low performance to the teacher ('causal attributions'), contextual characteristics were also traced. As a result, this node
was placed in the 'context' section too. What is more, the node 'teacher no effort' was placed in the 'context', 'generative mechanisms' and 'outcomes' section at this stage. This is because it indicated that the teachers' behaviour in class (outcome) was a contextual element (context) while also indicating the teacher's attitude towards his profession (generative mechanisms).

Figure 22: Outcomes at the intervention stage - example from the Highgarden classroom

The following figure (Figure 23) shows how the final nodes were organised according to the Realism paradigm in NVivo. The example is taken from Highgarden School.
The nodes were organised in a similar way at the intervention stage, while the new nodes that arose were added. The context changed during the second part of the study with the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices, which resulted in the activation of several different generative mechanisms, the introduction of new ones and the deactivation of others. These influences led to altered or new outcomes.
The contextual conditions changed due to the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices, which triggered, deactivated or changed the generative mechanisms, so certain nodes were deleted or altered (see Figure 24). However, some of the context nodes included a number of similar categories as before (e.g. 'my presence', 'the class'). For example, at Highgarden, the 'teacher no effort' and 'dyslexia-resources' nodes were not supported by data at the intervention stage and 'limited time the dyslexia-friendly practices were used' was a new node that arose in the Riverlands classroom. A common node that appeared for each school was 'researcher's DF practice' (see Figure 24: Association of Realism with my nodes (second part))
Figure 24) also named 'DF practice' in the Winterfell classroom, which included the dyslexia-friendly practices that the teacher was using in each class, mainly based on data from the classroom observations.

During the intervention part, the 'a priori' (Braun & Clarke, 2013) nodes on pupils' motivation were similar to those explored during the pre-intervention stage. Based on the data review I conducted in order to place the nodes in the Realism concepts, I kept merging, creating and deleting certain nodes at this stage too. For example, at Highgarden, the 'premature levels' ‘teacher-Albert’, ‘teacher-Ken’ and ‘teacher no effort’ nodes were merged with the 'teacher attitudes’ node. A new theme that arose as a result of the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices at Highgarden was 'attitudes to DP’s (dyslexic pupils’) inclusion', which described the non-dyslexic pupils' attitudes towards the inclusion of pupils' with dyslexia, while the motivational node 'instrumental orientation' for Albert and Ken (dyslexic pupils) and 'Albert’s seeking attention' were not retrieved from the data at this stage. The reasons for the lack of activation of these generative mechanisms are further explored in the findings section that follows. During the intervention stage in the Highgarden classroom, the 'changes noticed by pupils' node was added because of the themes that arose about the noticeable changes in the lesson - especially on the part of the pupils' views (data from the interviews and focus groups). A similar node was also traced in the Riverlands classroom for the pupils with dyslexia in describing the dyslexic pupils' views, thoughts, feelings and attitudes towards the dyslexia-friendly practices ('DP POSITIVE differences noticed B'). Other
examples of the new generative mechanisms that had not been activated during the pre-intervention stage were the 'pupils' attitudes towards dyslexic pupils' inclusion B' (the Highgarden classroom), the 'teacher got the assistance she needed B', and 'teacher-dyslexia awareness' (the Winterfell classroom).

The 'outcomes' nodes also shared similarities and differences with the intervention parts of the study. The difficulty that arose in the second stage was to decide whether the node relevant to the teacher's practices should be separated from the dyslexia-friendly practices the teacher was adopting. Although I could distinguish them by employing the two different nodes 'teacher's practices' and 'teacher-dyslexia-friendly practices' because there were instances where there was interplay between the two, I decide to keep them separate. For example, in the Highgarden classroom, the teacher employed a vocabulary exercise to show that he was still enhancing vocabulary skills though he had adapted it based on a similar dyslexia-friendly practice. In this case, the data (practices) would be placed in both nodes. The teacher's response to the dyslexia-friendly practices and the intervention was also explored during this stage (e.g. 'teacher's POSITIVE response to DF practices' in the Riverlands classroom, and 'teacher needs assistance ME B' in the Winterfell classroom).

Differences also emerged between the pupils' performance. For example, in the Highgarden classroom, the nodes on Ken's performance appeared although nothing emerged in the first part. On the other hand, in the Riverlands classroom, the node that had been created for the pupils' grades in the first part ('ND pupils' grades' -
'DPupils grades') was not employed in this stage because no assessments took place during the intervention stage.

At this point, it must be acknowledged that, in each case, the outcomes (e.g. behaviour) influenced the context and, in turn, the new generative mechanisms may have been triggered (or not). This is what the arrow in the outcomes area in Figures 23 and 24 demonstrates. However, an examination of these processes would have complicated my data analysis and lies beyond the scope of the present paper.

4.6 Findings: Highgarden classroom

At the pre-intervention stage of the study, I explored the classroom context and how the contextual characteristics influenced the pupils' motivation and teachers' experiences. The outcomes of these effects on the pupils' performance and teachers' practice and attitudes were also addressed. The exploration of the context also involved data beyond the classroom characteristics (e.g. the school context), as these had been recorded in my research diary.

The exploration of the classroom context is divided into two sections: the first refers to the non-dyslexic pupils while the second focuses on the dyslexic ones. This helped me to address my research questions, as the elements of motivation and performance I wanted to explore were divided into these two groups. All of the pupils in the Highgarden classroom were aged between ten and eleven years old.
4.6.1 The non-dyslexic pupils

Starting with the contextual conditions in the Highgarden classroom during the pre-intervention stage, my presence as an observer in the class affected both the pupils and the teacher during the first set of observations (‘my presence A’ node). The observer effects (Robson, 2002) was a recurrent theme in the data from my research diary and the observation notes.

Observation notes:
- “Some pupils keep looking at me.”

Research diary:
- “Sometimes, they (the teachers) see me watching a pupil and later they ask this pupil to do something.”

My presence during the observations activated Minos’ sense of responsibility to teach because he was intimidated by my presence. In the interviews and focus groups, the pupils noted that the teacher had changed after I started visiting the classroom while the teacher admitted that more teaching was taking place when I was there. In one of the first classroom observations, Minos started asking Albert (a dyslexic pupil) to participate in the exercises. This showed that my presence activated his responsibility to include the pupils with dyslexia in the lesson:

Research Diary:

- “I think he was behaving differently to Albert because I saw some pupils looking surprised.”

I understood that Minos’ behaviour was new in class because he later
looked at me, probably to see my reaction. Also, Albert and the other pupils looked at the teacher in some surprise.

For example, from a classroom observation at this stage (16/03/12):

- "Another pupil reads the words..."
- "Pupils (2) still ask when the break is."
- "Teacher asks dyslexic pupil to say the words."
- "Other pupils surprised."
- "(Dyslexic) pupil reads the words, Teacher helps him read them from the board."

Once the observer effects started to diminish, I noticed that Minos rarely paid attention to Albert. Data from the interviews with Minos confirmed that Albert was not usually included in the classroom exercises because he thought of Albert as a learner with low abilities; Minos also admitted that Albert would never participate in the classroom activities. The fact that no nodes relevant to Albert’s behaviour in class appeared at this stage confirmed this. Ken, the other pupil with dyslexia, was not included in the activities either as no data gave rise to a node related to his behaviour in class.

The review of the node ‘antecedent factors’ showed that the pupils had positive past experiences of learning English, as most of the expressions they used included positive connotations. In the following example taken from a focus group discussion, the pupils use positive expressions such as ‘everything is good’, ‘interesting things’, ‘nice’.

*R: Tell me for how many years you have been studying English? Are you happy with your experiences as a learner of English so far?
- Yes, miss everything is good...we learn many interesting things...
  we made a big poster in English last year and we sometimes try
to speak in English...

- The EFL lessons were nice all the previous years in the school

However, the pupils used negative language to describe their
classroom situation. Minos was indifferent; he provided the pupils
with limited or no explanations in class and was rarely giving them
homework. The data from the interviews and the focus groups
showed that the pupils viewed him as an unfair teacher who lacked a
sound knowledge of his subject. These negative views were
reinforced by the 'teacher no effort' node (merged with the 'teacher
attitudes' node).

For example, during an interview, on pupil described her EFL class as
follows:

R: - Are you enjoying your EFL classes this year? Do you find them
interesting/boring? Easy/difficult?

- I think Mr Minos is bored...he looks at his phone all the time...we
rarely do any exercises and we have to write new vocabulary all the
time.

Despite the fact that most of the non-dyslexic pupils were faced
with significant time pressures, they were more in favour of their
afternoon EFL classes than those in school. They claimed that this
was because the afternoon classes were more beneficial to them than
the EFL classes at school.

Another factor that was added to the context at the pre-
intervention stage was my attempt to introduce to Minos several documents on dyslexia. This might have influenced his views and attitudes towards the dyslexic learners. However, this remained unconfirmed because the data showed that he was resistant to studying them at this stage.

Most of the nodes on motivation that had been created for the non-dyslexic pupils showed that the pupils had good levels of motivation at this stage. The description of each node (e.g. good, higher, positive) was based on the data it contained. The nodes that had more positive than negative statements with regard to a specific motivational element (e.g. self-efficacy) were described using an adjective that reflected this (e.g. 'good' levels of motivation). The descriptions 'good, higher, positive' was based on the fact that the majority of the nodes on motivation were described using positive language. For instance, in the node 'antecedent factors positive experiences' the majority of the references in this node included language that was showing that the pupils had positive past experiences in EFL (e.g. 'last years were good', 'I enjoyed last year').

From another example in Highgarden classroom, data on the non-dyslexic pupils' 'self-efficacy' node showed that most of the pupils had high levels of self-efficacy. Also, the 'integrativeness' (pupils' integrative orientation) node showed that the pupils wanted to meet foreigners and learn about the English culture. This was a positive motivational component. For example, from a focus group:

R: - Would you be interested to meet people from these countries (where English is spoken)?
- Yes miss, I would really like to meet someone from America

- I would like to meet singers and footballers

- I sometimes speak to tourists - I think it’s funny!

I followed this process for all the nodes on motivation. The descriptions shown below were placed under each node to show whether the majority of the data found in this node was positive or negative. More specifically:

a) ‘MORE effort than do effort’ node: indicated that most of the pupils were making an effort to learn English

b) Language anxiety: this could not be described as positive, negative, good or bad, so no description was added

c) Negative attitudes towards the learning situation - TEACHER: most of the pupils showed positive attitudes towards the learning situation, especially towards the EFL teacher

d) High self-efficacy: the majority of the pupil’s comments showed that they had high self-efficacy

e) Integrativeness MEET FOREIGNERS: most of the pupil’s comments showed that they had a high integrative orientation

f) Antecedent factors POSITIVE EXPERIENCES: the majority of the pupils’ comments indicated that they had positive past experiences of learning English
g) **Valence slight higher than lower**: the majority of the pupils' comments showed that they had high valence.

h) **Causal attributions TEACHER'S FAULT**: most of the pupils attributed their failures or low English levels to outside factors and more specifically to the teacher.

i) **Goal salience CERT - JOB**: most of the pupils study English to obtain an official certification and access employment opportunities in the future.

j) **Language learning contexts LG SCHOOL**: most of the pupils attend an English language institute.

The above list includes negative nodes (e.g. negative attitudes towards the learning situation) and nodes that could not be clearly described (e.g. language anxiety). However, most of the other nodes contained positive motivational data. The pupils were putting effort into learning English, had high self-efficacy levels and were motivated to meet native speakers. They assigned a high value to learning English and their goal was to obtain official English language certificates that would increase their future employment opportunities. All of these positive elements superseded the negative motivation components (e.g. negative attitudes towards the learning situation). Therefore, their motivation was described as 'good' at this stage.

Although the non-dyslexic pupils were motivated, their negative views of the learning situation, and especially the teacher, were activated (e.g. node 'Causal attributions TEACHER'S FAULT'). These generative...
mechanisms were in turn linked to the pupils’ performance (see second research question) and resulted in certain attitudes in class.

Although the non-dyslexic pupils were motivated to learn, the learning situation was constraining this process, which may explain why they displayed both negative and positive attitudes in the classroom. Examples of negative attitudes shown were the pupils not paying attention to the teacher, moving around, and not doing the exercises. The positive attitudes that I observed were pupils paying attention to what the teacher was saying, following his instructions, etc. In the Highgarden classroom, the non-dyslexic pupils’ negative attitudes were associated with the teacher’s indifference while their positive attitudes resulted from their strong motivation.

For example, the teacher's indifference led to the pupils' indifference:

From a classroom observation (19/03/12):

- “Teacher sits on his desk all the time.”
- “He asks: how much longer until the break?”
- “Mumbling in the classroom”
- “No one looks on the board”
- “Naughty pupil (Ken?) teases dyslexic pupil”
- “Pupils talk to each other (most of them)”

However, there were instances where the non-dyslexic pupils showed good levels of participation in class, as in the example below:

From a classroom observation (20/03/12):
- "1-2 pupils usually participate in tasks and answer questions."
- "2 more girls stand to participate."
- "Only 4 girls in sum raise their hands."
- "4 girls raise hand to ask words."
- "Other pupils (3) raise their hands and want to read the words."

The non-dyslexic pupils' performance could not be clearly described as 'excellent', 'very good', etc., because of the many different levels that were found in the classroom. This was due to some pupils' attendance at evening language schools. Based on Minos' descriptions, the pupils' performance and classroom levels were described as satisfactory to low for the A2 level they were at. What is more, Minos' indifference resulted in the limited practice of language skills and therefore the opportunities I had to explore their performance were limited. This was the reason why the pupils had satisfactory to low levels of every skill apart from grammar. Grammar was the skill that Minos practised most. However, their very good grammar levels were only based on the teacher's views.

For example, from a teacher interview:

*R*: "You told me before that you were tracing a grammatical phenomenon and you were analysing it later"
*M*: "Yes, but not to a good extent"

4.6.2 The dyslexic pupils

During the interviews, Albert and Ken offered their own views about
the EFL context. For both of them, the classroom was described as noisy and everything that was happening was confusing. Neither of them attended an English language institute like the non-dyslexic pupils as the 'language learning context' node that referred to the broader EFL context did not appear at this stage.

Both Albert and Ken selected negative (see an example in Figure 25) rather than positive (Figure 26) emoticons when asked about how they felt in their English language classes.

![Emoticons showing negative feelings](image1)

'I feel confused'  'I feel angry'

Figure 25: Images and emoticons showing negative feelings with the oral explanations given to the pupils.

The positive emoticons showed smiling, confident cartoons/emoticons, as in the one below:

![Emoticons showing positive feelings](image2)

'I feel nice when I go to my English class'

Figure 26: Image showing positive feelings in the EFL class with the oral explanations given to the pupils.
The contextual conditions resulted in Albert having low motivation. This inference was based on a review of the nodes on his motivational components as most of these were described as negative rather than positive (see Figure 27).

More specifically, although Albert had high valence and was showing an interest in learning English for professional purposes (node ‘instrumental orientation – JOB’), he held negative attitudes towards the learning situation, displayed limited effort and had high levels of anxiety. For example, in one of the interviews with Albert:

R: How do you feel when the teacher asks you to give your answer in an exercise in class?

- No..I sometimes don’t understand what he wants, he is not explaining...then my face is red... I am confused...I don’t like this

The above extract shows that Albert felt confused (‘I don’t understand’, ‘I am confused’), anxiety or anger (‘my face is red’) and was negative towards the learning situation (‘I don’t like this’).

Also, Albert showed no signs of integrative motives and was in need of the teacher’s and his classmates’ attention.

From a teacher interview:

M: “He tries to get my attention in different ways. For example, he likes it when I tell him that he looks like Harry Potter.”

Albert’s self-efficacy was unclear at this point, although he attributed his confusion to his family (node ‘causal attributions
Albert's attitudes in class were much more negative than positive and this was caused by his low motivation and exclusion. Albert did not bring any books with him, rarely listened to the teacher's instructions and displayed inappropriate behaviour (e.g. hiding under his desk during the lesson). He sat on his own at the back of the classroom and sought the teacher and his classmates' attention. For example, from a classroom observation (28/03/12):

- "Dyslexic pupil tries to talk to the other one in front of him but no... the other one (pupil) keeps refusing."

Data also showed that Albert felt bored quite often.
From a classroom observation (26/03/12):

- “Dyslexic pupil is not participating in any different exercises.”
- “Dyslexic pupil is yawning.”
- “Dyslexic pupil sits next to me seems to be writing something.”
- “Dyslexic pupil keeps writing something...he is not writing he is drawing something.”

Ken’s motivation was also low, as the majority of the motivation elements explored were described as negative. He had limited EFL past experience, while his experience of the EFL class that year were negative. As he commented, the noise in the classroom was “really annoying” (interview data). His first language was Bulgarian, Greek was his second language and English his third. This, in combination with his learning difficulties, led to his confusion and low self-related beliefs. The data from the interviews showed that Ken believed that he was not a very able pupil. In contrast to Albert, he was not feeling stressed in the English class probably because he did not assigning them a high value. His low valence contradicted with the fact that both his instrumental and integrative orientation was developed. He said that he wanted to learn the language because this would help him to find a job and he was interested in meeting native speakers of English.

Ken also displayed negative attitudes in class. His low motivation had a completely different outcome to Albert’s. Ken was one of the naughty pupils in class. He sat in the front desk and the rest of the pupils were intimidated by his presence. He often ignored the teacher and did not pay attention to the lesson. Interestingly, in the first observations, when I was unfamiliar with the pupils’ names, I...
described Ken as ‘the naughty pupil’.

For example, from a classroom observation (26/03/12):

- "Ken still has the dart (although the teacher told him to put it away many times)."

Albert’s performance could be described as low mainly based on the teacher’s comments. For example, from a teacher interview:

R: “What about Albert’s response to the writing exercise?”

M: “Nothing…he only gave me a blank piece of paper”

Data relevant to Albert’s performance were not traced, apart from Minos’ comments, as he was not practicing many skills, had no participation in the classroom exercises and had not produced any written tests or dictation. For example, there were no references to Albert’s spelling, grammar or writing skills.

Similarly to Albert, few references were traced on Ken’s performance in this part. Their absence was probably an outcome of his low motivation, exclusion, and confusion.

4.6.3 The EFL teacher (Minos)

The context activated Minos’ negative attitudes towards his practice. Minos appeared indifferent and this was not only based on my observations or the pupils’ views but on the interviews as well.

From a teacher interview:

M: "I am more pleased with their Grammar. They have done most of the things already. Therefore, I do not have to work very much on
Minos also suggested that the pupils are at a relatively ‘premature’ level, and mentioned this quite often. He used this description either because he did not know his learners very well, had limited teaching experience, or perhaps both. However, his limited teaching experience might also have resulted in him having low confidence. However, a node on teacher’s confidence was not traced in the data.

Apart from being indifferent towards teaching, Minos also showed limited interest in my study during the pre-intervention stage:

From my research diary:

“I think that Minos from Highgarden (EFL teacher) is less willing. We spoke today and I think he wanted to hang up as soon as possible (I called him in the school). He wanted to show me that he understood what he should do.”

“We spoke 2-3 times very shortly (he might be avoiding me).”

Both of the above issues contradict the fact that Minos agreed to take part in my research. However, he might have complied possibly because the head teacher asked him to do so:

From my research diary:

“...maybe he was a bit stressed because the head teacher was standing next to him (I guess)”
Further, Minos was negative towards studying the resources on dyslexia:

"Minos didn’t have a look (at the documents) because he didn’t have time and he prefers to read them while he is doing the practices."

From my Research Diary:

"I gave them (the materials) in print so we can have a look together. Maybe he will start (reading them) this way."

The lack of previous training on dyslexia (because of contextual factors) had not triggered his knowledge of dyslexia. This was obvious from some of his references to Albert:

M: "For example there are some learners like Albert... he cannot read... there is a problem there..."

He also sounded unsure about how to behave towards Albert. This explains why Minos seemed indifferent towards Albert’s behaviour at this stage:

From the classroom observation notes (21/03/12):

- “Dyslexic pupil sits on the floor and hides
- Teacher doesn’t pay attention.”
- “Dyslexic pupil doesn’t look in the book, looks around.”
- “Teacher sees him (DP) doesn’t do anything.”
- “A pupil says that Albert should be also punished and write something”
- “Teacher says next time.”
4.6.4 The intervention stage: non-dyslexic pupils

The intervention stage (Part B) that follows describes the processes of change that occurred mainly due to the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices.

There were far fewer references to my influence in class ('my presence' node) at this point compared with the first part of the study. This suggests that the observer effects had been reduced in the second part.

From a focus group:

P1: "...When you came the teacher changed to...”
R: "You mean he changed because I came?“
P2: "Yes”
P1: "To give you a good impression”
P2: "We were doing more things in the lesson”. 

From an interview with a pupil:

P1: "When you came here, he did some things that were new, different.”

However, the 'my presence' node was retained because, at this stage, the pupils believed that I had informed the teacher of their negative views of the lesson as these had been mentioned in the interviews and focus groups.

From my research diary:

"When I was leaving school, some girls from the classroom asked me if I had told Minos anything we had discussed because they realised..."
the changes he made today. I told them of course not...”

Another issue that arose and was relevant to the context was the limited time available for the employment of the practices. This was stressed by the teacher several times:

From the teacher interviews:

*M: “There have been some positive changes but one cannot expect miracles in only two months' time.”
*M: “The practices are useful but you need more time for them to see them working”.

The influence of the afternoon language schools and non-dyslexic pupils' strong instrumental orientation also appeared in this part of the study.

From a pupil interview:

*R: “...when do you think you will have finished learning English?”
*P: “when I get my (English Language) certificate.”

A positive difference that was noticed in the context in this part was that the non-dyslexic pupils described the classroom situation far less negatively than in the first part (less causal attributions towards the teacher). They also suggested that positive changes had occurred within the teacher's attitudes in class.

For example, from a focus group:

*R: - Is there something different in your English classes lately? Something that the teacher hasn't done before? If so, do you want
to discuss your thoughts and feelings about this?

- The lesson is better now Miss... Mr Minos is not so bored
- I think it's because you came
- Yes... we did that lesson with the flags... it (the lesson) is nicer now

The non-dyslexic pupils’ motivation was described using the same motivational elements as employed in the first part. Based on a review on the nodes on motivation, the data at this stage showed that non-dyslexic pupils’ motivation had increased compared to the first part.

More specifically, the pupils demonstrated more effort (‘MORE effort node’), higher self-efficacy, improved attitudes (‘slightly more positive attitudes towards the learning situation’), and higher valence (MORE valence NOW). Also, the motivational components that had been described previously as positive (e.g. integrative orientation, goal salience) remained the same. The only exception was pupils’ anxiety, which, similarly to the pre-intervention stage, could not be described as either positive or negative. This increase in the positive nodes (e.g. higher valence, higher effort, more positive attitudes) showed that the pupils’ motivation had improved (with descriptions such as ‘higher’, ‘more’), based on the language that the teachers and I were using in the data as we compared the pupils’ motivation between the pre-intervention and intervention stages.

Also, at this stage, the non-dyslexic pupils’ positive motivation elements were not constrained by the context, as had occurred in the intervention stage. On the contrary, the pupils appeared to be positive about the changes in the lesson and exercises (node: ‘changes
noticed by pupils POSITIVE').

From a pupil interview:

R: “You mean that he (teacher) has changed lately?”
P: “Yes.”
R: “What do you mean?”
P: “The exercises are different. When he (teacher) asks us to do something, I can sit with the others and write.”
R: “Do you mean that the exercises are different?”
P: “We didn’t use to write; we would only read the text and write the words. Now we do other exercises too.”
R: “Do you like this?”
P: “We now do... yes, we can all get together and do the exercise now.”

At this stage, the pupils stop assigning the limited development of some of their skills to the teacher (the 'contextual causal attributions' node). However, they questioned Minos' motives for the changes in the lesson and his attitudes, as they thought that I was the reason behind these changes. At this stage, the pupils' weakness in some areas of English was attributed to the language school or to more general factors (e.g. the overall Greek EFL context). In addition, if we compare the emoticons that the pupils chose during the interviews and focus groups, we can see that their negative attitudes had slightly reduced (Table 14). There was also an increase in the choice of positive faces (Table 15).
As a result of the changed context, a generative mechanism that was activated at the pre-intervention stage was the non-dyslexic pupils’ attitudes towards dyslexic pupils’ inclusion in the classroom activities. These were both positive and negative. For example, in the extract below, the non-dyslexic pupil has mixed feelings about working with Albert. He notes that he did not get much help from Albert (negative connotation) although they ‘worked well’ (positive connotation) in one exercise:

- From a pupil interview:

R: *Have you noticed any changes in the lesson lately?*

- *Yes, the exercises are nicer, the teacher is not shouting, we all participate. We work together...although I sat with Albert once and I did not get much help but...we worked well*

The example above shows that, although there were instances where Albert and Ken were cooperating well with the non-dyslexic pupils,
there were cases where the non-dyslexic pupils were unwilling to work with the dyslexic pupils, especially on pair or group exercises. The data also showed that the non-dyslexic pupils noted that the pupils with dyslexia were 'slowing them down' (negative statement). This was influenced by the fact that the teacher was trying to include the dyslexic pupils in a way that was triggering negative reactions from the non-dyslexic pupils, possibly due to the teacher's limited knowledge of dyslexia.

For example, from my research diary:

“In the classroom, he (Minos) made the terrible mistake of asking Albert to get up and write on the board some vocabulary. The pupils started yelling at Albert…”

However, the appearance of this node (pupils' response to DP's inclusion) shows the enhanced inclusion of pupils with dyslexia at this stage. This, combined with the increased motivation for dyslexic pupils (see the following section) and participation in some tasks (e.g. Ken), is the first indication that the dyslexia-friendly practices increased the dyslexic pupils' participation in the classroom activities.

The outcomes that resulted from the activation of the above mechanisms vary. The data suggest that the non-dyslexic pupils' performance improved in certain areas (skills). The majority of the data showed that the pupils had low reading levels in the first part; that is, they only responded to the basic demands for these skills for the A2 level they were at (description “Satisfactory” or ‘low’ – Table 1). However, in the second part, their reading levels were described as ‘good’, meaning that they responded sufficiently to the demands of
the lesson in terms of the reading tasks (see also Table 1 and Appendix 10). For example, most of the reading exercises entailed asking the pupils to read a very short, simple text (see also reading skill- Appendix 10). The description ‘good’ at the second stage was based on data that showed that the pupils responded well (Table 1) to this task, demonstrating that their reading skill had improved. Similar findings emerged for their speaking skills. Also, although their vocabulary levels were previously described as ‘low’, in the second part, the data did not indicate this, although nor was any increase in this skill indicated.

The above results show that, although the changes in performance could not be described as significant, certain positive elements began to appear. Apart from the limited time for which these practices were used, this result might also be due to different performance levels among the pupils, which was possibly due to the language school influences or other unknown factors.

Apart from the pupils’ performance at this stage, their attitudes in class confirmed the assumption that they had mixed feelings about dyslexic pupils’ inclusion in the exercises.

An example of a negative attitude is taken from a classroom observation:

11/05/12

- **Albert sits with Andrew, they have to work together on the exercise**
Andrew says, that’s great I have to sit with you...perfect thank you Mr. (Minos)!

Teacher doesn’t say anything

4.6.5 The intervention stage: dyslexic pupils

In contrast to the non-dyslexic pupils, whose references to their past experiences were described as positive at the intervention stage, Albert still suggested negative past experiences related to learning English. Also, although Albert attributed his confusion to his family in the first part, he now directed his confusion towards the teacher:

From an interview with Albert:

R: “How do you think you are doing in English Albert?”
A: “Quite well”
R: “Why ‘quite’?”
A: “Because Mr Minos explains the word only once and not, for example, three”.

This influence was the result of Albert being asked to participate more in the exercises, a change that caused him anxiety and stress, especially in class.

From an interview with Albert:

A: “I don’t understand why he asked me to write on the board...how should I know?”

However, the context for Ken at this stage had improved since the
'causal attributions NOISY CLASS' node, which showed that Ken was finding the EFL class noisy and confusing, did not appear. Moreover, although Ken had previously mentioned that his background has caused him confusion, he seemed more positive towards the EFL class than before. For instance, in one of the interviews, he asserted that the previous years have been as good as this one:

*R: "How were the previous (EFL) teachers here?"
*K: "They were good, like Mr Minos"

From the above, we can infer that, after the introduction of the practices, although some aspects of the context remained the same, the changes that occurred for the pupils with dyslexia were mainly positive. These positive changes were mainly associated with the teacher, who appeared less indifferent at the intervention stage.

In the second part of the study, Albert showed signs of increased motivation based on a review of the motivation nodes. Although Albert’s integrative orientation had been developed at this stage, it contradicted the fact that he had lower valence than before. Albert was interested in learning English in order to be able to speak with foreigners; however, studying English was a stressful process for him. Moreover, no references relevant to his instrumental orientation appeared at this stage.

Despite Albert’s language anxiety, the data suggested that he was making more effort than before. Further, although he displayed negative attitudes towards the teacher, his feelings towards the learning situation were mainly positive. Other positive issues that were shown at this stage were Albert’s good self-related beliefs and
the absence of the 'seeking attention' node. Therefore, although the teacher’s attention caused anxiety to Albert, it satisfied his need for attention. The pictures that Albert chose in the second part of the study showed reduced negative attitudes towards the learning situation (see Table 16):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A PART</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive: 2</td>
<td>Negative: 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B PART</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive: 2</td>
<td>Negative: 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Choice of images from the interviews with Albert

Also, Albert was still experiencing negative feelings about learning English, as he continued to feel stressed. Data also showed that his past experiences in the EFL classes were negative. Despite the fact that, in the first part, he attributed his limited knowledge of English to his family, he now claimed that it was the teacher’s fault. This negative attitude towards the teacher could have been caused from the fact that Minos started approaching Albert more than before. This might have resulted in high levels of anxiety for Albert, as the teacher sometimes approached him in a way that was not inclusive. This will be later highlighted in the discussion of the teacher’s attitudes in class.

Ken’s motivation could not be described as positive or negative, improved or reduced, as his feelings were mixed. Ken’s self-related beliefs had remained low while he was feeling more stressed than before.

From a classroom observation (11/05/12):
In addition, the 'instrumental orientation' and 'causal attributions' nodes did not appear for Ken at this stage. His integrative orientation remained at the same level, as he asserted that he would be interested in meeting native speakers of English.

In contrast to the first part, Ken's attitudes towards the teacher and EFL class had improved (e.g. the absence of the noisy class node). However, the majority of his statements still showed that he held negative attitudes towards the learning situation. The data also showed that his previous experiences of EFL were positive. This could be inferred as a negative element: he was viewing the present situation as 'de-motivating' (Dörnyei 2001a) compared to his past experiences in EFL classrooms. The 'negative attitudes towards the learning situation' node was also supported by the fact that Ken chose more negative than positive emoticons in this part (Table 17).

From a teacher interview, that shows positive changes in Ken's case:

M: "Before, he was indifferent but now he showed much more interest at some point."
R: "So you mean there has been some improvement?"
M: "Yes, a slight improvement."
R: "So he started to..."
M: "He hasn't got a great potential but, based on his abilities, he has improved."

From an interview with Ken:
K: “Sometimes it (the lesson) is not easy... I don’t understand...”
M: “Would you like someone to make it easier to understand?”
K: “Yes.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A PART</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive: 3</td>
<td>Negative: 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B PART</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive: 4</td>
<td>Negative: 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: Ken’s choices of emoticons

Albert still demonstrated a lot of negative attitudes in class. Although his performance in some skills improved, he still showed no sign of using grammar. However, the claim that he showed improved performance can be questioned because it might have been the result of the increased opportunities Albert received to participate in the classroom activities. For example, Minos said that his writing skills had improved but this may have been due to the fact that the teacher saw evidence of his writing skill for the first time (see Table 18 below). Furthermore, no assessment tools were available for Albert from the first part of the study so comparisons could not be made with his performance during the pre-intervention stage. In any case, this finding (Albert’s improved performance) strengthens the claim that Albert’s inclusion increased and that some positive changes in his performance were noticed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Albert’s performance A</th>
<th>Albert’s performance B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low reading levels A</td>
<td>improvement reading more participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaking levels A (limited)</td>
<td>speaking improvement B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ken’s performance remained low because, among other factors, negative elements in his motivation were shown. However, Ken showed a positive response to the use of the dyslexia-friendly practices and he started to participate more in the lessons. This is perhaps the reason why some performance nodes started to appear.

For example, from a teacher interview:

*R:* “Do you think there was an improvement in Ken’s performance?”
*M:* “There was a positive response, he started participating more.”

### 4.6.6 The EFL teacher (Minos)

Various generative mechanisms relevant to the teacher’s attitudes were activated in the changed context in the second part. The data showed that Minos was still indifferent, though to a lesser extent. He also suggested that, although he found the dyslexia-friendly practices interesting, he would not use them in the future because they require a lot of effort, unless a pupil with dyslexia was found in class.

The data also showed that Minos had a better attitude towards my study. Although Minos was not receptive to the dyslexia training, he became more positive towards the use of the dyslexia-friendly practices. At the intervention stage, he took the initiative and voluntarily offered me his own reflections about the project. The

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>knowledge)</th>
<th>no use of GRAMMAR A</th>
<th>no use of Grammar B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no writing A</td>
<td>writing improvement B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Nodes on Albert’s performance
fact that I was providing him with some guidance about what to do in the classroom, not only for the pupils with dyslexia but also for their non-dyslexic peers, slightly changed his negative feelings towards teaching.

From a teacher interview:

R: "Ok let’s talk again about their (pupils’) reading skills. I noticed you were using some of the practices. For example, the one where you were reading first and then the pupils had to repeat and…”
M: “Yes this helped me a lot. They had to read after me. The slower it was, the better the response. Also, while I was reading, I was not in a fixed place in the class…”
R: “Yeah…”
M: “…but I was very close to them…”
R: “…yeah…”
M: “…and this helped them a lot…”

Minos showed positive attitudes towards the dyslexia-friendly practices and employed them in his lessons. This finding was also traced in the interview data (e.g. ‘this helped me a lot’- example above). However, he was in need of some guidance due to his limited teaching experience and lack of school support. He also suggested that the dyslexia-friendly practices should have been employed for more than seven weeks.

During the intervention stage, Minos started paying more attention to Albert and Ken than was the case previously. Although Minos still believed that both of these pupils had low ability, he suggested that there has been a massive increase in their participation in class.
However, the way the pupils with dyslexia were included in the classroom activities was not always inclusive:

From my research diary:

“In the classroom, he made the mistake to say to Albert to get up and write on the board some vocabulary. The pupils started shouting at Albert and I couldn’t help but tell him (through signals) to ask Albert to sit down...”

The above behaviour was the result of the limited knowledge the teacher has gained of dyslexia because he remained resistant to the dyslexia training throughout the study. In the interviews, he suggested that he felt confused when he attempted to read the documents for his training and this discouraged him from reading them. However, he did not ask for support at that stage.

4.6.7 Summary of the findings for the Highgarden classroom

From the above, we can infer that the dyslexia-friendly practices had positive effects on most of the pupils’ performance and motivation. The review of the motivation and performance nodes showed that there was an increase in all pupils’ motivation as well as positive changes in the non-dyslexic pupils’ performance. However, the changes in the dyslexic pupils’ performance were found to be less positive.

In the first part (pre-intervention), the context was shown to constrain all pupils’ motivation, as more negative than positive attitudes were being triggered. These negative attitudes were mainly relevant to the learning situation and especially the teacher. The
classroom context changed during the intervention context as the dyslexia-friendly practices were introduced. The dyslexia-friendly practices became part of the context and were adapted by Minos according to his own practice. Positive changes in the non-dyslexic pupils were noticed as more positive motivational elements were triggered. The non-dyslexic pupils enjoyed the lesson more than before. However, the pupils' negative attitudes towards the teacher were still being activated and they were questioning the teacher's motives for this change. Since motivation significantly influences performance, the data confirmed that the performance of the non-dyslexic learners had also improved.

The change in the context in the second stage also showed that Albert and Ken's positive motivation elements had been triggered. However, some negative issues arose. For instance, they both showed greater feelings of anxiety. This can be explained from the teacher's limited reading of the dyslexia resources, which resulted in him failing to use the dyslexia-friendly practices inclusively in some instances. It was difficult to evaluate whether the dyslexic pupils' performance had improved, as it was only in the second part of the study that they participated in the lesson and classroom exercises. However, the latter indicates that their inclusion had increased.

These positive changes did not significantly affect the performance and motivation elements. What was significant, though, was the fact that positive influences started to appear even though the dyslexia-friendly practices were used for nearly two months and with limited teacher training.
Apart from the pupils, the data from my research diary and the teacher interviews showed that the teacher experienced the dyslexia-friendly practices positively. Some of the data from the pupil interviews also supported this finding, especially those referring to the teacher's actions (e.g. “Mr Minos is giving us more exercises now”). Minos responded well to using the practices but less well when asked to read the dyslexia resources at the beginning of the study. Although he was provided with resources and support, he remained resistant to reading these resources until the end of the project. This might have occurred because, although at the start he participated in the project because he had been advised to do so by his head teacher, his interest in my study gradually increased. Although Minos noted that he had positive experiences from the study, his indifference remained as he admitted that he would not use the dyslexia-friendly practices in the future because of the additional work these would require. Minos noted that he would only use the dyslexia-friendly practices again if dyslexic pupils were found in class, suggesting that these would be a useful tool for him in that case.

From a teacher interview:

*R: and the dyslexia-friendly practices? What do you think? Would you use them again in the future?*

*T: No, I wouldn’t...unless I had someone with dyslexia in class...that’s what they helped me with, deal with this...*

It may be assumed that the positive effects on all pupils' motivation and on non-dyslexic pupils' performance might not have been the
result of the dyslexia-friendly practices but because more teaching took place during the intervention stage. Similarly, the teacher might have been experiencing positively the dyslexia-friendly practices because I was providing support and encouragement for his teaching. The data analysis sections on the Riverlands and Winterfell classrooms that follow will help us to assess this assumption; if the results from the other two classrooms are similar to those for the Highgarden classroom, then it can be inferred that the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices was the main reason for these positive results.

4.7 Findings: Riverlands and Winterfell classrooms

The data analysis process that was followed for the Riverlands and Winterfell classrooms was similar to that applied to the Highgarden classroom. The analysis of the Highgarden classroom provided me with insights and experience of coding, using NVivo and analysing my data based on the Realism paradigm. The nodes that arose from the top-down and 'bottom-up' processes were later placed in the 'Realism' nodes for the analysis. However, the different contextual conditions and different participants gave rise to several new nodes that revealed new areas of interest relevant to my research questions.

4.7.1 Findings: Riverlands classroom

Similar to the Highgarden classroom, large amounts of data were obtained from the classroom observations, the pupil and teacher
interviews, my research diary and the review of the pupils’ assessment tools. The ‘immersion’ process (Braun & Clarke 2013, p. 204) helped me to revise and conceptualise the content of my dataset. Having gained adequate knowledge and confidence with regard to using NVivo because of the previous analysis (Highgarden classroom), I started importing my data sources into NVivo instantly. However, because of the pupil variability in the Riverlands classroom (immigrant pupils, dyslexic, non-dyslexic, etc.), different colours were used to highlight the data in the datasets after I imported them into NVivo. Therefore, every time I came across specific colours in the data set, I would know immediately whether it referred to a pupil with dyslexia, the pupil with ADHD or one of the immigrant pupils. The pupils in the Riverlands classroom (dyslexic and non-dyslexic) were aged from ten to eleven years old.

The memo (Braun & Clarke, 2013) I used for Highgarden School guided me in following similar steps in the Riverlands classroom during my analysis. Slightly more data were obtained from this school than from Highgarden School, because there were more pupils and the lessons lasted four (rather than three) hours per week. Furthermore, I conducted more interviews and focus groups with the pupils than was the case at Highgarden School. Despite the time pressure and high number of pupils, I managed to complete all of my planned interviews, focus groups and observations, with the help of the school’s staff.

To summarise the findings on motivation, performance and the teacher’s experiences in the Riverlands classroom, I initially created some tables (Tables 19 - 24). These tables helped me refer to my
data during the analysis and trace whether and what kind of changes occurred at the intervention stage.

4.7.2 The non-dyslexic pupils

From the first day, I started making classroom observations in the Riverlands classroom, I noticed that there was a lot of noise prevailing in the class during the lesson.

From my research diary:

“.... the teacher is doing various activities, she is not doing dictation and seems motivated to do a nice lesson but this is hardly ever accomplished due to the 'messiness' that prevails in the classroom.”

There was a division between the boys and girls in the Riverlands classroom and this was also confirmed from the pupil interviews and focus groups. The pupils noted that there was a lack of group cohesion among them. The immigrant pupils usually sat close to each other in class while Mark, the pupil with ADHD, sat alone at the back of the classroom. Furthermore, the pupils' levels of English differed and this was another reason for the disorderliness that prevailed during the lessons. As a result, the groups that comprised the class were rather heterogeneous. What is more, the problematic materials that the teacher had been given by the Ministry were creating confusion for the teacher and the pupils.

Example from an interview with Myrtle:

M: “We cannot practice the listening skill based on the books we have because it's not working.”
M: “People who design the resources don’t emphasise many important things...”

Moreover, the parents would sometimes intervene and complain to the teacher about the grades she was giving their children:

From a teacher interview:

M: “...and then the parents come and ask me why I gave him this grade, his grades are excellent in the language school...that’s a typical line...”

Some pupils, including Carol (a dyslexic pupil), were under pressure to attend evening language schools, as this was mentioned several times by the pupils and the teacher. Carol also attended an evening language school.

For some non-dyslexic pupils, learning English was seen as a very difficult process. Although their previous EFL experiences were positive, most of the pupils suggested that Myrtle’s practices were ‘confusing’ and that they were finding their present EFL classes difficult to follow.

My presence also influenced the classroom context in the pre-intervention stage, as the pupils often looked at in class and would ask me questions.

From my research diary:

"Myrtle is stressed...at some point she said that there is also ‘someone’ in here and this is embarrassing (the noise)."
The teacher was employing innovative teaching approaches (e.g. interactive materials, flash cards) and up-to-date teaching methods (e.g. communication activities). The resources on dyslexia were also introduced at this point as part of the study.

The above contextual factors that were relevant to my presence, the pupils, the teacher or other outside influences generated several generative mechanisms. As shown in Part A Table 19, the classroom context was triggering the non-dyslexic pupils' positive (e.g. positive attitudes towards the learning situation) and negative motivation elements (e.g. low self-efficacy).

![Table 19: Non Dyslexic pupils' motivation elements: the green boxes indicate positive changes, the orange boxes indicate unclear changes](image)
The following extract is an example of data that shows that pupils’ high levels of effort (‘they try hard in class’).

For example, from a teacher interview:

R: What about the tasks you assign them to do? Do they do it?

T: Yes, they try hard in class, they follow my instructions and they want to get things right

Despite the pupils’ efforts and positive attitudes towards the learning situation, they found the exercises rather difficult (negative motivation element-negative attitudes towards the language learning context). The pupils also noted that the difficult tasks that Myrtle was asking them to do were the reasons they had low English levels (‘causal attributions’ node). Most of the non-dyslexic pupils’ self-related beliefs were low. The latter, in combination with the divisions that prevailed in the class, were raising their language anxiety. For example:

R: how do you feel when the teacher asks you to state the answer to an exercise?

P: I don’t know...I sometimes don’t know the answer and feel slightly anxious...I don’t know if what I say will be correct or not”

Non-dyslexic pupils’ past experiences in the EFL classroom were positive, as they noted that they had enjoyed their EFL classes in previous years. Their instrumental orientation had also been developed (positive motivation elements), and the majority of the pupils mentioned that their main goal was to acquire English language
certificates. However, from the pupils' comments, more data were found related to their integrative rather than their instrumental orientation, as most of them wanted to meet foreigners and travel to countries where they could meet native speakers of English.

From a pupil interview:

R: "Why do you think they tell you that you have to learn how to speak English?"

P: "Because if someone asks us for directions, we cannot take out a dictionary to help him...we need to communicate..."

From another pupil interview:

P: "My godmother is in America so, when she rings, I speak to her in English"

Despite the above elements, that showed that the context was motivating the non-dyslexic pupils, most of the pupils assigned a low value to learning English (valence node); they suggested that learning English was less important than their parents and teachers were suggesting and could not understand why it was considered so important in the Greek EFL context.

As shown by the above, the motivation nodes were mixed (positive and negative). However, most of the non-dyslexic pupils chose negative emoticons and cartoons when asked what represented them as language learners. This reinforced the conclusion that the pupils' motivation was mainly negative at this stage. Apart from three pupils, more negative emoticon pictures were chosen than positive ones (see table 20).
Some of the non-dyslexic pupils' negative motivation elements resulted in low performance levels in some skills (speaking, writing, spelling and vocabulary). However, the non-dyslexic pupils showed satisfactory progress in their reading and listening skills (Table 21). Similar to the Highgarden classroom, their performance was mixed, possibly because of their background and the language schools that some of them attended. The immigrant pupils also contributed to the variability in the non-dyslexic pupils' performance. Their grades from the tests varied and grammar was the only skill in which their level could be inferred to be good (Table 1) for the A2 level at which they were. For example, the pupils responded well enough to using simple structures in the exercises on superlatives (Appendix 10b). In Table 21 below, the majority of the pupils' skills were at low/satisfactory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Positive A</th>
<th>Negative A</th>
<th>Positive B</th>
<th>Negative B</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caitlwyn</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arya</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Slightly more positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Slightly more negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Slightly negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varys</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Slightly positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Much more positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Much more positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>More negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: Non-dyslexic pupils' emoticon/picture choices
levels, meaning that the pupils were responding to the basic demands for the A2 level at which they were.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A part</th>
<th>B part</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• mixed grades</td>
<td>• (no node)</td>
<td>• no clear change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• speaking LOW</td>
<td>• slightly improved</td>
<td>• no clear change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• grammar GOOD</td>
<td>• improved</td>
<td>• positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• lowish vocab</td>
<td>• good</td>
<td>• positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• lowish spelling</td>
<td>• (no node)</td>
<td>• positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• low writing</td>
<td>• same</td>
<td>• no clear change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• satisfactory listening</td>
<td>• some improvement</td>
<td>• same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• satisfactory reading</td>
<td>• same</td>
<td>• slightly positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: Non Dyslexic pupils’ performance elements

### 4.7.3 The dyslexic pupils

Tim did not attend an English language school (as Carol did) and was finding the exercises in English rather difficult. In one of the interviews, Tim, mentioned that he had rather negative past experiences not only in English but at school in general, as his last classroom teacher had abused him and his classmates. He elaborated a lot on his negative experiences and, although they were not specifically relevant to his EFL experiences, they had influenced his attitudes towards the EFL learning context. He only mentioned his experiences relevant to the English classes at once, when he stated that his previous EFL teacher was ‘nice’. Although Carol’s past EFL
experiences were positive, the present EFL class was also difficult for Carol, who suggested that she was not enjoying her afternoon EFL classes either.

From an interview with Carol:

- “It is difficult Miss...English is difficult. Even in the language school... I really don't understand a lot there either”

Carol had low motivation at this stage (Table 22). She felt very anxious and had negative attitudes towards the EFL learning context. Although Carol had low self-related beliefs, she assigned her difficulties with learning English to the difficult exercises Myrtle was giving them to do. Carol assigned low value to learning English and the reason she appeared to be making a lot of effort was probably because she was under pressure (from her family) to learn English.

From an interview with Carol:

R: "So you said you find English hard?"
C: “I do yes...a lot...even in the language school”
R: "Do you find it hard there as well?"
C: “Yes very much, I didn’t want to go; my parents wanted me to.”
Table 22: Dyslexic pupils' motivation elements: the green letters indicate positive change, the red letters indicate negative change, the orange letters indicate unclear change.

Carol had no particular goals (goal salience) though she mentioned that English could help her professionally (instrumental orientation). The latter was triggered by the overall Greek EFL context. Furthermore, Carol's integrative orientation was under-developed in contrast to that of the non-dyslexic pupils. The conclusion that Carol had low motivation at this stage was reinforced by the fact that she selected more negative emoticons than positive ones (Table 23).

Tim's motivation had not been activated much either at this stage. However, he was more motivated than Carol, as most of the
motivation components were described as negative rather than positive (Table 23). He assigned value to learning English but had no particular goals in English language learning. Moreover, Tim did not attend an English language school, where some goals such as the acquisition of English language certificates are strongly enhanced. His past EFL experiences were negative compared to that year's EFL class, towards which he had positive attitudes. The data from the 'attitudes towards the learning situation' node showed that Tim was enjoying his EFL class in school; hence, the 'positive' description. However, Tim found the exercises difficult, which might explain why he was making little effort. What is more, Tim's self-related beliefs were low and this was why he had high language anxiety. In contrast to Carol, Tim did not show any signs of instrumental orientation, though his integrative orientation was well developed.

For example, from an interview with Tim:

R: "Tim, do you think it is important to learn English?"
T: "Yes because if I want to visit a country where they speak English, I want be able to communicate with anyone (there)...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Positive A</th>
<th>Negative A</th>
<th>Positive B</th>
<th>Negative B</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23: Dyslexic pupils' emoticon choices (Positive effects)

Carol's performance was low (Table 24). From a summary of all of the A2 level skills that she should possess, she had low/satisfactory levels in most of them (spelling, vocabulary, writing, grammar,
speaking, reading), which means that she was responding to the basic demands of the A2 level she was found (Table 1).

In the classroom, Carol was often distracted and was very dependent on her friend, Helen, with whom she shared a desk. However, Tim appeared to be segregated, as he sat on his own at the back of the class.

Similarly to Carol, Tim's performance was also low (or satisfactory) for most of the skills. No assessment tools appeared for Tim at this stage and the references that supported Tim's performance were few. Some of the non-dyslexic pupils' negative motivation elements were also resulting in low/satisfactory performance levels in most skills (speaking, writing, spelling and vocabulary) (Table 23). However, their grades from the tests varied and grammar was the only skill in which their level could be inferred as good (Table 1 and Appendix 10).
Table 24: Dyslexic pupils' performance elements

4.7.4 The EFL teacher (Myrtle)

The parents' interventions annoyed Myrtle and triggered her negative feelings (e.g. 'problems with context' - Table 24). This was related to the fact that, in some cases, she suggested that she did not feel very confident about her teaching:

From a teacher interview:

*M: To be honest sometimes I think that I am not doing very well...sometimes...“*

Later, she notes the differences between the pupils is an issue that concerns her extensively:
M: “...even so...when I ask them to work in groups, they can’t be homogeneous and how can they be homogeneous...that’s not my purpose anyway...”

Table 25: Teacher nodes in both stages

Myrtle showed a positive response to the resources on dyslexia. She asked me a lot of questions in order to understand the documents she was reading better and often asked me to meet her. However, at the pre-intervention stage, Myrtle was usually angry in class, mainly because of the noise that was prevailing.

From a classroom observation (30/03/12):

– “Classroom starts being noisy again”
– “Pupils argue”
– “Teacher shouts, seems angry”
Myrtle sometimes doubted her practice and this was influencing her behaviour. She was using practices relevant to listening, speaking and grammar skills while she was using many images in the exercises she was preparing for her pupils. Myrtle was also using English a lot during the classroom activities and this was confusing the pupils.

Myrtle’s behaviour towards Carol was different from that towards Tim. She was differentiating her practice with Tim although she was unaware that he had been officially recognised as having dyslexia until I informed her of this. She provided Tim with books from earlier EFL levels because she had seen that he had very poor performance.

_M: “Tim doesn’t even know the basics, that is why I have given him different books with more basic English”_

Although Myrtle knew that Carol had dyslexia, she did not provide differentiation. One of my first thoughts about Myrtle and her relationship with Carol was:

“However, I haven’t heard her (Carol) say an answer – usually she asks questions. Myrtle is not paying special attention to her.

Also, based on a classroom observation (26/03/12):

- “Carol raises her hand to ask the teacher something or to say something”
- “Teacher works with the other group and doesn’t really pay attention.”
Also, when I asked Myrtle about Carol's writing, she could not remember whether Carol had given her a piece of writing.

From a teacher interview:

R: "Has Carol given you any writing?
M: "She might have...I don't really remember...it was something about London I had given them...but I can't remember..."

4.7.5 The intervention stage: non-dyslexic pupils

The strong division among the pupils was still present in the class and the pupils were still making a lot of noise during the lesson. This was the result of the pupils' heterogeneity (mixed abilities and backgrounds). What is more, according to the teacher, the type of resources that the Ministry was providing (e.g. books) was unsuitable for this class and this level.

The pupils still suggested that the teacher was using difficult exercises and recalled positive past EFL experiences. The influence of the language school was still present due to the high number of references that supported the node 'language school'.

The comments from my research diary in combination with the teacher's comments led to the creation of the node 'limited time the DF practices', demonstrating the limited time that Myrtle had available in which to implement the dyslexia-friendly practices. This node also indicated Myrtle's need to use the dyslexia-friendly practices for a longer period of time (based on the teacher interviews).
As shown in Table 22, some of the elements related to the non-dyslexic pupils’ motivation improved. The pupils showed higher self-efficacy, higher valence and a slightly higher effort than before. Another positive result was the pupils’ lowered anxiety. An element that cannot be inferred as positive was the fact that the pupils displayed mixed attitudes towards the learning situation and were less positive than previously. The changes in the teacher’s practice resulted in them describing their lesson as more difficult than before.

For example, from a focus group discussion:

*R: Have you noticed any changes in the lesson lately?*

*P: Yes, the teacher is asking us to do difficult things now*

*P2: Yes, I agree, very difficult…*

All of the other elements related to the non-dyslexic pupils’ motivation did not show any significant changes (e.g. instrumental orientation, goal salience).

The positive influences on motivation also led to positive results in terms of the non-dyslexic pupils’ performance (Table 28). As shown above, none of their skills had worsened while improvement was shown in certain skills (‘slightly improved’ speaking, ‘improved’ grammar, ‘good’ vocabulary). A slight positive change was also detected in their listening skills while their writing and reading skills remained at the same level (‘some improvement’).
4.7.6 The intervention stage: dyslexic pupils

Tim's descriptions of the EFL context were unclear due to his regular absences, as I only conducted one interview with Tim in this part. However, in the interview, he suggested that his low level of English was due to the difficult exercises that Myrtle was asking them to do (causal attributions).

Carol was also not clear about the previous factors that had influenced her view of learning English, although she mentioned that she was also learning French in this part of the study (as part of her language learning context). No references supported the 'causal attributions' node for Carol.

Tim and Carol suggested that they had noticed positive differences (e.g. 'she is not shouting', 'she is helpful now') in the teacher.

From an interview with Carol:

C: "...Ms Myrtle is asking me more things now..."
R: "So what do you mean now? Have you noticed anything she wasn't doing before, any exercises that she did for the first time? Has she been treating some people differently?"
C: "Yes"
R: "What do you mean?"
C: "Ms Myrtle has changed a lot."
R: "Yes, tell me...what do you mean?"
C: "She is not shouting."
R: "Yes."
C: "She is not angry."
R: "Yes..."
C: “She is doing the best for us...and for her.”
R: “Is she helpful?”
C: Yes
R: Has this changed?
C: Not so much (this)
R: Sorry?
C: She is helpful now but she wasn't very helpful before.”

Carol, in this part of the study, showed increased motivation (see Table 22). She was still making an effort to learn English and, in contrast to the first part, showed a positive attitude towards the learning situation and higher self-related beliefs. However, the data at this stage also showed that Carol was still dependent on her friend, Helen.

From a teacher interview:

R: “You told me that Carol was participating in that game too?”
M: “Yes, but she had support from her friend she was sitting with and Mark had my help...in general, I think Carol is encouraged by this support.”

Carol was feeling less language anxiety than before and was valuing the process of learning English more highly. However, she still had no specific goals and this could be linked to the fact that no references relevant to her instrumental orientation arose. Her integrative orientation appeared to be developed at this stage. Another difference in the intervention part was that Carol stopped attributing her limited experience of learning English to the teacher. This could be seen as both a positive and negative change. It might
suggest that Carol had positive views of the teacher at this stage, but could also be seen as negative because she was attributing her low levels of English to a lack of personal ability (Ushioda 1996, 1998). However, the latter contradicts the conclusion that Carol showed increased self-efficacy in this part. Therefore, I considered the change in Carol’s causal attributions as positive (Table 22).

No changes were shown in Tim’s motivation. Although some positive elements were traced in the motivational nodes, it could not be inferred that his motivation had increased due to the limited amount of data (Tim’s absences). Although Tim had no particular goals in the first part of the study, in the second part, he mentioned some. Also, he assigned more value to EFL learning then before (higher valence).

For example, from a pupil interview:

T: "My target is to learn English to be able to speak to people from England; otherwise, I won’t be able to do this."

From another interview:

R: "Why do you think it’s important to learn English?"
T: "Because if someone comes here, a tourist, and needs help, we must be able to help him, for example."

Tim’s attitudes towards the learning situation had remained positive. His views of his EFL context had not changed either, while he still showed the same levels of integrative and instrumental orientation. A significant negative change in Tim’s motivation was his effort, which had decreased in this part. This was influenced by the fact that he
showed higher anxiety and lower self-related beliefs in this stage (in contrast to Carol).

The pupils with dyslexia showed different types of responses to the dyslexia-friendly practices. Both Tim and Carol’s response to the dyslexia-friendly practices was mixed as there were cases where they would get frustrated or feel satisfied with the changes to the lesson.

From a classroom observation (11/05/12):

- "Carol is crying because the teacher changed her seat."

From another classroom observation (21/05/12):

- "Children listen to the song and move their heads."
- "Carol is one of these girls; she is excited."

In general, the data showed that Carol showed a positive response to the dyslexia-friendly practices. This was reinforced from the node that arose entitled ‘teacher dpupils more noticeable’, which described the positive change in Myrtle’s attitude towards the pupils with dyslexia (directing her attention to them more than before).

From two classroom observations (18/05/12):

- "Carol is looking at Helen’s photocopy, the teacher approaches her and helps her with something."
- "The teacher asks Carol to answer; she answers correctly"
Carol’s increased motivation (Table 22) led to the improvement in some of her skills (speaking, listening and reading).

From an interview with Myrtle:

R: “What about Carol’s reading level?”
M: “Yes, when Carol gets some help...”
R: “Yes...”
M: “…she improves because she is getting many opportunities (to improve)...I think she’s improved now (in reading).”

Some of Carol’s skills remained at the same level (vocabulary) while others were unclear (grammar, writing). The same applies to Tim, who experienced a positive influence on his speaking, grammar, and vocabulary skills (Table 24). His writing skill appeared to remain the same while his listening and spelling levels were also unclear at this stage.

4.7.7 The EFL teacher (Myrtle)

The altered context activated Myrtle’s positive attitudes. However, she still suggested that she had problems in class and stressed the inappropriateness of the resources available. This was also shown by the nodes, as some elements of the context remained (e.g. noisy class) that were still stressing Myrtle ('teacher angry' node).

Myrtle was positive about the dyslexia-friendly practices and employed them in every lesson (see also Table 5). In a review of the nodes about her response to the dyslexia-friendly practices, she used positive language to describe her experiences.
From example, from an interview with Myrtle:

- "... and what about the practices, how did you find them?"
- "At the beginning I didn’t know how to use them...later, I realised how helpful they were...it wasn’t as difficult as I thought...and they helped me a lot..."

In some cases, Myrtle adjusted some of the dyslexia-friendly practices to suit the tasks she had planned. The dyslexia-friendly practices resulted in Myrtle including the pupils with dyslexia more than before in the classroom tasks and approaching them during certain classroom activities. Myrtle also admitted this.

The node that arose entitled ‘teacher dpupils more noticeable’ described a positive change in Myrtle’s attitudes towards the pupils with dyslexia (directing her attention to them more than before).

From two classroom observations (18/05/12):

- "Carol is looking at Helen’s photocopy; the teacher approaches her and helps her with something."
- "The teacher asks for Carol to answer and she answers correctly"

Myrtle’s practices at this stage were focusing more on grammar activities while she continued to use a lot of games. She also started using Greek more than before:

From a teacher interview:
M: “When we were doing group work, I had to use L1 to solve the controversies that were arising in each team.”

From the above, it can be concluded that the dyslexia-friendly practices positively influenced most of the pupils' motivation and performance and were experienced positively by the teachers; most of the nodes on both of these elements appeared as improved.

The dyslexia-friendly practices were adjusted to suit Myrtle’s own practices. She continued to use the same types of exercise, which were altered at the second stage. Myrtle asked me to suggest a specific practice from the list of dyslexia-friendly practices, possibly because she was feeling insecure about which to employ. At the end of the project, Myrtle showed negative attitudes towards the specific classroom since, she claimed, that the use of the dyslexia-friendly practices in another classroom would possibly produce better results.

The contextual differences in the Highgarden classroom previously analysed triggered similar and different mechanisms in the pupils and teacher, which led to particular outcomes. However, a common finding was that, in both classrooms, positive results emerged, especially with regard to all pupils' motivation. This answers the query on whether the positive results shown in the Highgarden classroom arose because of the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices or because more teaching was taking place at the intervention stage. The analysis of the class at Winterfell School that follows will reveal further issues that will enhance or falsify this assumption.
4.7.8 The findings from Winterfell classroom: the non-dyslexic pupils

The setting in the Winterfell classroom was different from that at Riverlands or Highgarden. The two bilingual pupils who did not speak Greek and Keith, a non-dyslexic immigrant pupil, sat at the back of the classroom, not participating in any of the activities. Although the reasons behind Keith’s behaviour was unknown, it seemed acceptable to the teacher. The learners in this classroom were a year older than those at the other two schools, and their ages ranged from eleven to twelve years old.

This classroom variability described above was also noticed from the data drawn from my research diary:

"The problem with Penelope's classroom is that, for a lot of the pupils, English is their third language since they come from other countries and they have difficulties with English - they seem confused."

Some pupils were attending evening language schools while the Internet and social networks were also influencing their views of the English language. The teacher had noticed this too:

From a teacher interview:

P: "Sometimes they (pupils) are influenced by the media and the advertisements that are highly influential in our context and in which the English language is used. At their age, they all have Facebook and Youtube accounts and they quite frequently mention songs or films that include English...however these are not used in class...and they
The teacher arrived at Winterfell School at the end of October despite the fact that term starts in September. She suggested that the two months she missed were critical:

P: "They started seeing me as part of everyday school life only since February - don't forget that I started rather late, we lost the two significant first months - September and October. These are the months when the teacher becomes close to the pupils and when they become acquainted with the teacher too...it wasn't good that I was not here during these first two months.

Neither interactive materials nor computers were found in the class. Moreover, because the school received the EFL books late, the teacher had to work with photocopied materials for some time.

From a teacher interview:

P: "...the materials arrived quite late and this was rather unpleasant especially for the pupils...pupils and parents started undermining the EFL lesson because there were no materials to work with...everything depended upon each teacher's motivation and willingness...the Ministry maintained a rather 'passive' stance towards all this last summer...”

Based on the teacher's statements, the classroom pupils were taught using traditional teaching methods, such as learning the translation of words and dictation (similar to the Grammar-translation method). The EFL pupils' goal was to receive a good grade from the teacher.
curriculum from the Greek Ministry of Education failed to provide many cultural stimuli to trigger the pupils’ interest in English culture. However, their integrative orientation was developed because of the significant tourism development in the area in which the school was located. What is more, the economic crisis in Greece had motivated the pupils to learn English for immigration purposes:

P: “...the financial crisis influences children too...One pupil wants to learn English because her family wants to migrate to Australia...”

All of the participant pupils had been attending EFL classes in school since they were eight years old and had been in this class since kindergarten. This has resulted in high classroom coherence:

R: “Are you all friends?”
P: “Yes. We’ve known each other for six-seven years”

During the lesson, two pupils were mainly involved in the exercises (Annis and Val), who had a very good level of English (‘the lesson BRIGHT pupils A’ node).

The review of the nodes on the non-dyslexic pupils’ motivation showed that they had relatively high levels of motivation, with some negative issues arising. More specifically, their integrative orientation had developed because of their regular contact with tourists. Although their instrumental orientation was also strong, it was weaker than in the previous two classrooms. This was probably because the number of pupils attending private language institutes (in which this language target is usually enhanced) was lower. The influence of the language
institutes created a sense of unfairness (a negative element) for some pupils.

From a pupil interview:

R: "How is the English language lesson here?"
P: "I like it...I know many things...I just believe that some pupils attend evening language classes while others can't afford this...this is not a private school and some pupils can learn English only here...there are pupils who do not want to learn, of course...”

The pupils had different past experiences of learning English; some of them described them as positive while others regarded the current year's class as better than that of previous years. Thus, the majority of pupils showed negative attitudes towards the current year's EFL class, but positive attitudes towards Penelope. The pupils' positive view of the teacher was a strong theme in the data.

From a focus group:

R: “What do you think of Miss Penelope? Is she interested in presenting a good lesson?”
P1: "Yes, because she tries for our sake.”
R: "Is she helpful?"
P2: “Yes she is helpful most of the time...during the tests too.”

Most of the pupils assigned a high value to learning English and displayed good self-related beliefs. Although all of them suggested that they were friends (high group cohesion), they felt anxious when asked to speak in class. The pupils' anxiety was caused by Penelope's behaviour, as she was very often bad-tempered. The data at this
stage also showed that the non-dyslexic pupils were making some effort to learn English, but that this was insufficient.

Also, the traditional approaches that the teacher was using did not attract the pupils’ attention, as they were easily distracted during the lessons. These approaches and the fact that Penelope was working extensively with two bright pupils was how the teacher was dealing with the pupils’ differences (immigrant, SEN, dyslexic).

The non-dyslexic pupils’ high levels of motivation positively influenced some of their skills performance, as they appeared to have very good grammar and vocabulary skills at this stage. However, they showed ‘satisfactory’ performance in listening, spelling and writing activities while their reading and speaking abilities were low (Table 1).

From some classroom observations (27/03/12):

- “He starts reading now VERY LOW LEVEL.”

- “Ida is reading something incorrectly but the teacher says that ‘I’m glad that you tried, it’s ok that you mispronounced it’.”

From a teacher interview:

P: “When they are reading a text, they have problems quite often because they mix the word meanings while they are not aware of the way it should be pronounced…”

P: “There are pupils who cannot speak English...for example, I never recall El, Keith, Poly or Ida using English…”
The help and support that the non-dyslexic pupils provided to Alexander was rather noticeable in the data drawn from the classroom observations:

From a classroom observation (15/03/12):

- "Annis tells DP (dyslexic pupil) to open his book."
- "DP asks for help from Annis."
- "Ida gives something to DP."

However, there were instances where Alexander would not engage in the lesson despite the fact that his classmates were helping him. This was regarded as 'selfish' behaviour on his part. For example, from a focus group:

P: "For example, there are pupils who are selfish, like Alexander..."
R: "Who do what?"
P: "He wants to do some things on his own..."

4.7.9 The findings from Winterfell classroom: the dyslexic pupil

Alexander, the dyslexic pupil, was originally from Albania and had lived in Greece for the past ten years. He used to attend an English language institute but had stopped because, as he said, he was receiving no help from his family in trying to study English. His past experiences in school were mainly positive, especially last year's EFL teacher.
Alexander (a pupil with dyslexia) was less motivated than his peers and was feeling that he was not doing well enough in English. For example, from a pupil interview:

R: "...Anything else you find difficult?"
A: "All the other children raise their hand because they can understand. I can’t understand...”

Thus, Alexander’s low confidence contradicts his low language anxiety. This can be explained by his sense of group cohesion because he was receiving help from his classmates during the lesson (e.g. pupils would pass him their notebooks from which to copy words). Alexander noted that he did not feel stressed when asked to speak in front of his non-dyslexic classmates. However, he was not asked to take part in the classroom tasks very often and this was possibly the reason his attitudes towards the learning situation were negative. Also, he described his past experiences as more positive than the experiences he had the current year. At this stage, no negative or positive attitudes towards the teacher were created as separate themes for Alexander.

Despite his exclusion, Alexander assigned a high value to learning English and would participate in the classroom exercises whenever he could (‘effort’ node). He also mentioned that it was difficult for him to study at home because none of his family could help. The data also showed that he would get distracted quite often. Alexander’s integrative orientation was far more developed than his instrumental orientation.
Table 26: Alexander’s motivation

Based on the above, it could not be inferred at this stage whether 
Alexander’s motivation was high or low, as the nodes were mixed. 
However, his performance was described as low, possibly due to his 
difficulties, background and possibly other unknown elements. 
Although he was generally excluded, he would sometimes participate 
in speaking exercises and therefore his speaking skills were better 
than his other skills.

From a teacher interview:

R: “...and what about Alexander’s speaking levels?”
P: "Alexander is lively in class... he participates a lot... his speaking levels are good... he can make sentences that have a starting point and an ending point..."

The high levels of group cohesion and Alexander's low anxiety led to his high level speaking skills.

From several classroom observations (Extracts a, b & c):

Extract a (15/03/12):
- "The pupil with dyslexia looks at the board."
- "DP says the words are too big and there is little space."

Extract b (27/03/12):
- "DP asks the pupil writing something on the board to move because he can't see."
- "DP stands close to the board, gets up and asks another pupil about the exercise, asks the teacher again about the exercise."

Extract c (30/03/12):
- "DP looks confused. Asks to repeat again."
- "Same for 5th word."
- "Same 6th word."
- "DP is the only one talking/asking."

At this stage, Alexander very often seemed to form a partnership with Keith who would rarely participate in the lesson. Both of them would often get distracted.
From a classroom observation (15/03/12):

- "DP is not even looking at the board."
- "DP and Ken don’t participate."
- "T asks DP to start writing the exercise."

4.7.10 The EFL teacher (Penelope)

Penelope used traditional teaching methods, such as asking the students to learn the spelling and translation of words (similar to the Grammar-translation method).

At the pre-intervention stage, Penelope started reading the resources on dyslexia that I had given her. She was positive about the dyslexia resources and admitted that limited seminars on learning difficulties had been offered by the local authority. However, she also expressed feelings of stress because of her ignorance of dyslexia.

From my research diary:

"I met Myrtle and Penelope today. Their response is almost the same. I saw that they were a bit stressed in general but they didn’t say anything about my research while they mentioned that they will look at the documents."

Penelope had negative views about her EFL context. She was annoyed with the way she had been appointed, since she had arrived late at Winterfell School. Because she had been at the school for only a short time, she felt insecure about her teaching and the way the
pupils viewed her. This is why her need for assistance inside and outside class was mentioned quite often; she suggested that an extra person in the classroom would provide her with valuable support, especially with pupils like Alexander who had 'attention issues' (from a teacher interview). Penelope believed that Alexander, in order to participate fully in the lesson, should have her full attention; otherwise, he could not follow the classroom processes. For Penelope, Alexander was a pupil who sometimes "sinks into his own world" (from a teacher interview). Penelope also suggested that the Greek EFL context was the main reason why she was using traditional methods such as dictation. She was aware of the strong influence of the language schools and suggested that this was undermining her job. However, she believed that she was handling the classroom's variability well.

The lesson was mainly teacher-centred, with the teacher practising a lot of vocabulary tasks. One of the two bright pupils was writing words on the board while the rest of the classroom pupils would copy them into their notebooks. Penelope was also doing group activities and reading exercises from the book.

Penelope was mainly working with Annis and Val, the bright pupils. However, she wanted the other pupils to participate in the lesson.

From a classroom observation (16/03/12):

- "El on the board."
- "T (teacher) asks the classroom to clap because he got up."
- "They are applauding."
Although Penelope was aware of the limited participation of the pupils in the exercises, she did not alter them, perhaps because she felt too insecure to try something different.

From a teacher interview:

*R*: "...and during the classroom exercises? Do they concentrate? Do they listen to you? Do they follow your instructions?"

*P*: "If the exercise is interesting yes, if it seems boring to them, no... I feel scared to make them focus and ask them to turn their heads and see what we are doing and there are cases where I have to approach them and literary 'drag' them to make them participate..."

Therefore, Penelope was making a compromise by working with the two bright pupils as long as the rest of the class was quiet. When the classroom became noisy as the pupils lost interest, Penelope would become irritated. The pupils often mentioned this behaviour.

However, one lesson was different from the usual ones at this stage. The school had been involved in a project organised by the local LEA's EFL director called "a world tour in two days". For this reason, the teacher took the pupils into the inclusion classroom to use the computers and complete the task. During this lesson, all of the pupils showed high levels of engagement because of the nature of the task. Penelope was also different in this class as she appeared more eager than usual to engage every pupil in the lesson. For example:

From two classroom observations in the pre-intervention part (Extracts a & b):

Extract a (16/03/12):
“T stands and writes on the board.”

“T dictates.”

“A pupil says that he hasn’t understood an exercise.”

“T says ok we will explain later.”

“T dictates pupils write what the teacher dictates apart from a pupil who sits at the back.”

Extract b (20/03/12):

“Teacher writes words on the board with translation, pupils write too”

“Teacher asks to open books, tells them the page”

“T explains on the board”

From the classroom observation in the inclusion class room (pre-intervention) (30/03/12):

“T tries to explain she says that they are not playing any games they have to do sth (something).”

“T has brought her own laptop.”

T gathers pupils around her laptop

“T explains about a project they have to do, they will get a prize at the end.”

“The theme of this competition is “a world tour in two days”

“T asks them where they are from pupils from other countries in class.”
“T says that they may do something about flags.”

“T asks them to go to Google.”

“They seem rather interested.”

“Pupils found a dance song.”

“T asks them if they all like it.”

“T tries to engage all the pupils.”

Although Penelope would always approach the SEN pupil to write down for her the vocabulary and homework, she provided no differentiation or support for the dyslexic pupil (e.g. dictating at a slower pace). However, there were some instances where Penelope would approach Alexander and ask him to pay attention. Penelope was aware of Alexander’s differences and acknowledged that he was sometimes eager to participate in the classroom exercises.

From a classroom observation (20/03/12):

“2nd word dictated, DP (dyslexic pupils) asks her (teacher) to repeat it again.”

“DP asks the teacher to repeat the first word she dictated.”

“T says the word, DP is writing.”

“Same happens to 3rd word.”

“DP is writing, 4th word asks again.”

“T approaches DP but doesn’t do anything, says the word ‘generation’"
"DP looks confused asks to repeat again."

This lack of differentiation for Alexander was due to Penelope’s limited awareness of dyslexia. From a teacher interview:
P: “...reading the resources will be good for me, it will be food for thought, it will give me directions on how to help these types of children...the truth is that I’m not aware of the issue (of dyslexia)...”

4.7.11 Intervention: the non-dyslexic pupils

At the intervention stage, the context was altered and Penelope was introduced to the dyslexia-friendly practices while she kept reading the resources. The practices were employed for seven and a half weeks.

The data at this stage suggested that the lesson was slow and in some cases noisy. Although the two bright pupils still had a strong presence in class, this was less than before. The differences among the pupils (immigrant pupils, language school) influenced the classroom processes at this stage too (see generative mechanisms below) and some group exercises were still taking place (‘group cohesion’ node). As in the first part, most of the pupils suggested that they had had positive past experiences in their EFL classes.

The tables that were used for the Riverlands classroom were also adopted here to explore whether the pupils’ motivation had changed (Table 27). A teacher table was not adopted in this part because it was less useful than the tables for the pupils.
Table 27: Non-dyslexic pupils' motivation: Green box: positive change, Pink box: no change, Yellow box: theme could not be described in the title (complex issues, many differences, a few references)

The above table demonstrates that some of the pupils' motivation elements were increased, while many remained the same. Although the pupils were still describing their previous years as better than their present year, their attitudes towards the learning situation improved due to the intervention. It was noticeable that the 'positive attitudes towards the teacher' node previously shown, did not appear and while data showed that the pupils had negative attitudes towards the teacher at this point.

From a pupil interview:

*R*: “What about Miss Penelope?”
P: “Eh...the class is a bit boring because she...I don’t know...she gets very easily irritated. I don’t know what happens to her...she is even angry during breaks...”

Non-dyslexic pupils’ integrative orientation developed at this stage and the ‘group cohesion’ node arose. However, the node on group cohesion for the non-dyslexic pupils did not include Alexander. Although the ‘pupils close to dp’ node arose (outcomes) during the intervention stage, showing that the non-dyslexic pupils had started working with Alexander, he was not always welcome in the group exercises. The data from the classroom observations for the ‘pupils close to dp’ node showed that Alexander was neglected or excluded during the group exercises.

In general, the pupils’ high motivation levels were reinforced and they showed increased effort. Moreover, the new learning situation lowered their language anxiety. The teacher was also more confident and became irritated less often than during the pre-intervention stage.

From a pupil interview:

P: “With the film...the project the EFL teachers organised...”
R: “You felt relieved?”
P: “Yes, I wasn’t feeling stressed or under pressure to study...”

Regarding the non-dyslexic pupils’ responses, most of them noticed the changes during the class and described these as positive.

From a classroom observation (15/05/12):
“The teacher shows the pupils the materials printed (vocabulary printed) and asks them 'Do you prefer this?'"

“Annis says that English would be better this way.”

“Everyone says they prefer the printed words.”

However, there were instances when the pupils would become distracted during the lesson and this explains why the classroom appeared noisier than before at this point (attitudes IN the learning situation DISTRACTED B’ node).

From a classroom observation (01/06/12):

“Pupils are now distracted.”

“Not everybody watches (the film).”

“Some pupils watch.”

“Elias moves around.”

“T makes funny comments asks them if they like the film.”

“Some pupils say they don’t like it.”

The changes in pupils' performance are shown in Table 28 below.
Based on the above table (Table 28), we can infer that the non-dyslexic pupils showed an improved performance in the second stage of the project. This was a result of the activation of a number of positive motivation elements in combination with other factors. However, the pupils' vocabulary performance appeared to be lower, probably because the teacher was not focusing on this skill as much as before. Moreover, the spelling skill, which was based on vocabulary or dictation activities, did not appear at this stage.

4.7.12 Intervention: the dyslexic pupils

The context in the view of Alexander was the same as in the first part though, in contrast to his classmates, he did not feel as much a part of the group as before.

Alexander's motivation did not show any improvements with the use of the dyslexia-friendly practices and more negative motivation nodes appeared compared to the pre-intervention stage (Table 26). Despite the fact that the activation of certain positive elements was
shown (e.g. increased effort, enhanced instrumental orientation), his valence was lower than the pre-intervention stage as he only made one statement about the importance of learning English (compared to the ten references noticed before). Further, he stopped suggesting a sense of group cohesion while the data from the observations showed that he was excluded from the new group activities.

From a classroom observation (24/04/12):

- “Pupils sit in groups.”
- “DP is asking her something, his pair is not helping him.”

Alexander also suggested that some of his friends had progressed and this made him feel neglected.

From an interview in the second part:

R: “In the classroom do you feel you all are part of a group?”
A: “No.”
R: “Why?”
A: “Because the others, Val, Annis and Harold...and El... have progressed a lot while me, Irene and Poly have stayed behind... Ida has progressed too. I forgot about her... so we stay behind... we are not progressing as much as the others...we are not...”

Further, Alexander’s lower group cohesion increased his language anxiety. His low self-related beliefs and negative attitudes towards the teacher and the learning situation remained:

From another interview:

R: “What do you think of Miss Penelope?”
A: “You have asked me this question before...well, she is very...she is always angry...I say hello to her and she doesn’t even reply...three times this happened...she has never replied...”

The lower group cohesion for Alexander was the reason why he was not positively receptive to the changes he had noticed. However, he described them as ‘clever’.

From an interview with Alexander:

R: “...so what do you think about the fact that Ms Penelope showed you a film? “
A: “it (the film) was boring...”
R: “So was it a bad idea then?”
A: “It was clever...”

The outcomes at this stage varied due to the differences between the triggered mechanisms for the teacher, the non-dyslexic pupils and Alexander.

The fact that Alexander felt more distant from his classmates was sometimes shown in his in-class behaviour. He would keep being distracted and asked for help with the exercises. There were also times where he would sit very close to the teachers’ desk. He did not forming partnerships with Keith like before, an element that further decreased his group cohesion.

His increased negative attitudes towards the teacher were the result of the changes in Penelope’s behaviour towards him; she approached
him more than before, an attitude that was causing him to feel stressed.

From a classroom observation (10/05/12):

- "DP seems to be doing something under the desk."
- "Teacher wants to check."
- "He has written only three words."
- "T asks him to write three more."

Alexander's performance was not significantly different (Table 29) apart from his vocabulary skill, which was slightly lower. Again, this was due to the teacher's altered practice. It is noticeable that, in contrast to his classmates, a node on his spelling skill also appeared in the second part, mainly because the teacher mentioned it frequently during the interviews. This shows Alexander's increased participation in spelling activities.

- From a teacher interview:
  - R: "What about Alexander's spelling skills?"
  - T: "...he didn't really know how the words are spelt in English or their translation of course and, the times he knew the meaning in Greek, he would make severe spelling mistakes...he had severe problems in both languages..."
Table 29: Alexander's performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A part</th>
<th>B part</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• mixed grades</td>
<td>• (no node)</td>
<td>• same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• speaking LOW - but better than other skills</td>
<td>• low</td>
<td>• same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• grammar low</td>
<td>• low</td>
<td>• same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• low vocab</td>
<td>• very low</td>
<td>• same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• low spelling</td>
<td>• low</td>
<td>• same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• low writing</td>
<td>• very low</td>
<td>• same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• low listening-distracted</td>
<td>• low</td>
<td>• same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• low reading</td>
<td>• low</td>
<td>• same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.7.13 The EFL teacher (Panlope)

The teacher was positive about the resources I had given her, and suggested that these had increased her knowledge of dyslexia.

From a teacher interview:

R: "Would you now say you are ignorant of this matter (dyslexia)?"

P: "No, I can now say I have some knowledge of the issue"

She appeared more confident than before and believed that the knowledge she had gained would help her in the future.

For example, from a teacher interview in this part:

R: "What do you think you did differently after having read the resources? Has something changed?"

P: "Now, I have a picture about what dyslexia is...more than before - since I haven't had any previous training on the issue, nor have I"
personally studied it... I now have a totally different perspective. These children are smart of course, but they need different approaches...maybe more personalised (approaches) because of their issues... I used to be ignorant, now I have an idea about what can happen... and I dare say that I feel kind of inadequate because every child is special and different... and in the future, I might deal with more severe difficulties and not know how to deal with this again... and this is not a good thing... I hope I will be able to manage it...”

Although hesitant at first, Penelope started using the dyslexia-friendly practices in every lesson. By the end of the study, she had formed positive attitudes towards this intervention. She regarded the dyslexia-friendly practices as a tool that helped her to differentiate the traditional approaches she used to employ and this had positive effects on all of her pupils. She also suggested that the practices had helped her to communicate better with the pupils. Penelope also held positive views towards my research because it satisfied her need for assistance. She considered my presence valuable because she had the opportunity to discuss many issues that concerned her and exchange ideas on her classroom practice. She maintained a negative view of her context. At this stage, she suggested that the negative contextual conditions were affecting her confidence to evaluate the effects of the practices; she was a newly appointed teacher in this school and had not yet formulated a clear picture of each learner’s profile in order to be able to evaluate the changes effectively.

Penelope also started approaching Alexander more than before. This was the result of her increased knowledge of dyslexia and her
increased confidence about approaching Alexander. The teacher later confirmed this in the interviews. However, she viewed the classroom's heterogeneity as a prohibiting factor for providing differentiation to Alexander. Penelope’s attitudes towards all the classroom learners had changed by this stage. Although the bright pupils still had a strong presence in the class, the teacher moved away from the traditional approaches she used to practise, which resulted in more pupils being included in the lesson; the lesson was less teacher-centred and new materials were used (flashcards, coloured chalks, the film). Penelope also started asking the pupils about their views of the lesson.

At the end of the study, Penelope expressed her contentment with her participation in the project. Although she had felt stressed at the beginning, she was satisfied with my support and valued the interviews we shared.

The results from the analysis of the Winterfell classroom suggest that the dyslexia-friendly practices had positive effects on the non-dyslexic pupils' performance and motivation and that Penelope experienced my intervention positively. However, the same did not apply to Alexander, the learner with dyslexia. Alexander had negative views of the classroom situation and low self-related beliefs. This, combined with the fact that his classmates were not involving him in the group exercises, prohibited him from feeling included. All of these factors, in combination with his increased language anxiety, lowered his motivation during the intervention stage. However, some positive elements were shown, as the changes appeared to have further developed his integrative orientation. Also, he was making
more effort that before, which shows that, at this stage, he might have had an opportunity to participate more in the lesson. As expected, Alexander's performance remained low, with his writing skill appearing lower than before.

Despite the negative impact that the dyslexia-friendly practices appeared to have on Alexander's motivation and performance, his inclusion in the classroom activities started to develop. The outcomes of the practices regarding Penelope’s behaviour in class were that she started involving Alexander in the classroom processes. Penelope’s awareness of the nature of his difficulties had increased and she started employing practices that were dyslexia-friendly. Alexander was also approaching her more than before as, during the intervention stage, he would often sit close to her desk.

The increase in Penelope’s awareness did not lead to increased confidence, however, as her anxiety influenced the classroom processes. This is probably why Alexander’s inclusion cannot be described as successful, given his lowered motivation and performance elements.

The findings from the third and final school that I analysed revealed how the data led to my findings for the Winterfell classroom. The following chapter summarises the findings from each school to provide the final conclusions and answer my research questions.
5 Cross-case analysis

5.1 Overview of all the three classrooms

In this section, the discussion compares the findings of all the three EFL classrooms with the aim to answer the study’s research questions. During the data analysis process, the topic under investigation was the way the dyslexia-friendly practices worked in three Greek EFL classrooms and whether and how they influenced the performance and motivation of the dyslexic EFL pupils with dyslexia and their peers. EFL teachers’ experiences of employing dyslexia-friendly practices in their classrooms were also addressed.

5.1.1 Cross case comparisons

Before starting the discussion of the findings of all the three cases, I present a table in which a short summary of each case is provided (Tables 30 & 31) followed by a separate table (Table 32) that shows the nodes on teachers’ experiences.
Although the tables appear as two separate categories (pupils, teachers) they are not independent from each other. The way each teacher responded to the resources and the way the dyslexia-friendly practices were adapted influenced the classroom context and, in turn, the generative mechanisms and the outcomes. The discussion that follows is concerned with the influence of the dyslexia-friendly practices in the three EFL classrooms with a focus on whether, how and why changes occurred. To accomplish this, a cross-case analysis (Yin, 2013) is conducted in which I compare and contrast the findings of each classroom. Despite the fact that the classrooms have been treated as separate cases so far, an investigation of the findings among the three of them, will aid my final conclusions and avoid false comparisons. As in most cross case analyses, new findings might also emerge (Yin, 2013). The data analysis processes were influenced by Realism while data triangulation helped me eliminate possible alternative explanations. Therefore, the overview of the findings from all the three classrooms is based on data from the teachers', the pupils' and my views. The member checks I had accomplished with the teachers and the pupils in the second interviews (both stages of the study) aided me into confirming or disconfirming assumptions.
Table 30: Cross-case analysis: pre-intervention NDP: Non Dyslexic Pupils, DP: Dyslexic Pupils

Red colour: negative changes/no changes on negative elements, green colour: positive changes/no changes on positive elements, orange colour: slightly positive changes

Table 31: Cross case analysis: iintervention

Red colour: negative changes/no changes on negative elements, green colour: positive changes/no changes on positive elements, orange colour: slightly positive changes
5.1.2 Contextual factors

The way the dyslexia training and the dyslexia-friendly practices impacted on pupils' motivation and performance was highly influenced by contextual conditions. These were traced in the classrooms, the schools and the overall Greek EFL context. Apart from the time limitations, the provision of resources was limited while in some cases the teachers would bring their own materials in class (e.g. photocopies, markers). Because the dyslexia-friendly practices were adopted from a different context (UK), the Greek context was, at instances, constraining their inclusive character. This is further discussed in the discussion chapter.

The highly centralised education system in Greece was resulting in the three classrooms sharing some similarities; all of them were following the same curriculum and were using the same resources provided by the Greek Ministry of Education. The overall Greek EFL context was enhancing pupils' instrumental orientation; data showed that pupils wanted to learn English mainly for their professional and educational development. However, because all the participating schools were found in an area in Greece where tourism was highly developed, pupils' interaction with English speaking foreigners had enhanced their integrative orientation too. Yet, their instrumental orientation still appeared as stronger than their integrative orientation. The strong influence of the afternoon language schools was present in all the classrooms because a high number of pupils were attending them after school. Many pupils were relying on these additional EFL classes to learn English and acquire official English language certificates. This was resulting in differences among non-
dyslexic pupils’ performance levels in most cases; the pupils that were attending English classes outside school usually had better performance levels than other pupils who were only learning English at school. For instance, in Winterfell classroom, the two pupils that were mainly participating in the lesson at the pre-intervention stage were the only pupils in class that were attending evening language schools. Some pupils were confident in doing some tasks in contrast to some others who needed lower level activities. These mixed ability groups and the differences among the pupils were the reason the classrooms were noisy. Nevertheless, the EFL teachers were not providing differentiation at the pre-intervention stage.

5.1.3 Intervening contextual factors

The above contextual conditions were influenced by my presence as an observer and an interviewer in all the three classrooms from the beginning of the study. However, my influence in the setting started to diminish after the first month the study started. Moreover, at the beginning of the study, the EFL teachers were initially introduced to resources on dyslexia while discussions and meetings were also taking place. The EFL teachers’ response to these resources varied as this was influenced by their teacher stance, personality and contextual factors.
5.2 Pre-intervention

5.2.1 The EFL context for the non-dyslexic pupils

The first classroom I analysed was the classroom from Highgarden School because it originally appeared as more challenging. I wanted to explore whether my intervention influenced Minos' indifference. However, Riverlands and Winterfell classrooms were interesting cases too. Riverlands classroom was comprised of a lot of diverse pupils (immigrant pupils, pupil with ADHD) and this was creating confusion for the teacher and the pupils. Although Winterfell classroom was also highly heterogeneous (immigrant pupils, pupil with SEN), all the pupils were showing good levels of unity.

Penelope and Minos were following traditional teaching approaches such as extensive vocabulary and grammar activities while Myrtle was using more interactive and multisensory approaches (e.g. games). The classroom setting was identical in all the three classrooms with some minor differences (e.g. different arrangement of desks).

Many of the EFL learners among the classrooms had various backgrounds. Although Riverlands and Winterfell classrooms both had a high number of immigrant pupils, only one immigrant pupil was found in Highgarden, Ken, who also had dyslexia (according to the specialist teacher). What is more, some pupils had learning difficulties other than dyslexia (e.g. ADHD in Riverlands). This classroom variability was influencing the classroom context, the pupils, the teachers and the workings of the dyslexia-friendly practices.
The number of officially recognised learners with dyslexia in the classrooms varied as one dyslexic pupil was found in Winterfell classroom and two in Highgarden and Riverlands classrooms. In Highgarden classroom, apart from Albert who had been provided with an official dyslexia certificate by the CDDS centres (see also section, I also decided to consider Ken as a pupil with dyslexia, though he had not been officially assessed at that time. Both Alexander and Ken were immigrant EFL learners with dyslexia.

The EFL teacher's practice also differed. Myrtle was using practices that were enhancing interaction among the pupils. In Winterfell, Penelope was mainly working with the best performing students in class and was employing traditional teaching approaches. Minos in Highgarden classroom was indifferent and not a lot of teaching was taking place at the pre-intervention stage.

The context presented above refers to the context for the non-dyslexic pupils. The following section discusses the context from the standpoint of the dyslexic pupils which was slightly different.

5.2.2 Non-dyslexic pupils' motivation

In all the classrooms, the review of the non-dyslexic pupils' motivational components showed that the majority of the pupils were motivated to learn English. For example, in most classrooms the pupils showed high levels of effort, self-efficacy and developed integrative orientation (e.g. Highgarden, Winterfell). It was also shown that most of the non-dyslexic pupils were under pressure to learn English (e.g. node 'lg context pressure English) and a good number of them were
attending evening language schools. The non-dyslexic pupils' past experiences in learning English were mainly described as positive (e.g. 'the previous years were good') in Highgarden and Riverlands classroom. However, this was not so clear in Winterfell classroom (node 'mixed antecedent factors').

In contrast to Highgarden classroom where the non-dyslexic pupils were criticising the teacher's behaviour, in Winterfell classroom, pupils described their teacher as helpful. However, the pupils in Winterfell classroom showed negative attitudes towards their present EFL context. Riverlands classroom was the only class in which non-dyslexic pupils showed positive attitudes towards their learning situation at the pre-intervention stage. However, all the other nodes on motivation for the non-dyslexic pupils' were lower (e.g. low self-related beliefs, low valence) than the motivational nodes explored in the other two classrooms. This showed that the non-dyslexic pupils in Riverlands classroom had lower motivation than in Winterfell and Highgarden classrooms. The lower motivation pupils showed in Riverlands classroom was perhaps influenced from the high number of the immigrant pupils, the demanding exercises they were asked to do and the fact that the teacher was using English during the lesson (node 'contextual causal attributions').

The main goal for most of the EFL pupils at this stage was to learn English to acquire EFL certificates and progress professionally (node 'high instrumental orientation'). Many references supported the node 'integrative orientation' too especially in Riverlands classroom (compared to the other two classrooms). The fact that pupils had their integrative orientation increased might have occurred because
Myrtle was employing practices that were enhancing pupils' cultural awareness. Finally, the non-dyslexic pupils showed some, but not high, effort in learning English. The same applies for the value they were assigning in the learning process.

5.2.3 Non-dyslexic pupils' performance and in-class behaviour

Non-dyslexic pupils' overall performance could be described as low or satisfactory for the A2 level they were found (see Table 1 & Appendix 10) despite the fact that most of them appeared as motivated. This is perhaps because other intervening factors were influencing the motivation-performance relationship.

It was noticeable that most of the non-dyslexic pupils showed good grammar levels. However, all their other skills were described as low or satisfactory (reading, speaking, vocabulary, listening, writing) (Table 1). The only exception was shown in Winterfell classroom where the vocabulary levels of the pupils were described as good for A2 level learners (see also Appendix 10b).

In all the classrooms, the non-dyslexic pupils appeared to be very often distracted during class. Pupils were talking to each other and were moving around as shown from the observations and the teacher interviews. The Highgarden and Riverlands classrooms were noisier than Winterfell where pupils would normally follow Penelope's instructions (e.g. dictation, vocabulary writing). Another similarity that appeared in Penelope's and Minos' class was the sense of group cohesion among the pupils. Pupils' group cohesion in Winterfell and Highgarden is probably the reason pupils appeared as participating
more in the classroom tasks than pupils in Riverlands classroom where there was a high division among the pupils. Furthermore, the classrooms’ group cohesion in Winterfell had resulted in the pupils being very supportive with Alexander, the pupil with dyslexia (e.g. assisted him in exercises).

In Highgarden classroom Minos’ indifference was probably the reason pupils were distracted during the lesson and would often ask for a break. However, the pupils were eager to participate in classroom activities when these were taking place. The latter could mean that their motivation was prohibited by the classroom conditions and, more specifically, teachers’ malpractice. This, in turn, was negatively affecting their performance.

5.2.4 The EFL context for the dyslexic pupils

At the pre-intervention stage, data showed that the EFL classroom context was not inclusive for the pupils with dyslexia. The analysis of data from the classroom observations showed that the dyslexic pupils were excluded from the classroom tasks. This was confirmed from the teacher interviews that showed that the EFL teachers were not considering the dyslexic pupils as part of their responsibilities. This is possibly the reason all of the dyslexic pupils were attributing their low abilities mainly to the context (review of node ‘contextual causal attributions’): Carol and Tim were finding the classroom tasks difficult while Albert and Alexander suggested that other factors outside school were confusing them (e.g. family). Ken was finding his present EFL classroom noisy and confusing and Carol was under a lot of pressure from her family to learn English. Furthermore, Carol was
the only learner with dyslexia who was attending an evening language school. Carol and Alexander suggested that their previous years in English were good in contrast to Ken, Albert and Tim who suggested negative past experiences.

5.2.5 Dyslexic pupils’ motivation

Dyslexic pupils’ exclusion from the EFL activities at the pre-intervention stage could be considered a reason for their low motivation. This, in combination with their difficulties was resulting in them having low self-related beliefs. The low self-related beliefs was a common element for all the dyslexic pupils. The only exception was Albert whose self-related beliefs could not be clearly defined as data on this motivational component could not be clearly described (description: ‘mixed’ in the ‘self-efficacy’ node). Although pupils that have low confidence tend to internalise their failures (Burden, 2008) the dyslexic pupils in this study were attributing their low performance levels to contextual factors. For example, Carol and Tim supported the idea that one reason for their low level in some skills was the teacher’s demanding tasks. Furthermore, Ken said that the noise in class was a prohibiting factor for his progress while Albert and Alexander were attributing their low performance to their family.

The dyslexic pupils’ negative views of the context at the pre-intervention stage were apparent from the beginning of the study. Some pupils with dyslexia were trying to form partnerships with other pupils (e.g. Alexander with Keith). Other dyslexic pupils were
responding to their segregation in different ways: they would either be disruptive (Ken) or sit quietly in the back of the class (Tim).

Another common element among the dyslexic pupils was their high levels of anxiety, apart from the case of Alexander, whose good relationship with his classmates was prohibiting this (node 'high group cohesion').

The differences among the pupils with dyslexia were possibly influenced by various factors such as family, background, age and personality. However, this was not addressed in this study. The level of the dyslexic pupils' difficulties also varied. For instance, Ken was a confused learner because of his bilingualism, the dyslexic-type difficulties he was showing and the fact that he was exposed to two or more languages in and outside school (e.g. Greek, English, French and Bulgarian).

Differences were also shown among the pupils with dyslexia that were found in the same classroom. More specifically, Tim and Carol (Riverlands classroom) had different views of their English language class. Although Tim was enjoying the EFL classes Carol had negative attitudes towards the EFL lesson. The latter can be explained from the fact that Myrtle was providing differentiation for Tim but not for Carol. However, most of the pupils with dyslexia appeared negative towards their EFL contexts and this is probably the reason they did not have any specific goals in EFL learning. It was noticeable that although Albert had negative views towards the EFL class he had positive attitudes towards Minos and was seeking his attention.
The dyslexic pupils’ past experiences in the overall EFL context were mixed. Alexander and Carol suggested that they had positive experiences in their previous EFL classes while Tim and Albert had negative views. Ken’s past years were unclear as he came from Bulgaria a few years before the study was conducted.

The influence of the Greek EFL context, which was enhancing pupils’ instrumental orientation, also arose in the case of pupils with dyslexia at the pre-intervention stage. Most of the dyslexic pupils had their instrumental orientation developed. However, Albert showed high levels of integrative orientation.

It is worth noting that the dyslexic pupils’ valence was at some instances contradictory to their effort. This can be explained from the limited opportunities they had to participate in the lesson. More specifically, although Albert was assigning high value in learning English, he appeared to be putting limited effort since he was excluded from the classroom activities. This was not the case of all the dyslexic pupils. Although Tim and Alexander were also excluded their high valence was in agreement with their high levels of effort. However, Tim was receiving differentiation from Myrtle and Alexander was having support from his classmates (e.g. they would copy words for him). Ken showed low levels in both these motivational elements (effort, valence) while Carol’s low valence was not in accord with her attempts to participate in tasks and perform well. This is because Carol’s effort was mainly stemming from the pressure she had from her family to learn English.
5.2.6 Dyslexic pupils’ performance and in-class behaviour

As already mentioned in the previous chapter, the pupils’ performance was mainly shown from the skills that each teacher was practicing.

The dyslexic pupils’ low motivation in combination with a lack of differentiation provided by the teachers at the pre-intervention stage (apart from the case of Tim), were resulting in them having limited opportunities to access the curriculum. For pupils with dyslexia, the skills that appeared as less developed were mainly associated with the areas pupils with dyslexia usually struggle with: reading, spelling and writing skills. All these skills were described as low for the A2 level the pupils were at. Also, some performance elements were absent for some of the dyslexic pupils. For instance, no nodes relevant to Tim’s reading or spelling skills appeared while data relevant to his writing abilities were limited. Albert’s vocabulary, listening and spelling skills were also missing from the nodes on his performance. Albert’s writing and his grammar skills, although supported by a number of references, were described as ‘no writing’ and ‘no grammar’ respectively suggesting that although the teacher was practicing these skills, the dyslexic pupils were not responding to them (e.g. no production of written texts).

In spite of the above, dyslexic pupils’ performance in some skills was shown as some performance nodes appeared in this part. Apart from Alexander, all the other dyslexic pupils’ listening and speaking skills were described as low. Carol showed better performance than the rest of the dyslexic pupils in her reading, writing, listening and speaking skills (description ‘low’ for all the skills—see also Table 22).
Ken’s performance at the pre-intervention stage could not be described in individual skills (e.g. reading, writing etc.) because no references gave rise to any of these. Therefore, a general node on his performance was created which was described as low mainly based on the teacher’s general comments.

Some data relevant to dyslexic pupils’ grades appeared at the first stage in Riverlands classroom. Both Carol and Tim had low grades (grade 5 or 5.5 – see also Table 1) in the tests conducted in the first and the second semester. In the other two classrooms no tests took place at the intervention stage. Furthermore, the dyslexic pupils were not included in any of the dictation tasks.

The dyslexic pupils’ attitudes varied among the three classrooms. However, some similarities were also found. Both Alexander and Carol were forming close partnerships with another pupil, though, this was happening for different reasons. Carol needed Helens’ assistance (one of the bright pupils in class) and was heavily dependent on her. Alexander, however, was very close to Keith possibly because neither of them was taking part in the classroom activities. The description ‘distracted’ was used for most of these dyslexic learners (Alexander, Albert, Carol) to describe their in-class behaviour. Furthermore, the description ‘segregated’ appeared for both Ken and Tim, while Ken’s attitudes were mainly described as inappropriate (description: ‘naughty’).
5.3 Intervention

5.3.1 The classroom contexts at the intervention stage

The introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices changed the context in the second part of the project although some contextual characteristics remained. All the teachers’ responded well to my suggestions and most of them adopted the dyslexia-friendly practices. In some cases, the dyslexia-friendly practices were altered to fit to the teachers’ own practice. However, the timeline of the project (see Table 3) posed limitations for the use of the dyslexia-friendly practices (e.g. holiday breaks, national elections).

The problematic materials the teachers were provided with were negatively affecting their practice and the use of the dyslexia-friendly practices. This was mainly suggested by Myrtle (e.g. node ‘teacher problematic materials’). The mixed levels among the pupils and the strong influence of the language schools were still shown. My presence continued to have an effect in the classroom processes, though to a much lesser extent.

5.3.2 The EFL context for the non-dyslexic pupils

Non-dyslexic pupils’ past experiences in EFL were still described as positive in Riverlands classroom. However, they were at this stage shown as negative for the pupils in Highgarden (previously positive) and positive in Winterfell classrooms (previously mixed). This finding could have been the result of the changes in the present context (due to the dyslexia-friendly practices) and of the pupils’ comparisons of their past years with the present situation. For
example, pupils in Highgarden classroom were possibly viewing their present EFL context as better than previous years. These assumptions were later confirmed or disconfirmed from the rest of the motivation elements.

The review of the node on non-dyslexic pupils' (contextual) 'causal attributions at this stage suggested that the EFL teachers in Highgarden and the overall EFL context in Riverlands classrooms were mainly the reasons for their low abilities in English. What was more noticeable though was the absence of the node 'causal attributions' in Highgarden classroom.

5.3.3 Non-dyslexic pupils' motivation

In Riverlands classroom non-dyslexic pupils' motivation appeared as slightly higher than before but not as higher as what was shown in Winterfell and Highgarden classrooms. In Riverlands although some of the motivation elements improved (e.g. higher valence, higher self-efficacy) others remained the same or were described as mixed (e.g. node 'mixed attitudes towards the learning situation').

The dyslexic pupils were feeling less anxiety (though this element was mixed in Highgarden) while their levels of self-efficacy appeared to be higher than before, especially in Highgarden and Riverlands classrooms. In both Winterfell and Riverlands classrooms the dyslexic pupils attitudes towards the EFL class improved while they started valuing the English language learning process more than what was shown at the pre-intervention stage. In Highgarden classroom, pupils' positive attitudes continued to be affected from their
negative views towards the teacher. They were still questioning his motives for the new, positive changes they noticed. As children understand the teachers that are not genuine (Lawrence, 2006), non-dyslexic pupils realised that Minos' indifference had probably remained.

In all classrooms, the dyslexic pupils' main goal in learning English was still guided by their instrumental orientation as most of them wanted to acquire English language certificates. The pupils' belief that English is an essential requirement for professional and study development was recurrent in the data. Non-dyslexic pupils in Winterfell classroom were the only ones that showed higher integrative orientation. These statements were probably stemming from the general Greek EFL framework which enhances EFL learners' instrumental motive.

An element that appeared at the second stage was that, after the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices, changes occurred not only to the pupils' present experiences but in their past experiences too. The pupils' past experiences in Highgarden classroom were described as more negative than the pre-intervention stage. This was possibly influenced from the comparisons the dyslexic pupils started making with the current learning situation.

Furthermore, the node 'NDP's attitudes towards dyslexic pupils' inclusion' appeared at this stage. The review of this node showed that the non-dyslexic pupils had mixed feelings (positive and negative connotations) for the inclusion of the learners with dyslexia in the classroom activities.
5.3.4 Non-dyslexic pupils’ performance

The exploration of non-dyslexic pupils’ performance was mainly focused on their grammar and vocabulary skills possibly because these were the skills the teachers were practicing. In general, non-dyslexic pupils’ performance showed some improvements as the majority of their performance nodes were described as higher than before in some skills. In Riverlands classroom, the pupils showed improved listening and speaking skills. Although some descriptions were 'low' at the pre-intervention stage in some skills these were later described as 'good' or improved based on their review (example see Table 24). In Winterfell and Highgarden classrooms, the dyslexic pupils showed lower levels in vocabulary and grammar respectively. However, in Highgarden classroom pupils appeared to have higher reading levels. It was also noticeable in the data that Minos, described his pupils’ levels in spelling and vocabulary as different or mixed and stopped using the term 'immature' at the intervention stage. However, the term 'immature' was possibly an excuse for his limited knowledge of his learners’ level.

5.3.5 The context for the dyslexic pupils

Carol, Tim, Alexander, Albert and Ken noticed the changes that occurred in their EFL classrooms in this part and both positive and negative changes were noticed. Although Ken suggested more positive past experiences than the pre-intervention stage Carol’s past experiences had changed and were not described as positive as before. Since the data on Tim were limited for this part, his
antecedent factors and the way he was viewing his language-learning context were not so clear.

In contrast to Carol who stopped assigning her low performance to the teacher, Albert and Tim started directing the reasons for their low abilities to the teachers. At the pre-intervention stage Albert was assigning his limited knowledge of English to his family while Tim was internalising his failures.

A negative change that was noticed at this stage was that Alexander's feelings of group cohesion were not as strong as in the first part. This was possibly because his classmates were not providing him with the same support as in the first part.

5.3.6 Dyslexic pupils' motivation

With the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices, most of the dyslexic pupils' motivation appeared as increased. The only exception was Alexander in Winterfell classroom (lowered) and Ken (Highgarden), who showed mixed feelings at this point.

More specifically, some of Alexander's motivation elements were lowered (nodes 'lower valence', 'lower group cohesion') while he showed increased language anxiety and continued to have negative attitudes towards the learning situation. These changes were considered negative. Also, no node on his integrative orientation appeared at this stage. However, there were some positive influences such as the development of his instrumental orientation and his increased effort.
The positive and negative changes on dyslexic pupils’ motivation seemed to be influenced by the way the teachers were using the dyslexia-friendly practices. For example, Penelope was still feeling insecure towards the issue of dyslexia even when she started using the practices. This influenced the way she was attempting to include the dyslexic pupils (e.g. hesitancy in approaching Alexander). Other outside influences that the study could not address might have also contributed to Alexander’s lowered motivation (e.g. family issues).

Furthermore, dyslexic pupils’ motivation appeared to be affected by the way the non-dyslexic pupils’ reacted to the sudden inclusion of the dyslexic pupils in the classroom tasks. For example, the dyslexia-friendly practices negatively influenced Alexander since his sense of group cohesion was lost after the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices (reduced support from classmates). However, Alexander showed increased effort. One reason for this change could be the fact that he was relying on his classmates less than before.

Similar to Alexander, Albert also showed increased effort, higher integrative orientation but lower valence. Albert’s effort appeared as increased as he was given more opportunities to participate in the classroom tasks. However, his difficulties possibly prohibited him from assigning high value to the process of learning English. In Highgarden classroom, both Ken’s and Albert’s language anxiety remained at high levels. This could have resulted from the fact that Minos started asking them to participate in the classroom activities more than before. This was a change that was possibly causing them stress.
Tim and Carol showed lessened instrumental orientation, improved valence and decreased anxiety. Carol showed less integrative orientation and Tim higher as Tim's goals in learning English were mainly relevant with meeting foreigners. Despite this, Tim showed less effort than before. However, data at the intervention stage for Tim were limited because of his frequent absences.

Although Carol and Ken's 'effort' nodes did not appear at this stage, Carol showed higher self-related beliefs than before. She was the only dyslexic pupil whose self-related beliefs appeared as improved at this stage.

5.3.7 Dyslexic pupils' performance and in-class behaviour

Exploring changes in dyslexic pupils' performance was difficult at this stage, as limited performance data had been traced at the pre-intervention so as to make comparisons. Despite this, some positive influences were shown in some areas.

Most of the nodes on dyslexic pupils' performance were described as low. In some cases, improvements were shown (description 'improvement'- see example, Table 24), especially in the pupils' speaking skill. This could have been the result of their increased participation in speaking exercises. Carol was the only dyslexic pupil whose listening and grammar skills improved. Albert's writing and reading skills appeared as slightly better too.

Similar to his motivation, Tim's performance could not be evaluated due to his frequent absences. However the limited data available suggested that Tim's performance levels remained low. Interestingly,
although no nodes on Ken’s performance appeared in the first part, a
general node on his performance was created at this stage. The
latter indicates Ken’s increased inclusion in the classroom activities.

Although most of the pupils with dyslexia appeared as being more
included than before some negative elements were influencing their
successful inclusion. Alexander was not forming partnerships with
Keith during the intervention stage because Keith started
participating in the activities. Therefore, Alexander’s response to
the changes appeared as negative. This, in combination with his
exclusion from group activities, is probably why Alexander was sitting
alone in front of the teacher’s desk and was in need for assistance.

In Highgarden classroom, Albert showed both negative (e.g. not
listening to the teacher’s instructions) and positive attitudes (e.g.
trying to find a pair for a pair-work exercise). However, Ken’s
aggressive behaviour was not improved. In Riverlands classroom, Carol
was the only pupil with dyslexia that showed more positive attitudes
in class compared to the previous stage. Tim’s attitudes remained
mixed at this stage.
5.4 EFL teachers’ experiences

5.4.1 Pre-intervention

Data at the pre-intervention stage showed that the EFL teachers were feeling insecure and knew that their work was undermined. This was noticed in the teachers’ practice since Minos was indifferent, Penelope was working with two pupils and Myrtle could not impose herself during the lesson.

More specifically, Myrtle and Penelope were negative towards their context and were feeling stressed. Myrtle was tired of moving to different schools while Penelope had been changing schools for all the four years she had been working in public education. As Penelope suggested, this was not allowing her to know her EFL pupils well. Penelope and Myrtle were describing the resources the Greek Ministry of Education was providing them as problematic. Furthermore, the mixed ability learners found in their classrooms were stressing them. This is the reason why Penelope was in need for assistance. In Myrtle’s case, parents’ frequent interventions in her practice were reinforcing her negative attitudes towards her context.

Penelope seemed more confident than Myrtle who was sometimes questioning her work. However, both of them suggested that there were cases where they felt stressed especially at the beginning of the study.

Despite the fact that Minos originally appeared as having low confidence, data provided convincing evidence that Minos’ strongest
characteristic was his indifference; for example, he was excusing the limited teaching that was taking place in the classroom by suggesting that the pupils had rather premature levels in English. Moreover, the absence of a node that described teachers' attitudes towards his context reinforces the assumption that Minos was indifferent. Minos' indifference explains his negative response towards reading the resources on dyslexia and the fact that he did not appear as stressed at the beginning of the project.

The classroom conditions in each classroom were also affecting teachers' experiences. Personality differences among the teachers (e.g. low confidence - Myrtle) were also relevant. Although mixed ability learners were found in Myrtle's classroom, this was not stopping her from using updated practices and using English in class. Moreover, Myrtle was providing different materials for Tim to enhance his inclusion despite the fact that she was not aware Tim had been identified with dyslexia.

On the other hand, Penelope was dealing with the differences among her learners by using traditional teaching methods and working with only two pupils in class. The strong influence of the language schools was resulting in most EFL teachers feeling that their job was undermined. For instance, Penelope and Myrtle asserted that the private English language schools were having a negative influence on their classroom contexts. However, Minos was not negative towards the strong influence of the private language schools in his classroom and suggested that the fact that some pupils were learning things outside school was making teaching an easier process for him.
As seen in Table 32, the EFL teachers’ response to the introduction of the resources on dyslexia varied. The themes under the title ‘pre-intervention’ (first row boxes) were themes that emerged at the beginning of the study where the resources on dyslexia had been introduced.

Table 32: EFL teachers’ experiences

Two of the teachers showed interest and read the resources I gave them at the per-intervention stage (Penelope and Myrtle). On the contrary, Minos was indifferent towards reading them. Therefore, only in Riverlands and Winterfell classrooms did the teachers’ awareness of dyslexia increase. Furthermore, although Penelope was motivated towards reading the resources at the beginning of the project, at the intervention stage she showed more interest in using the dyslexia-friendly practices. Myrtle kept reading the resources throughout the whole project.

At the pre-intervention stage, it was also notable that the interaction between the teachers and the dyslexic pupils was limited...
or non-existent in all the three cases. This behaviour possibly stemmed from the teachers' limited awareness of dyslexia.

5.4.2 Intervention

In contrast to the dyslexia resources where teachers' response was partly positive, all the three teachers responded well to the employment of the dyslexia-friendly practices (Table 32). The way the teachers used the dyslexia-friendly practices was different. Minos employed the dyslexia-friendly practices very close to the way these were instructed in the documents and Penelope and Myrtle adapted the dyslexia-friendly practices in a way that fitted their own practice. For example, Penelope kept practising dictation, but in a more dyslexia-friendly manner (e.g. repeating the words twice) while Myrtle started using highlighters and different coloured paper in an environmental project she had started from the beginning of the school year. A common finding was that all the three teachers started approaching the dyslexic EFL pupils and including them in the classroom activities.

Data showed that the teachers experienced positively the dyslexia-friendly practices as they all noted that they helped them deal with the dyslexic pupils. However, the teachers' stance and their previous approaches shaped the way the dyslexia-friendly practices were used and influenced the way they experienced my intervention.

In the teacher interviews, Myrtle and Penelope noted that they were in favour of the dyslexia-friendly practices and the resources I gave them. Also, although Myrtle and Penelope were feeling stressed at
the beginning of the project this was reduced during the second part of the study. However, their negative attitudes towards their context remained. Minos was resistant towards reading the resources throughout the whole project despite the fact that he used dyslexia-friendly practices within his lesson while he also attempted to include Ken and Albert. Minos suggested that he would not use the dyslexia-friendly practices in the future unless he had pupils with dyslexia in his class. Also, Minos continued to describe the dyslexic learners as pupils with 'low abilities' (based on teacher interview data).

Furthermore, his limited awareness of dyslexia resulted in using the dyslexia-friendly practices in way that was not always inclusive and was causing anxiety to both Albert and Ken.

Although Minos' strongest characteristic was his indifference I am not assuming it was mutually exclusive with confidence issues. As it appeared from the data, despite the fact that Minos remained indifferent towards his practice and the resources throughout the study, he employed a number of dyslexia-friendly practices in the intervention stage. Also, at the end of the project Minos voluntarily wrote his own reflections about their impact. The reasons behind Minos' response to the study could be several. One explanation could be that Minos needed support and encouragement, something which was satisfied with my role in the study (see section 3.3.5).

On the other hand, Penelope and Myrtle responded well to my intervention at both stages. However, they were both feeling stressed with the changes and were not confident in approaching the dyslexic pupils. For example, although Penelope appeared to understand better Alexander's difficulties and was addressing him...
more than before, she appeared as insecure about how to approach him and provide support. This was shown in the data from the teacher interviews and the classroom observations. Penelope was a teacher who was feeling confident only in areas that were already familiar to her (e.g. vocabulary and dictation tasks). Furthermore, Penelope’s need for support was stronger than Myrtle (node ‘teacher need for assistance’) and needed more encouragement than Myrtle in using the dyslexia-friendly practices.

However, Myrtle was insecure about her teaching and this is probably why, at the intervention stage she was still suggesting that the resources available and the classrooms’ context (e.g. noisy, different pupils) were prohibiting factors for using the dyslexia practices. Despite her insecurity, Myrtle was more audacious than Penelope and more eager in employing the dyslexia-friendly practices. At the intervention stage, Myrtle also started approaching Tim and Carol a lot more than before in a way that enhanced their inclusion in the classroom activities.

It is possible that teachers’ similar teaching experience (two to four years) influenced their response. All the three of them were young and newly appointed in the schools. However, Minos’ teaching experience was mainly in afternoon supportive EFL classes where he was mainly helping pupils with their homework. Despite their differences, all the teachers appeared to be open to participating in new projects and updating their practices from the beginning of the study. Teachers’ response might have been different if more experienced teachers had been included in the study (e.g. teachers with more experience in working with dyslexic pupils)
There seems to be no compelling reason to argue that the way the teachers’ responded to the dyslexia-friendly practices was influenced by their school context. It is not coincidental that the head teachers’ stance in each school was similar to the EFL teachers’ stance in most cases (apart from Winterfell). For example, Minos’ indifference was influenced by his head teacher’s negative attitudes towards the profession (see also. In Riverlands School, the fact that Myrtle was motivated to employ new teaching methods such as the dyslexia-friendly practices was probably because her head teacher was in favour of projects that promote teachers’ professional development. The latter was also one of the reasons Myrtle appeared as a more daring teacher than Minos and Penelope.

Teachers’ response to the resources on dyslexia influenced the way the dyslexia-friendly practices were employed by the teachers. Minos who had not read the resources employed the dyslexia-friendly practices in a different manner than Myrtle and Penelope who had gained some understandings of dyslexia at the pre-intervention stage.

In practice, Penelope and Minos shifted away from the previous traditional approaches they were using at the pre-intervention stage. However, Minos continued to highly emphasise the dictation skill. Despite the fact that new tasks were introduced (e.g. speaking) the dyslexia-friendly practices Minos and Penelope employed were mainly focusing on the same skills as the pre-intervention stage. For example, both of them chose dyslexia-friendly practices that were relevant to vocabulary and grammar activities. The fact that they would not attempt massive changes in the curriculum indicates that they were hesitant in changing their overall teaching approach.
In contrast to Penelope and Minos, Myrtle was adopting teaching approaches different from the ones commonly used in public EFL classes. This influenced the way she employed the dyslexia-friendly practices. She was also bringing her own resources at the intervention stage (e.g. brought her personal computer for the song, colour highlighters). However, the node ‘teacher-angry’ that appeared only for Myrtle at the intervention stage can be related with the fact that she still appears as insecure about her teaching.

All the teachers noted that the time the dyslexia-friendly practices were used was limited. The question on whether the teachers would participate in a similar study in the future further demonstrated how they experienced my intervention. Myrtle and Penelope suggested that they would be interested in being part of similar projects in the future in contrast to Minos who noted that he would not be interested in engaging in a study on dyslexia in the future.

5.4.3 Summary

Although the dyslexia-friendly practices were employed in the same education context (Greek primary EFL education), the way they were working in each classroom depended on various factors; each classroom’s distinctive contextual characteristics produced different results. Also, the way the dyslexia-friendly practices were impacting on dyslexic and non-dyslexic pupils’ motivation and performance was highly dependent on the teachers’ practice. Differences among the pupils (dyslexic and non-dyslexic) were also shown.
Despite the different contextual characteristics and the differences in the way the dyslexia-friendly practices were used, the above discussion shows that the effects of the dyslexia-friendly practices influenced positively most of the pupils’ motivation (dyslexic and non-dyslexic). Non-dyslexic pupils’ performance also appeared as improved. However, some negative results were also shown such as the lowered motivation for one of the dyslexic pupils (Alexander's) and the negative attitudes some of the non-dyslexic pupils showed towards dyslexic pupils’ inclusion. Increased motivation did not always result in performance improvements possibly because of other factors intervening (e.g. background, personal characteristics).

The EFL teachers’ experiences were mainly described as positive but this was mainly in relevance to the dyslexia-friendly practices. Their response to the dyslexia training varied as not all of them read the resources I provided at the pre-intervention stage of the study.

The above cross-case comparisons helped me in reaching final conclusions by comparing the patterns that arose from all the three classrooms. The following chapter discusses the significance of my study’s findings and how these contribute to the field of dyslexia and English language teaching.
6 Discussion

6.1 Introduction

This chapter brings together the previous chapters of this thesis to discuss whether the original aim was accomplished and how new knowledge has been gained. Firstly, I revisit the study’s research questions and answer them individually based on my results. Secondly, I compare the results with relevant literature. In cases no studies with similar results are found, I present the new issues that arose and establish my study’s contribution to knowledge. Finally, the limitations of this study are acknowledged and recommendations for further research are put forward.

The present study was a case study research that explored the effects of the dyslexia-friendly practices (BDA, 2005) in the Greek context where English is taught as a Foreign language. It was an intervention study since I interfered in the setting by suggesting new practices to EFL teachers in three different classrooms in Greece. The dyslexia-friendly practices I introduced were selected because they have been shown to enhance inclusion for pupils with dyslexia in
the UK. My purpose was to investigate whether dyslexia inclusion was achieved in three Greek EFL classrooms, which were the cases of this case study research. The impact of the dyslexia-friendly practices was explored with reference to dyslexic and non-dyslexic EFL pupils’ motivation and performance. The focus on the non-dyslexic pupils was due to the mainstream character of this study. The dyslexia-friendly practices were introduced in three mainstream EFL classrooms and this posed the need to explore their effects on all the EFL pupils.

What is more, limited studies on inclusion have looked into the effects of inclusive practices on non-dyslexic pupils. The EFL teachers’ experiences of using the dyslexia-friendly practices were also important, as they were asked to read resources on dyslexia and employ the dyslexia-friendly practices in their classrooms. The need to address teachers’ experiences arose as a need from the beginning of the study as teachers’ views and attitudes were influencing the intervention. The latter, in combination with the limited research that exists in EFL teachers’ experiences of training and inclusion (Smith, 206) lead to the design of my third research question (see section 6.2 below).

6.2 Research questions

The research area of the project was:

How the dyslexia-friendly practices ‘work’ in an EFL context? Are they ‘friendly’ to dyslexic and non-dyslexic EFL learners? How do EFL teachers experience the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices?
The research questions were:

1. How do dyslexia-friendly practices affect dyslexic EFL learners’:
   a. motivation towards learning English?
   b. performance in English language tasks?

2. How do dyslexia-friendly practices affect non-dyslexic EFL learners’:
   a. motivation towards learning English?
   b. performance in English language tasks?

3. How do EFL teachers experience:
   a. the introduction of dyslexia-friendly practices in their classrooms?

An exploration of all pupils’ motivation and performance before (pre-intervention) and during the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices (intervention), showed whether, and what kind of changes occurred. The EFL teachers’ experiences of the resources of dyslexia and of using the dyslexia-friendly practices were also addressed.

Influenced by a Realist stance (Sayer, 2000), in the following sections I revisit the research questions in association with the contextual elements of each classroom at both stages of the study. The comparison between the two stages helped me answer my research questions. The group of pupils with dyslexia is firstly
explored followed by the group of their peers. Later, I present the EFL teachers' experiences of my intervention.

6.2.1 First Research Question:

How do dyslexia-friendly practices affect dyslexic EFL learners':

a. motivation towards learning English?

b. performance in English language tasks?

6.2.1.1 Motivation (pre-intervention stage)

At the pre-intervention stage, dyslexic pupils’ motivation varied as this was influenced by contextual characteristics (e.g. peer relationships) and the pupil variability (e.g. background differences).

Two of the five dyslexic pupils included in this study, Alexander and Ken, had additional languages apart from Greek and English. This appeared to create confusion, especially to Ken, who was listening and was sometimes asked to speak four different languages simultaneously (Greek, Bulgarian, English, French).

Research has shown that dyslexic language learners have low motivation (e.g. Csizér & Kormos, 2010). The review of dyslexic pupils’ nodes at the pre-intervention stage confirmed this finding as most of them were described as negative. The majority of the dyslexic pupils showed low self-related beliefs, high language anxiety and had negative attitudes towards their EFL context. They were finding the EFL classroom stressing and confusing. Also, the references that were traced in the nodes ‘integrative orientation’ and ‘instrumental
orientation’ were much fewer than the ones that appeared for their non-dyslexic peers.

In all the EFL classrooms, the dyslexic pupils were excluded from the classroom activities. The nodes on dyslexic pupils’ effort showed that this motivational element was limited. This was confirmed from the observational data as their participation in tasks appeared as very limited and, in some cases, non-existent. The interviews with the EFL teachers showed that they did not consider the pupils with dyslexia as their responsibility while they would very rarely approach them in class or ask them to participate in the classroom activities.

Dyslexic pupils’ response to their segregation varied; some of them were forming partnerships with other segregated pupils (e.g. Alexander with Keith) while others would seek the teacher’s attention (e.g. Albert). None of the three EFL teachers provided differentiation for pupils with dyslexia, apart from the case of Myrtle who was giving Tim materials (e.g. books) from lower level classes. The lack of support to dyslexic EFL pupils is in agreement with Martin’s (2013) claim that language classrooms usually fail to provide differentiation for pupils with dyslexia. This poses the need for more research in the field of language teaching for dyslexic pupils. In Riverlands classroom, despite the fact that Myrtle was providing Tim with different materials, she was not aware that he was a pupil with dyslexia. The reason for this differentiation was Tim’s low level in English. Myrtle’s ignorance, in combination with Minos’ and Penelope’s lack of interaction with dyslexic pupils illustrates that dyslexic pupils in Greece are not considered as part of mainstream (including subject) teachers’ responsibility (Papalouka,
Furthermore, data confirmed the lack of cooperation between specialist teachers and subject teachers in Greek education (Rontou, 2010) as none of the three EFL teachers had made contact with the specialist teachers in their schools.

Apart from the lack of differentiation for the dyslexic pupils, other in-class factors appeared to be resulting in dyslexic pupils' low motivation. One of these factors was dyslexic pupils' relationship with their peers. For example, Tim and Albert were sitting alone in the back of the classroom and had limited contact with their classmates during the lesson. Furthermore, Ken was showing aggressive behaviour towards his classmates. These patterns show lack of group cohesion and confirm Clement et al.'s claim that pupils' motivation is influenced by the feelings of cohesion they experience (Clement et al., 1994). However, although Alexander felt part of the classroom group, his motivation was low possibly because, other factors (e.g. personality, background) also influenced these feelings (based on Burden, 2005). For example, Albert suggested several times that he found it confusing when his family was trying to help him study English ('Albert family confusion' node). Another example is Alexander who was an immigrant pupil from Albania and who might have been more motivated to master Greek rather than English. Carol's relationship with her classmates was not addressed, mainly because she was highly dependent on the girl that was sitting next to her. Carol's dependence on another pupil was similar to Alexander's tendency to form partnerships with Keith during the lesson. These patterns arose possibly because no differentiation was taking place in class and neither Carol nor Keith could participate in the classroom
activities. It is likely that their need for support was met with the close relationship they were forming with these classmates. Carol was continuously asking for support from her friend while Alexander was very often sitting with Keith and was not participating in the classroom tasks.

Although it seemed that Alexander was receiving support from most of his classmates (e.g. copying things from the board for him), this was not enhancing his inclusion. This shows that, although peer relationships are important for the creation of a supportive environment for the dyslexic pupils (Humphrey & Mullins, 2002), other elements such as lack of inclusive approaches (shown in Alexander’s classroom) impede the creation of a motivational classroom atmosphere for dyslexic language learners (Kormos et al., 2009).

Furthermore, the finding that Alexander was receiving support from his classmates and had good relationship with most of them, disconfirms the claim that non-dyslexic pupils tend to segregate or even bully pupils with dyslexia because of their difficulties (Rose, 2009; Terras et al., 1999). Nevertheless, non-dyslexic pupils were segregating Albert and Tim in Highgarden and Riverlands classrooms respectively (e.g. Tim sitting alone in the back of the class) while there were cases were the dyslexic pupils were bullied. On the other hand, Ken in Highgarden was intimidating his classmates. Ken’s bullying behaviour was possibly a defence mechanism (e.g. prevent his classmates from bullying him). Past, unknown experiences might have also caused this response (e.g. Ken having been bullied in previous school years).
Broader contextual factors were also contributing dyslexic pupils' low motivation. The majority of the dyslexic pupils were not forming part of the overall Greek EFL context because, in contrast to most of their non-dyslexic peers, they were not attending private English language classes outside school (apart from Carol). This finding demonstrates the strong influence the private English institutes have on the Greek EFL system (Tziava, 2003). In the case of the dyslexic pupils, no data gave rise to a 'language school description' like their non-dyslexic peers. The latter might also explain the limited data in dyslexic pupils' integrative and instrumental orientation previously mentioned.

So, apart from the difficulties dyslexic pupils were facing in class, they were also compared with their non-dyslexic peers who were learning English outside school. Dyslexic pupils' exclusion from the broader EFL context has also been noted by other researchers who have found that the Greek EFL context is not a level playing field for learners with dyslexia (Petala, 2011). In this study, this was resulting in greater differences between dyslexic and non-dyslexic pupils' performance levels. Dyslexic EFL pupils' exclusion from the broader Greek EFL context, in combination with the negative feelings pupils with dyslexia experience in mainstream contexts (Chapman, 1988b; Resnick & Harter, 1989; Humphrey, 2002) are factors that were contributing to dyslexic pupils' low motivation.

Despite the strong presence of private language institutes in Greece, the number of studies that have explored dyslexic pupils' inclusion in the private Greek EFL sector is limited. In Greece, only a few private schools cater for learners with dyslexia. For example, the private
English language institute ‘I love dyslexia’ in Athens is teaching English to pupils with dyslexia following multisensory approaches, using ICT, etc. However, inclusion is not promoted, as this institute is designed exclusively for dyslexic pupils and not for non-dyslexic learners. The lack of differentiation and support for dyslexic pupils in the public and the private EFL sector in Greece, further supports the claim that the dyslexic pupils' inclusion in language contexts is problematic (Martin, 2013).

In this study, although Carol was not assigning high value in learning English, she was the only dyslexic pupil that was attending an English language institute. Furthermore, she showed negative attitudes towards learning English. Carol’s low motivation could imply that she was feeling excluded in the language institute too. However, this is only an assumption. On the contrary, although the rest of the pupils with dyslexia were only learning English at school, they were assigning high value to the whole process. Their views were probably influenced from contextual conditions (e.g. family, school context); English language has a high status in Greece and learning to speak and write in English is highly valued (Tziava, 2003). Despite the high valence dyslexic pupils showed, the node on their effort was low as they were excluded from the EFL classroom context. This was prohibiting them from developing their skills in the target language.

Data in this study confirmed the claim that pupils with dyslexia tend to have low self-related beliefs (Csizér & Kormos, 2010; Humphrey, 2002; 2003; Burden, 2008) as this node appeared as low for all of the dyslexic pupils. Despite their low self-related beliefs, the dyslexic EFL pupils were not internalising their failures. Instead,
they were mainly attributing their low EFL performance to external contextual factors such as the teacher or the learning situation. Albert's contextual attributions were mainly towards his family while there were cases where Alexander was suggesting this too (e.g. no help from the family). This finding contrasts relevant literature that suggests that pupils with low self-related beliefs (self-concept, self-efficacy, self-esteem) do not usually externalise their failures (attributing them to external factors) (Terras et al., 2009; Burden, 2008). However, dyslexic pupils' external causal attributions were supported by data as they were experiencing exclusion in their EFL classes and the opportunities to participate in tasks were limited. Their low self-related beliefs were possibly the result of their difficulties and environmental factors (exclusion). This finding is in agreement with Humphrey's (2003a) statement that "self-perceptions are acquired mainly in a social context" (p. 130) (in this case the EFL classroom context). Furthermore, it disconfirms Clement et al.'s (1994) suggestion that self-confidence is not dependent on the classroom atmosphere. However, Clement and his colleagues were not referring to dyslexic language learners whose self-related beliefs are usually complex because of their difficulties (Burden, 2008).

The limited opportunities dyslexic pupils were receiving to participate in classroom tasks was probably the reason most of them, apart from Tim, had negative attitudes towards the learning situation in their EFL classes. Tim's positive views, on the other hand, were possibly triggered because of Myrtle's differentiation (lower level materials). Results showed that dyslexic pupils' exclusion was a combination of
external and internal factors (see Figure 28). Apart from the lack of differentiation provided in the EFL classrooms, the dyslexic pupils' low self-related beliefs were causing them stress (emotional arousal based on Bandura, 1977) and were prohibiting them from participating in tasks (e.g. reading and writing activities) and practice their language skills. This was resulting in dyslexic pupils' low performance levels.

Figure 28: Exclusion is the result of an interaction of internal (blue boxes) and external factors (purple colour)

The above figure is designed based on Realism to explain the relationship of the context with dyslexic pupils' exclusion and low self-related beliefs. In the 'top-down' table the context had resulted in a lack of differentiation for dyslexic pupils as teachers' knowledge of dyslexia was not triggered (generative mechanism). This resulted in the pupils not being able to participate in the classroom tasks (outcome). Similarly, the context appeared to be triggering dyslexic pupils' low self-related beliefs and causing them stress (generative
mechanisms). This was possibly resulting in the pupils avoiding to take part in the classroom tasks.

In the case of Alexander, his low self-related beliefs were not causing him anxiety possibly because of the high levels of group cohesion and the support he was provided with. This finding disconfirms the suggestion by Clement et al. (1994) that anxiety is not related to the classroom situation.

Bandura’s theory on personal mastery experiences (Bandura, 1977) suggests that the extent to which people have failures or successes determines their expectations: success leads to greater expectations while failure lowers them. The findings of this study demonstrated that dyslexic pupils’ exclusion from the classroom activities and from the broader EFL context (language institutes). The latter, in combination with their low performance (see following section) was resulting in them having low or no expectations in learning English. It was noticeable that none of the dyslexic pupils had any specific goals in learning English (no nodes on ‘goal salience’).

6.2.1.2 Performance (pre-intervention stage)

Dyslexic pupils’ performance was low and, in some cases, non-existent at the pre-intervention stage (absence of performance nodes). This was possibly influenced by their low motivation. The latter confirms the suggestion made by Dornyei (1994) that “motivation is one of the main determinants of second/foreign language learning achievement” (p.273). However, other factors should be acknowledged in the motivation-performance relationship such as individual differences.
and context (Gardner, 2003). Explorations of the context showed that dyslexic learners’ low performance was influenced by the dyslexic pupils’ overall exclusion from the Greek EFL context previously discussed as they were given limited opportunities to practice their skills. As a result, all the dyslexic EFL pupils showed very low levels in most skills (speaking, listening, writing, reading) with greater difficulties in their reading, writing and spelling abilities. This finding agrees with previous studies that have shown that dyslexic pupils’ first language literacy difficulties (reading, writing, spelling) will persist in the process of second, foreign or additional language learning (Sparks & Ganschow, 1993; Miller & Lundberg, 2000; Helland & Kaasa, 2005; Geva et al., 2000; Goldfus, 2013). Moreover, data showed that dyslexic pupils had attention problems. This corroborates with the findings of previous work on dyslexia that suggests that dyslexic pupils’ sometimes find it difficult to maintain their attention during tasks (Torgesen et al., 1999). Data from the classroom observations and the teacher interviews showed that most of the pupils with dyslexia were getting easily distracted and were easily losing their attention during the classroom tasks.

Although the theoretical framework of this study followed a linear approach of performance and motivation, it is acknowledged that these two elements have a cyclical relationship (Ushioda, 1996; Dornyei & Otto, 1998). The data were analysed following a realism approach in which motivation was seen as a generative mechanism triggered or not by contextual characteristics, leading to certain performance outcomes. The low performance of the dyslexic pupils
was the result of their exclusion and lack of task participation: the context was not triggering their motivation to practice their skills (outcome). However, it is acknowledged that the opposite route of motivation and performance is also important. Ellis (1994) suggests that good performance might increase learners’ confidence and, in turn, motivation (‘resultative motivation’). This reciprocity was not addressed in this study because it would complicate the data analyses processes. For example, the fact that dyslexic pupils’ limited practice of skills (outcome) was resulting in low motivation (personal competency) was not explored (Bandura, 1977). This has already been stated in the data analysis chapter (see section 4.5 and Figure 29 below blue arrow).
The introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices resulted in the increased participation of the dyslexic pupils in the classroom activities. Furthermore, the EFL teachers started approaching the dyslexic pupils more than before. At the intervention stage, it appeared that the dyslexic pupils were also finding their classroom more inclusive, as they stopped attributing their failures to the context (contextual causal attributions). However, differences among the three classrooms were shown. The dyslexia-friendly practices
and teacher’s behaviour negatively influenced Albert as he started to attribute his low abilities to the teacher (in the first part he was attributing these to his family). Carol, Tim and Ken had no causal attributions at this stage, while Alexander continued to internalise his failures. Other more general contextual elements remained (e.g. strong influence of private language institutes).

6.2.1.3 Motivation (intervention stage)

The new or altered activities the teachers started to use at the intervention stage increased the motivation of three of the dyslexic pupils. Most of the nodes on their ‘effort’ and ‘valence’ were described as higher and their attitudes towards the learning situation increased. However, no effort nodes were shown for two pupils (Ken and Carol). Signs of improved self-efficacy were also shown (e.g. Carol, Tim, Albert). Ken’s motivation was unclear; Carol, Albert and Ken started to be included in the classroom activities and the EFL teachers were approaching them more than before. Besides, the dyslexia-friendly practices are designed to enhance performance and create positive feelings to the dyslexic pupils (BDA, 2005).

Dyslexic pupils’ causal attributions also varied; Tim, Carol and Ken showed no causal attributions while Alexander started attributing his failures to the teacher at this stage (not towards his family). Carol and Tim showed lower anxiety than before while Alexander, Albert and Ken showed higher. Dyslexic pupils’ higher anxiety was caused by the fact that the pupils with dyslexia at this stage, are suddenly asked to participate in tasks and use their language skills. However, these had not been well developed by that stage (data from the pre-
intervention stage) as they were previously excluded. This sudden practice of skills in combination with non-dyslexic pupils' negative response, in most cases, enhanced their feelings of failure and raised their language anxiety (emotional arousal – Bandura, 1977).

The element of group cohesion affected dyslexic pupils’ motivation and inclusion during the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices. The loss of group cohesion was one of the reasons Alexander appeared to have lower motivation. Alexander could not form partnerships with Keith in this part, as Keith was involved in the classroom activities with the intervention. At this stage, Alexander was feeling more stressed ('language anxiety' node) than before and was not feeling part of a group (group cohesion). He also showed reduced valence and reduced integrative orientation. His self-efficacy remained low.

At instances, the non-dyslexic pupils' were showing negative attitudes towards the inclusion of their dyslexic peers. For example, the non-dyslexic pupils were not receptive towards working together with the pupils with dyslexia because they were slowing them down in group tasks. As already mentioned, Alexander's motivation was lowered despite the fact that the teacher was approaching him more than before and was differentiating the classroom activities. He was also feeling more stressed at the intervention stage. One reason for Alexander's lowered motivation was that the non-dyslexic pupils were not supporting him to the same extent as before. Similarly, in Highgarden classroom, the teacher introduced activities that were involving pair or group work and Albert was not always welcome. This finding disconfirms the suggestion that group and pair work among
the pupils positively affects their motivation (Dörnyei, 1994). However, group work might be a more sensitive area for dyslexic pupils, especially in settings like Greek state schools where the curriculum is not promoting group activities in class. What is more, non-dyslexic pupils' negative response was caused by the fact that they had not been used to work with their dyslexic peers. Mainstream pupils' negative response towards dyslexic pupils' inclusion is similar to the findings from a study by Ralli, Margeti, Doudoni, Pantelemidou, Rozou and Evaggelopoulou, (2011) who explored the views of Greek mainstream pupils towards their SpLD peers. They found that the mainstream pupils, although positive towards socializing with SpLD pupils, were less willing to sit or share the same class with them. Data also showed that non-dyslexic pupils were sometimes undermining the pupils with dyslexia and, similar to their teachers, they were not aware of their difficulties (Ralli et al., 2011). The above findings pose important implications for the workings of the dyslexia-friendly practices in contexts other than the UK and show that the contextual conditions influence the inclusive character of the dyslexia-friendly practices.

Although the dyslexia-friendly practices had positive effects on most of the dyslexic pupils' motivation, it is a finding that needs to be further elaborated. Motivation is a complex and dynamic concept (Ushioda, 1996) and, apart from the context and personal factors, learners' emotional influences impact on the motivation of language learners (Dörnyei, 2001). For example, areas such as self-esteem are sensitive for learners with dyslexia because of their difficulties (Humphrey, 2003). This might further complicate their motivation.
Some data also showed that dyslexic pupils’ motivation was affected by various other factors, such as family issues (e.g., Carol: pressure to learn English from the family), their background (e.g., immigrant pupils) and personality characteristics. This assumption was influenced by other researchers in the field of dyslexia who suggest that dyslexic pupils’ individual differences, background factors and past experiences, affect their skills and their response to interventions (see Bruck et al., 1997; Raz & Bryant, 1990; Vellutino et al., 1996; Frith, 1997; Torgesen et al., 1999; Mortimore et al., 2012). However, personal and background factors were not addressed in sufficient detail in the present study due to time limitations.

The way the EFL teachers were using the practices was influencing the extent to which dyslexic pupils’ motivation was triggered. This finding shows that teachers play an essential role in inclusive attempts, confirming similar findings from other studies (e.g., Dyson & Millward, 2000; Collins, 2005; Ainscow & Sandill, 2010). Further particulars on teachers’ response will be discussed in more detail in the ‘teachers’ experiences’ section.

The time the dyslexia-friendly practices were suggested was another factor that affected non-dyslexic pupils’ response to dyslexic pupils’ inclusion. In this study, the dyslexia-friendly practices were introduced in the middle of the school year and only in the pupils’ EFL classroom. The fact that the non-dyslexic pupils were asked to work with their dyslexic peers was new and unexpected. Furthermore, a whole-school dyslexia-friendly approach was not followed. The non-dyslexic pupils might have shown different responses if dyslexic pupils’ inclusion had also been attempted in other subjects.
6.2.1.4 Performance (intervention stage)

The influences on pupils’ motivation from the changes in the context, improved their performance but only to a small extent. As mentioned before, many factors intervene in the motivation-performance relationship (Dörnyei, 2001; Gardner, 2000). These can be located in school contexts outside the classroom but also within the individual (Gardner, 2003). So, although the context became more inclusive, dyslexic pupils’ difficulties in specific areas were prohibiting them from developing some skills. This finding matches Oxford and Shearin’s (1994) claim about the strong influence of pupils’ skills on the exploration of motivation-performance relationships.

Furthermore, changes in dyslexic pupils’ performance were not significant because the dyslexia-friendly practices were introduced in the middle of the school year for only seven weeks. Therefore, in this time available, the inclusion of pupils with dyslexia in tasks that most of them had not practiced before could not produce important changes in their skills. This finding also shows that exploring changes in dyslexic language learners’ performance is a difficult process, confirming Cline’s argument that “a major challenge in development work on teaching strategies for bilingual children with learning difficulties will be to evaluate the impact on their progress” (Cline & Shamsi, 2000, p. 9).

Data on dyslexic pupils’ performance were limited at both stages of the study. This is because at the pre-intervention stage the pupils were not being included in the activities and the assessment processes (e.g. dictation) and the teachers were not considering them
as their responsibility. Furthermore, the intervention stage was accomplished at the last semester of the school year during which assessment processes are usually rare in Greek state schools. However, the fact that dyslexic pupils participated more in the exercises resulted in the creation of more performance nodes from the performance nodes that appeared at the pre-intervention stage. Apart from Carol, who was the only pupil whose higher motivation also led to higher performance, the new performance themes that arose for some dyslexic pupils and were previously non-existent (e.g. Albert, Ken) was noteworthy. Although difficulties in reading, writing and spelling skills remained, most dyslexic pupils showed improvements in their speaking skills.

6.2.2 Second Research Question

How do dyslexia-friendly practices affect non-dyslexic EFL learners’:

a. motivation towards learning English?

b. performance in English language tasks?

The dyslexia-friendly developments increased non-dyslexic pupils' motivation and performance though there were differences among the three classrooms. These were dependent on personality issues, the classroom context and the teacher's response to the intervention.
6.2.2.1 Motivation (pre-intervention stage)

At the pre-intervention stage, the contextual characteristics in the three EFL classrooms the study took place were activating non-dyslexic pupils' motivation.

The teaching approaches the EFL teachers were using among the three classrooms differed. However, similarities were found between Winterfell and Highgarden classrooms as Penelope and Minos were both using traditional approaches. On the other hand, in Riverlands classroom, Myrtle was employing more interactive and multisensory approaches. These differences among the EFL classrooms were the result of the highly centralised Greek education system, which has been shown in several studies in the Greek context (see Lappas, 1997; Pigiaki, 1999). In state schools in Greece, although a central curriculum has to be followed, the teachers are provided with freedom on the approaches they can employ in subjects such as English. This variability in teachers' practice, results from the lack of school and classroom-based advisors in Greek schools and the absence of teacher assessments (Pigiaki, 1999).

Furthermore, data mirrored relevant literature about the strong influence of the private language institutes in Greece (Tziava, 2003). Apart from the differences between the dyslexic and the non-dyslexic pupils previously discussed, the attendance of some of the non-dyslexic pupils in these schools was also creating unfairness and different levels among them. Teachers were also feeling that their work was undermined. The latter, corroborates with findings from other studies in the Greek EFL framework that have shown the
negative influence of private language schools on the public EFL education (Tziava, 2003; Sifakis, 2008).

Apart from the mixed levels among the pupils in all the EFL classrooms, a number of immigrant pupils from various countries were also complicating the classroom processes. These factors explain the high levels of confusion (noise) in class, especially in the first part of the study. The latter agrees with Ame’s (1992) suggestion that pupils’ experiences and background are transferred in the classroom and influence the classroom processes.

However, despite the diverse EFL learners, none of the teachers was providing differentiated instruction. All the three teachers had negative attitudes towards their context while they were aware that private schools were undermining their profession. Furthermore, it appeared that the significant salary reductions the teachers had suffered the time the study was conducted were, in some cases, creating negative attitudes towards their context, because their material needs were not being met (based on Bennel, 2004).

Apart from the EFL teachers’ needs, the austerity measures in the country were also influencing the contextual characteristics of the classrooms as the limited provision of resources and ICT was apparent in all the three schools. This finding matches Koulouris’ (2014) finding about the negative impact of the austerity measures on Greek education.

Nevertheless, all the above negative contextual characteristics were not leading to low levels of motivation for the non-dyslexic pupils as
this has been already stated at the beginning of this section. However, negative attitudes towards the learning situation had been activated. This was prominent in Highgarden classroom, where the pupils were negative towards their EFL class. This was possibly because of the teacher who was indifferent and wanted more teaching to take place. This finding contrasts Pigiaki's (1987) finding that pupils in Greek state schools are indifferent and bored.

Group cohesion has been put forward as a strong influence on learners' motivation (Clement et al., 1994). This was confirmed in the case of the non-dyslexic pupils. The strong division that existed among the pupils in Riverlands classroom was, among other factors, resulting in the pupils having low levels of motivation. On the contrary, in Highgarden and Winterfell classrooms where the pupils had higher levels of motivation than the Riverlands classroom, the sense of group cohesion was rather high. However, it must be noted that in contrast to Winterfell classroom where Alexander (pupil with dyslexia) was close to his non-dyslexic classmates, in Highgarden the group cohesion was among the non-dyslexic pupils and not the pupils with dyslexia (Albert, Ken).

6.2.2.2 Performance (pre-intervention stage)

Although most of the non-dyslexic pupils were motivated at the pre-intervention stage, their performance levels were described as low or satisfactory. This finding could be due to the presence of intervening factors (e.g. contextual characteristics) and the indirect relationship of motivation and performance (Dörnyei, 2001; Gardner, 2000).
The fact that non-dyslexic pupils had slightly better levels in grammar and vocabulary compared to the other skills (apart from the case of Myrtle) shows that the Greek EFL education in state schools enhances these two skills and tends to disregard more communicative approaches. This mirrors Sifakis' argument that the EFL lessons in Greek schools focus on "the functions and the structures of language" (Sifakis, 2008, p. 233) rather than the use of more communicative approaches (ibid). This was also confirmed from the observational data, which showed that most of the EFL teachers were practicing traditional and not updated teaching approaches (apart from the case of Myrtle). This was possibly due to the teachers' negative attitudes towards their context and the fact that state schools in Greece are undermined compared to the private language institutes (Tziava, 2003).

The mixed levels that existed among the learners in all the classrooms appeared to influence the non-dyslexic pupils' in-class behaviour and, in turn, performance. As a result, learners' different experiences were not only impacting on their motivation (based on Ames, 1992) but on their performance too. The various levels and the different backgrounds among the pupils, in combination with the lack of differentiation mixed level classrooms require (Tomlinson, 2001), were resulting in confusion and noisy classroom environments. The lack of differentiation in the three EFL classrooms explored, confirms the belief that teaching the class as a whole (no differentiation) is rather common in mainstream contexts ( McIntosh et al., 1993; Schumm et al., 1995).
The introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices appeared to change the EFL classroom contexts as the EFL teachers employed them in most of their lessons. Many contextual characteristics remained, such as the strong influence of the private language schools and the lack of resources. Therefore the teachers had to adapt to these conditions. This resulted in the dyslexia-friendly practices used in a way that reflected "local and regional needs" (McKay, 2004, p. 230).

The mixed levels among the learners was an element that appeared as reinforced at this stage as more references supported the 'different levels' node in all the classroom. This could be due to the fact that the EFL teachers were including more pupils in the activities, which made their differences more noticeable than before.

6.2.2.3 Motivation (intervention stage)

Non-dyslexic pupils' motivation remained high or increased at the intervention stage and the non-dyslexic pupils' views of their lessons were more positive (node 'positive attitudes towards the learning situation). Furthermore, most of the non-dyslexic pupils showed increased effort, increased valence and in some cases increased self-efficacy (e.g. Riverlands classroom). It was also noticeable that the value the non-dyslexic pupils' were assigning to learning English was increased. Although some negative motivation elements remained (e.g. negative attitudes towards the teacher in Highgarden) these results confirm the claim that “dyslexia-friendly practice is, in fact, good practice for all” (BDA, 2010 - DFS pack).
6.2.2.4 Performance (intervention stage)

Overall, non-dyslexic pupils’ performance increased after the intervention, apart from the case of Highgarden classroom. The review of the nodes on pupils’ skills showed that the descriptions were altered from ‘low’ or ‘satisfactory’ to ‘good’ in Riverlands and Winterfell classrooms. In some cases the description ‘good’ was altered to ‘very good’ (e.g. Grammar levels in Winterfell).

The increased performance was possibly the result of a combination of increased motivation and increased practice of skills for the non-dyslexic pupils. The teachers stopped focusing extensively on some tasks as they were doing before. For example, Penelope started using more communicative activities and was using less vocabulary tasks. This gave the opportunity to pupils to show their levels in the speaking skill too. This finding is consistent with Kormos’ (2012) proposition that the learning outcomes are influenced from motivation and task practice.

The dyslexic learners’ increased motivation was not linked to increased performance. However, in the case of the non-dyslexic learners, improved motivation was associated with improved performance. This could possibly mean that the motivation-performance relationship is not as complex for non-dyslexic pupils as it is for pupils with dyslexia whose difficulties and low self-related beliefs might complicate this relationship. However, it is acknowledged that other factors were intervening in the case of the non-dyslexic pupils too (e.g. teacher’s practice) as, in some cases,
although they showed increased motivation, their performance was lowered in some skills (e.g. lower grammar levels in Winterfell).

6.2.3 Third research question

How do EFL teachers experience the introduction of dyslexia-friendly practices in their classrooms?

6.2.3.1 Resources on dyslexia (pre-intervention stage)

The teacher’s response, commitment and attitudes towards the resources on dyslexia introduced in the first part of the study varied. This was dependent on many factors such as the context, personal characteristics, confidence and awareness of dyslexia. Apart from the resources the teachers received at the beginning of the study (pre-intervention stage) none of them had received training in the area of disabilities before. The only exception was Penelope’s participation in a short seminar on dyslexia in the past.

The Greek EFL context was triggering the teachers’ negative feelings towards their profession. All the three EFL teachers at the pre-intervention stage were faced with several problems. Examples are the lack of appropriate resources and support, the way the appointment of teachers takes place every year and the mixed-ability learners found in their classrooms. The centrality of the Greek education system (Lappas, 1997; Pigiaki, 1999) was resulting in the teachers having a strong need for assistance in their classrooms to deal with their diverse learners. This could also stem from the fact that the three EFL teachers had similar years of teaching experience...
(two to four years). The teachers were also aware of the low status of Greek public education in the area of EFL (Tziava, 2003) due to the private EFL schools. The austerity measures (Hellenic National Reform Programme 2012-2015) were enhancing the teachers’ negative attitudes towards their context as the lack of resources and support were creating negative experiences.

School conditions were also impacting on the way the teachers were experiencing the intervention. It was shown that the teachers' response and attitudes towards my study was influenced by their school culture. In Riverlands classroom, where the school was enhancing teachers' professional development, Myrtle was motivated to read the resources on dyslexia and participate in my study from the beginning of the project. Myrtle also saw my study as an opportunity to improve her teaching practice. The school's high status and the head teacher's positive attitudes towards research projects triggered Myrtle’s positive response to the resources. Other studies on teacher's practice have shown similar findings; in schools where there is a commitment to school improvement, teachers enhance opportunities for engagement and professional development (Deal & Peterson, 2009).

Apart from contextual elements, personal characteristics were also influencing each teacher's stance and response to my study. Although all the three EFL teachers agreed to participate in the project and were aware of their responsibilities from the start, two of them showed interest and read the resources I gave them. However, as already mentioned, all of them employed the practices. Minos, the teacher that did not show interest in reading the resources at the
The differences in teachers' stance and attitudes towards my intervention were also shown from the way they were responding to the mixed levels found in their classrooms. Besides, studies have shown that teachers' personality as well as beliefs and values, affect teachers' practice (Collins, 2001). For instance, Minos, who was indifferent towards his profession, was also indifferent towards the resources on dyslexia at the pre-intervention stage. Minos' response could stem from personal factors as these are brought into the classroom and affect the teachers' practice (Deal & Peterson, 2009). Minos' indifference was most possibly triggered from the centrality of the Greek education system that lacks teacher assessments (Pigiaki, 1999) and the salary reductions he had suffered.

Another factor resulting in Minos' indifference was the attitudes held within the Greek education system towards inclusive education. According to Greek legislation, dyslexia support is provided by specialist and not to mainstream or subject teachers (Vlachou, 2004). This finding confirms the claim that teachers need support at a
legislative level so as to develop positive attitudes towards inclusion (Sharma et al., 2008). However, although Penelope and Myrtle were found in the same context, they appeared as more motivated teachers from the beginning of the project and were positive towards reading the resources on dyslexia. These findings confirm that there is variability in teachers’ attitudes towards inclusion (Clough & Lindsay, 1991) and that, among other factors, teachers’ response to inclusion is affected by personal characteristics (Deal & Peterson, 2009).

A common element that appeared among the three teachers was their low confidence. It must be noted though that Penelope’s confidence was slightly higher than Minos’ and Myrtle’s. This finding was the result of limited or non-existent support for the teachers who were in need of assistance to deal with the dyslexic and the mixed level learners in their classrooms. The lack of support in combination with the limited training the EFL teachers had received might have been the reasons for their low confidence. This finding is similar with Sharma & Sokal’s (2013) finding that lack of training on special needs negatively affects teacher’s efficacy.

Another common element among the teachers at the pre-intervention stage was the limited interaction they had with the pupils with dyslexia. This was stemming from their limited or lack of knowledge on dyslexia. Similar results have also been drawn in Dereka’s (2001) study who found that Greek teachers’ lack confidence in teaching pupils with difficulties due to limited pre-service training on special education they receive during their studies.
The claim that Greek mainstream teachers do not view dyslexia as their responsibility (Papalouka, 2011) was confirmed in the case of all the EFL teachers at the pre-intervention stage. The teachers were not aware of the number of the dyslexic pupils in their classrooms and were not providing them support or differentiation. However, Myrtle and Penelope were eager to learn more on dyslexia. The latter confirms the suggestion that language teachers are willing to learn more dyslexic learners' inclusion (Gyorfi & Smythe, 2010) and consider dyslexia as a significant matter (Nikolaidis & Matthaioudakis, 2008).

In contrast to the dyslexia training where EFL teachers' response varied, the use of the dyslexia-friendly practices was positively embraced by all the teachers. Teachers' negative or neutral feelings at the beginning of the intervention changed. This was possibly because of my help and support throughout the whole process. This result confirms Sharma and Sokal's (2013) claim about the importance of addressing teachers' concerns when asked to implement inclusive practices. Besides, the provision of continuous support enables teachers to deal with complex situations (Collins, 2005; Avramidis & Kalyva, 2007).

The importance of previous training on teachers' response to inclusion (Sharma et al., 2008; Sharma & Sokal, 2013) was confirmed as the way the dyslexia-friendly practices were employed was based on teachers' stance, background and knowledge of dyslexia. This was also dependent on the teaching approaches each teacher was already using. The three teachers adopted the dyslexia-friendly practices that were closer to their own practice. Although the teachers were
feeling more comfortable in practicing the same skills as before, in
some cases, new tasks were added, influenced by the focus of the
technique they chose to employ (e.g. film - practice of listening skill).
Besides, as it had been guided by relevant literature (Cornwall, as
cited in O’Brien, 2001), the practices were given to the teachers in a
way that there was room for them to decide (e.g. 'Do, Try document
see Appendix 2). Furthermore, the teachers were adapting the
dyslexia-friendly practices according to their own teaching
approaches and their own context. This finding mirrors
Kumaravadivelu’s (2002) suggestion that specified teaching
approaches cannot be prescribed to the teachers, as these are always
adjusted to the various teaching contexts (learners, teachers'
cognition, culture, teachers' stance, etc.).

The practices Myrtle was using at the pre-intervention stage were
sharing similarities with some of the dyslexia-friendly practices. This
was shown from the high number of 'I already do' statements Myrtle
selected in the document provided. However, at the intervention
stage, Myrtle’s practices enhanced the dyslexic pupils’ inclusion in the
classroom as she started approaching the pupils with dyslexia more
than before. Penelope also adapted the dyslexia-friendly practices to
her own lesson though she started practicing more skills. During the
intervention stage, the most significant differences were found in
Minos’ class, where his sense of responsibility increased and more
teaching was taking place in the classroom. This finding confirms
Sharma & Sokal’s (2013) claim that teachers’ direct experience of
models enhances positive attitudes towards inclusive developments.
Studies have shown that inclusion causes anxiety and concerns to teachers (Schaefer, 2003, Sharma & Sokal, 2013). This was confirmed in Penelope's and Myrtle's cases, which were feeling stressed towards employing the dyslexia-friendly practices. However, despite their 'emotional arousal' (Bandura, 1977) Myrtle and Penelope embedded dyslexia-friendly practices in their lessons. This was probably because my support and the knowledge they had gained on dyslexia (resources on dyslexia) were raising their self-efficacy (based on Bandura, 1977).

Although all the teachers started using the dyslexia-friendly practices which enabled them to start including the dyslexic EFL learners, the short information they had received on dyslexia at the pre-intervention stage did not reduce their stress towards approaching the dyslexic learners. The teachers received the resources one month before the intervention and no systematic provision of knowledge or training occurred at the pre-intervention stage. Therefore, although Myrtle's and Penelope's knowledge of dyslexia was raised, it was not sufficient to reduce their 'insecurity' towards approaching the learners with dyslexia. The teachers gained more awareness of the nature of the dyslexic learners' difficulties but not enough so as to feel more confident in approaching them. This result is in agreement with the claim that limited awareness of and training on learners' needs affects teachers' attitudes when implementing inclusive models (Declaration of Education for ALL – EASE, 1995; Garner, 2001; Robertson, 2001; Rontou, 2010; Sharma et al., 2008) and causes them anxiety (Center & Ward, 1987; Fragoyianni, 2009; de Boer et al., 2011; Sharma & Sokal, 2013).
The importance of teacher training and attitudes towards the employment of inclusive models (Cornwall, 2001; Avramidis & Norwich, 2002; Cole, 2005; Sharma et al., 2008, Sharma & Sokal 2013; Gyorfi & Smythe, 2010) has also been shown in language contexts (Kormos et al., 2009). Minos’ lack of awareness of dyslexia influenced negatively the way he employed the dyslexia-friendly practices. Although Albert’s inclusion was enhanced, the way Minos’ was using the practices was not reflecting their ‘friendly’ character. Furthermore, Minos was closer to the pathognomic approach to dyslexia (Jordan & Stanovich, 2003). Therefore, he was not assigning the difficulties to more social factors such as the teaching approaches. This is another reason Minos was not using the practices in an inclusive manner. This confirms Skidmore’s (1999) suggestion that teachers closer to the pathognomic approach to learning difficulties have less effective teaching skills. Minos’ practice at this stage resulted in Albert attributing his failures to the teacher at this stage and feeling more anxiety than before.

What is more, the attempt to include dyslexic pupils was new to all the three EFL teachers and no school support had been put in place. This finding is similar to Collins’ (2005) finding, who showed that changes in teaching practice are seen as unexpected for some teachers whose schools are not “geared to differentiation” (p. 11).

6.3 Contribution to knowledge

The present study is the first doctoral study in which the dyslexia-friendly practices that have been designed in the UK are ‘exported’ to another education system (Greek). The motive for bringing
together the Greek and the British system was the need for more studies on dyslexia inclusion in EFL/EAL/ESL education.

This section is divided into three themes, which are the new issues that arose from the study's findings. Quotes from literature on dyslexia are sometimes presented to illuminate these findings while more general themes are discussed later.

6.4 Dyslexic EFL pupils

"The dyslexia-friendly schools (in this case practices) engage in constant drive to improve achievement of all pupils...there is a feel good factor' throughout the school" (BDA, 2005 – DFS pack).

"The dyslexia-friendly practices raise standards in literacy for multilingual learners with dyslexia" (BDA, 2012 – DFS pack).

The EFL pupils with dyslexia in this study showed gains in the area of motivation and started being included in the EFL classroom. Therefore, the claim that the dyslexia-friendly practices promote good feelings for dyslexic pupils in the processes of learning (BDA, 2005) was confirmed in this case. However, data showed that dyslexic EFL pupils’ motivation was highly dependent on the way the teachers were approaching the dyslexic pupils and on the response of their peers. This finding demonstrates the importance of exploring peer relationships when addressing dyslexic language learners’ motivation.

Dyslexic pupils’ self-related beliefs are also difficult to change as most dyslexic pupils’ self-related beliefs remained low throughout
the study. This shows that other elements such as the EFL curriculum, the education system, pupils’ background elements and personality characteristics might also influence dyslexic language learners’ feelings. Research on dyslexic language learners’ self-related beliefs needs to address personal and beyond school factors to explore the way ‘feel good factors’ can be enhanced.

The dyslexic EFL pupils’ performance did not significantly improve during the intervention stage. It was the first time the dyslexic pupils started being included in an EFL class and some of their EFL skills had not been developed. The absence of data on their performance from the first part of the study confirmed this. Therefore, the dyslexic pupils might needed extra support such as individualised tuition. This finding shows that, there are cases where, apart from classroom adaptations, dyslexic language learners need individual support in the language classroom. This is applicable especially in cases where dyslexic pupils’ inclusion is attempted for the first time in higher-level classrooms where their non-dyslexic peers have already mastered some skills.

6.5 Non-dyslexic pupils

“Dyslexia-friendly good practice is, in fact, good practice for all”? (BDA, 2005 - DFS pack).

The present study confirmed the above claim as the dyslexia-friendly practices positively affected dyslexic and non-dyslexic pupils’ motivation and increased the participation of all pupils in the classroom activities. However, this claim has some implications.
This study is the first study that explores the impact of the dyslexia practices on non-dyslexic EFL pupils. Although earlier studies have explored non-dyslexic pupils' attitudes towards the presence of pupils with dyslexia in class, no research has explored this in language contexts. The non-dyslexic EFL pupils had not been accustomed to working with their dyslexic peers since dyslexic pupils in Greece are mainly taught in the specialist and not in the mainstream classrooms. This resulted in many non-dyslexic pupils showing negative attitudes towards the inclusion of the dyslexic pupils especially when they were asked to work with them. Therefore, in some cases where the dyslexia-friendly practices were resulting in the non-dyslexic pupils having negative attitudes towards the learning situation.

The above poses implications for inclusive attempts. Mainstream pupils' will be more receptive to dyslexic pupils' inclusion if they are used to the presence of pupils with difficulties in their classrooms. As a result, the need for early whole-school approaches to dyslexia inclusion is posed so that all pupils are in the habit of working with dyslexic pupils from the beginning of their school career. Furthermore, all children should be informed of the meaning of the term dyslexia in particular and learning difficulties in general. Lack of knowledge of these matters creates false beliefs and negative views of the dyslexic pupils (e.g. incompetent) in mainstream education and prohibits inclusive attempts.

6.6 Context

"Dyslexia - friendly teaching can occur all the time, every time, with everybody"? (Mackay, 2006, p. 171)
Studies similar to this research have found that the dyslexia-friendly practices have positive effects on EAL dyslexic learners (Mortimore et al., 2012; Fernando, 2012). Although EAL settings are different from EFL settings in that in the latter, language is mainly instructed in class, the positive effects of the dyslexia-friendly practices were still shown. This promotes the use of the dyslexia-friendly practices in FL/SL settings where pupils with dyslexia are found. Furthermore, I am suggesting that when the dyslexia-friendly practices are used in language contexts an addition of language teaching practices might enhance their positive effects. For example, practices from the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach (Littlewood, 1981) will result in the dyslexia-friendly practices addressing cultural awareness issues and enhancing dyslexic pupils’ integrative orientation. Other language related tasks should also be added when the dyslexia-friendly practices are used in language contexts, such as activities that show the similarities and differences between dyslexic learners’ first and target language (e.g. similarities and differences between the two alphabets, pronunciation, etc.).

Another significant finding of this study was that the dyslexia-friendly practices were not, and could not be subserviently followed. They were adapted based on the characteristics of the Greek EFL context in general and of each EFL classroom in particular. This corresponds to Ainscow’s (2007) claim that education is highly influenced from culture and that ideas for inclusion should be always adapted to the context. Therefore, when language teachers attempt
to use the dyslexia-friendly practices in their context they should make them fit "local and regional needs" (McKay, 2004, p. 230) such as the education system, the classroom and the needs of the language curriculum.

The deep explorations of the context this study offered, showed the negative impact of the highly centralised Greek education system on schools and teachers. The lack of support or training by regional advisors has resulted in limited inclusive developments in Greek state education. The centralisation of the Greek education system has also created a lack of assistance for teachers in the area of learning difficulties. This was probably the reason why all the three EFL teachers of this study were ignorant towards dyslexia and indifferent towards the dyslexic pupils in their classrooms (at the pre-intervention stage). There is a need for the Greek education system to become more decentralised. This would make inclusion more attainable in Greek education and would enhance the support of language teachers.

Furthermore, results of this study showed that dyslexia in Greek schools is a matter for specialist teachers. This has resulted in a lack of differentiation approaches for EFL pupils with dyslexia in Greece and a lack of differentiation provided by the Greek EFL teachers. Despite these limitations and the lack of teacher training previously mentioned, the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices from the UK showed positive results. This poses implications for circulation of ideas and for dissemination of inclusive practices among different contexts to improve inclusion for learners with difficulties. The latter corresponds to the 'transfer of practice' the Education
and Training work programme (ET2020) the European Commission has put forward, which promotes peer-learning between the member states of the European Union. Further research on exchange of inclusive practice is needed, especially for practices that come from education systems such as the UK that have primacy in areas of inclusion and learning difficulties.

6.7 Teachers

"Dyslexia-friendly good practice is in fact good practice for all"? (BDA 2005 - DFS pack).

The findings of this study showed that the effects of the dyslexia practices should be explored in reference to pupils and their teachers. The teachers' experiences influence the extent to which inclusion is achieved and the way the pupils experience the dyslexia-friendly practices. In this study, the EFL teachers were in favour of the dyslexia-friendly practices by the end of the project, despite the fact that they were feeling stressed and initially had limited knowledge of dyslexia.

The introduction of the resources on dyslexia and the dyslexia-friendly practices increased Penelope's and Myrtle's' knowledge of dyslexia and advanced all EFL teachers' practice. This is the reason inclusion was enhanced, not only for the group of the dyslexic pupils, but for all pupils; increased participation was shown in the classroom activities at a second stage by all learners.

Data also showed that the EFL teachers preferred the dyslexia-friendly practices than the resources of dyslexia I had provided
them with. This finding demonstrates that language teachers favour suggestions that can be immediately transferred into practice.

Teachers' experiences were also positive towards my intervention because I was providing them with support throughout the study. This demonstrates that inclusive attempts in language education should provide continuous training and encouragement to language teachers. This is a factor that contributes to the successful inclusion of the dyslexic pupils in language education.

6.8 Motivation and performance for pupils with dyslexia

The study showed that, in the case of dyslexic pupils, the exploration of motivation-performance relationships should be approached with care, because of the dyslexic pupils' difficulties and complex self-related beliefs. In this study, although dyslexic pupils' motivation and task participation increased, their performance did not show any significant improvements. Intervening factors such as teachers' practice, stressful contextual conditions (e.g. negative reactions from peers), dyslexic pupils' limited experiences in English language tasks and some negative motivation elements such as low self-related beliefs possibly resulted in this. Furthermore, the study did not sufficiently address pupils' background, family and previous educational experiences, which were possibly influencing the motivation-performance relationship.

The minor changes on dyslexic pupils' performance demonstrates that changes in dyslexic pupils' performance is a long-term process that requires more than seven and a half weeks my intervention lasted.
Individualised support might also be needed especially in areas of literacy development in the foreign language.

6.9 **Dyslexia and English language teaching**

The dyslexia-friendly practices can enhance inclusion for pupils with dyslexia in EFL classrooms and improve the performance and motivation of their non-dyslexic peers. However, because the dyslexia-friendly practices have been originally designed for monolingual education, they lack practices that enhance cultural awareness of the target language. Although the updated dyslexia-friendly pack (BDA, 2012) includes information on multilingual learners, the needs of dyslexic pupils in foreign or second language contexts are not addressed. In EFL contexts, pupils are only taught English in class and are rarely asked to speak English outside school. Therefore, their integrative motive is not well developed and language is learnt mainly as a set of rules. Practices from communicative language teaching and other practices that enhance cultural awareness will make the dyslexia-friendly practices more ‘friendly’ to language education.

6.10 **Group cohesion**

The motivational element of group cohesion was significantly influencing dyslexic pupils’ motivation. This was shown from Alexander’s lowered motivation due to the reduced group cohesion he was experiencing during the intervention stage (apart from other possible beyond school factors). This finding confirms my earlier suggestion about addressing the effects of the dyslexia-friendly
practices in reference to all pupils and whether and how the
introduction of inclusive practices affect peer relationships.

6.11 Ethnically diverse pupils with dyslexia

Literature suggests that “another area in which literature is lacking
is the use of ethnically diverse samples of children with LD (learning
difficulties)” (Gans et al., 2003). The study addressed this need
because two of the dyslexic EFL pupils were also immigrant pupils
(Alexander, Ken). However, data showed that pupils’ background was
influencing their motivation and performance. Although these were
limited and mainly related to EFL experiences it is a finding that
shows the need to address dyslexic language learners’ background
characteristics, culture and other social elements that influence
their development and their skills. This is more important in the
cases of bilingual or multilingual learners, which are sometimes
exposed to more than one culture (e.g. immigrant pupils that grow up
in England).

6.12 Study’s methodology and theoretical framework

It is acknowledged that results from case studies are difficult to
generalise in other contexts (generalizability). However, as already
mentioned in the Methodology chapter (see section 3.4.2), in this
study generalisability is replaced by dependability. Dependability
refers to whether the study can be “repeatable under the same
circumstances in another place and time” (Guba & Lincoln, 1982, p.
377).
Dependability in this study was addressed with the deep exploration and presentation of the context, which were three typical Greek EFL classrooms in public education. This guides future studies that want to explore the effects of the dyslexia-friendly practices in Greek EFL but also other EFL/ESL/EAL settings with similar contextual characteristics.

6.13 Concluding points

The present study poses the need for developing an inclusive framework for language learners with dyslexia. The positive effects of the dyslexia-friendly practices demonstrate that inclusion for language learners can be enhanced with the use of the dyslexia-friendly practices, which can be adapted to fit to each language context and produce positive results for teachers and all classroom learners. Also, the interaction of the dyslexia-friendly practices with language teaching practices can possibly result in the design of new direct, communicative and interactive language teaching approaches.

Despite the fact that this thesis discussed the negative impact of the austerity measures in Greece at the time of this study (e.g. limited resources, teachers’ reduced salary) (2012) it is not suggesting that these factors should not discourage attempts for inclusion. The lack of government funding might, in cases, hinder inclusion but it does not make inclusion insurmountable. Despite the limited provision of resources, training and whole school support shown in this study, positive effects of the dyslexia-friendly practices were still shown. ‘Bottom-up’ developments can enhance inclusion in cases where the central education system is rigid,
resistant or unable to embrace new inclusive practices. Although the interest and willingness of relevant stakeholders are essential for developing inclusion, teachers' co-operation is also important in promoting inclusion. Therefore, inclusion can be achieved through 'bottom-up' processes (e.g. classroom-based interventions). Further research in language classrooms (and perhaps other fields) will enlighten future 'bottom-up' attempts at inclusion.

The present project is one of the few projects that have employed a realist approach to educational research. In educational research, the 'context-generative mechanisms-outcomes' relationships that realism researchers put forward (Sayer, 2000) are 'translated' in relationships among teaching practices, pupils' potential, learning outcomes and affective outcomes. Realism, as a theoretical framework, enables educational researchers to explore the impact of teaching programmes on specific school and classroom contexts. Realism also allows teachers to explore the extent to which these new programmes affect the context, trigger affective factors and pupils' potential (generative mechanisms) and evaluate the results (outcomes). Apart from pupil related areas, realism supports researchers in exploring teachers' experiences and how these are transferred into practice.

6.14 Unique contribution to knowledge

This study makes a unique contribution to the fields of dyslexia and language teaching as it promotes inclusion for dyslexic language learners. The employment of the dyslexia-friendly practices in language settings opens up new opportunities for inclusion for pupils.
that learn languages differently. Furthermore, it advances both the fields of dyslexia and language learning and shows that language teachers' training and interventions for dyslexic language learners will promote the inclusion of dyslexic pupils in language education.

6.15 Limitations

The limitations of this project are mainly relevant to time restrictions and contextual issues that arose. The application of the practices and the dyslexia training was limited. If the training had started from the beginning of the year more time would be available for the use of the dyslexia-friendly practices and the exploration of their impact. Moreover, dyslexic pupils' parents could not be included in this study due to ethical and time issues imposed by the scope and the nature of this study. A view on the pupils' significant others (e.g. family), peer relationships in and outside school and other social elements would have provided significant information on children's' difficulties, self-esteem and motivation (Terras et al., 2009).

In terms of dyslexic pupils' inclusion, it is acknowledged that sometimes, individualised teaching is needed along with the use of differentiation approaches in class. The study failed to address this as only the EFL teachers were involved.

A limitation rooted in the design of this study, was the fact that the interviews with the teachers failed to sufficiently address the teachers' views of disability. This element could possibly further enlighten their experiences of the intervention.
Furthermore, the study has a methodological limitation. The data collection and analysis processes did not address the way the outcomes (changes in performance and motivation) were influencing the context. This might have enlightened the way the practices were impacting on the classroom processes, the teachers and the pupils.

Finally, this thesis demonstrated the way inclusion for EFL pupils with dyslexia can be achieved in a specific context, how this process can also benefit their non-dyslexic peers and how EFL teachers experienced the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices. The final conclusions of this study and the extent to which these findings can be broadened in other areas are discussed in the concluding chapter that follows.
7 Conclusion

This final chapter of this thesis draws on the themes that arose from the discussion chapter (chapter Five) and summarises the significance of this study’s findings. The purpose of this chapter is to respond to the aims that were set out in the introduction chapter and set an agenda for further research.

7.1 The research questions

The research questions of this project were designed with a purpose to explore the effects of the dyslexia-friendly practices (Mackay, 2004) in EFL education. The assumption was that these practices are possible to enhance inclusion for pupils with dyslexia in the Greek EFL context. In case this assumption was confirmed, the use of the dyslexia-friendly practices could be suggested to other EFL/EAL/ESL contexts that seek ways to develop inclusion for learners with dyslexia. The impact of contextual characteristics before and during the use of the practices is discussed in all the
chapters of this thesis, for the reader to understand the contextual characteristics of the cases and contextualize the study. The descriptions of the context demonstrate the importance of contextual factors when developing inclusion. The significance of this study lies on the fact that the impact of the dyslexia-friendly practices was explored with reference to all EFL classroom pupils (dyslexic and non-dyslexic) and the EFL teachers. The final recommendations of this study are based on knowledge that arose from the data analysis process, which were guided by my study's research questions. These recommendations have as a purpose to enlighten the way the dyslexia-friendly practices worked in a specific context and promote their employment in mainstream EFL/ESL/EAL education.

7.2 Answers to the research questions

The introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices in the three Greek EFL classrooms, resulted in an increased motivation and inclusion for EFL pupils despite the fact that no significant differences were found in their performance. Positive outcomes were also shown for their non-dyslexic peers. Therefore, the study’s aim to enhance inclusion for EFL dyslexic learners while supporting non-dyslexic pupils’ development was fulfilled. The positive experiences of EFL teachers of the introduction of the dyslexia-friendly practices and their preference for practical suggestions shows the importance of addressing teachers’ views, attitudes and feelings towards the dyslexia-friendly practices. Data also showed the importance of continuous and supportive teacher training the teachers are need.
The above evidence promotes the use of the dyslexia-friendly practices in other language contexts; the dyslexia-friendly practices provide a basis for enhancing inclusion in classrooms where English is taught as a Foreign/Additional/Second Language. The deep exploration of the context and the processes of change this study offers, enlighten the way inclusion in EFL/ESL/EAL contexts can be accomplished and the factors that affect this process (e.g. context, teacher characteristics, learner characteristics). This supports future studies in the field of inclusion for EFL pupils with dyslexia.

7.3 Beyond the research questions

Apart from the above, the study signified new important themes that are relevant to dyslexia inclusion in EFL education.

a. The dyslexia-friendly practices have positive effects on dyslexic and non-dyslexic pupils that learn English as a Foreign Language in Greece and promote dyslexic pupils' inclusion. These results can be generalized in other EFL contexts, provided the practices are modified based on the characteristics of the education system and the classroom.

b. Non-dyslexic pupils' attitudes towards the inclusion of their dyslexic peers influence the processes of developing dyslexia inclusion in language education. Non-dyslexic pupils' response to the dyslexia-friendly practices (or other inclusive practices) should at all times be addressed.

c. The way a country's education system is structured is highly important in promoting inclusion. However, circulation of ideas, such
as the use of practices from different contexts, might further enlighten the area of inclusive education.

d. The centrality of the Greek education system in combination with the lack of dyslexia training for EFL teachers are prohibiting factors for dyslexic pupils’ inclusion in Greek EFL education. The same applies in other subjects (e.g. physics, history etc.), as dyslexic pupils are mainly taught in the inclusion class. Based on this study’s findings the ‘de-centralisation’ of the Greek education system is warranted.

e. Greek EFL teachers are in need of training on dyslexia and positive towards employing practices designed to enhance inclusion for dyslexic pupils. However, the practices are adapted to their own approach. In this study, the dyslexia-friendly practices were ‘filtered’ through EFL teachers’ own language teaching practices.

f. The motivation of pupils with dyslexia that learn English as a Foreign Language is more complex than non-dyslexic EFL pupils. The same probably applies to EAL/ESL dyslexic learners. Dyslexic language learners’ performance and affective factors (motivation) should be approached with care mainly because of dyslexic pupils’ difficulties and low self-related beliefs.

g. Pupil’s (dyslexic and non-dyslexic) sense of group cohesion is not only strongly related with pupils’ motivation but influences inclusion too; therefore group cohesion should be enhanced in classrooms where dyslexic pupils are found.
h. There is a need to further investigate the inclusion of pupils with dyslexia that have various linguistic and cultural backgrounds and address factors that influence their abilities and feelings beyond school. In this way, we can address their needs in language subjects and in other areas of the curriculum.

i. Inclusive education can be promoted via 'bottom-up' approaches. The results from classroom-based interventions will provide insights on how inclusion can be achieved with 'bottom-up' approaches.

j. Inclusive education should not be constrained by a country's economic and political tensions. Although, these factors impact on a country's education system, they should not be seen as prohibiting factors for inclusive developments. Inclusion can be achieved despite economic and political constraints.

k. More studies on education should employ Realism as a framework. Reaslim allows for deep contextual explorations and how these influence teachers and pupils and the outcomes produced. Studies that look into the effects of teaching approaches in educational settings would benefit from this.

7.4 Suggestions for further research

More studies that explore the influence of the dyslexia-friendly practices on non-dyslexic pupils at a classroom-based level are needed. This study warrants for more research that explores the interaction of approaches between educational psychology and language education; this will provide further insights on the inclusion
of pupils with learning difficulties in language classrooms. The
dyslexia-friendly practices can be applied to contexts where English
is taught as an Additional Language (e.g. immigrant pupils in the UK)
or as a Second Language (e.g. India). What is more, although English
is an international language, the area of research that focuses on
language learners with dyslexia should expand on other world
languages such as Spanish or French. Several contexts in which
bilingualism is a necessity not only in school but also in the community
(e.g. Canada, Switzerland) should cater for dyslexic pupils' inclusion.
Research is also needed on language teachers' experiences of training
on learning difficulties and of employing inclusive practices; this will
help relevant stakeholders and school systems to address their needs
during inclusive attempts, and provide language teachers with the
support they need.

7.5 Summary

The aim of the study to enhance the development of dyslexia
inclusion in mainstream EFL settings was achieved. This study
demonstrated that the dyslexia-friendly practices can be
successfully employed in the context of language education and
include dyslexic EFL pupils. However, the dyslexia-friendly practices
need to be adapted to contextual characteristics and account for
social and cultural norms. As the inclusive character of the dyslexia-
friendly practices depends heavily on the teachers', the need for
teachers training on the area of learning difficulties is warranted. At
last, this study showed that an 'interplay' of different education
systems can provide significant advancements in the area of inclusion,
as long as the school systems are open to change and embrace inclusive developments.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Resources provided to the teachers


of ideas to support teachers in reflecting about the strategies used when teaching dyslexic children. Unpublished Doctorate Project, University of Manchester.

Appendix 2: Dyslexia-friendly practices suggested to the teachers

Part of the document designed:

Dyslexia Friendly practices you may want to use

Below you can find suggestions about practices that may help the inclusion and support for pupils with dyslexia in the EFL classroom but who may also have positive effects to all the classroom.

You may use already some of these practices; some others that may not fit in your context; for this reason -if you want- you can decide to tick DO for practices that you already use or TRY for the ones you want to try out. For practices you think it is not possible to use or do not want to use you can leave a blank. Note that no one will see this.

General issues:

* Developing a general framework for including all different types of pupils in the classroom is very important. You can:
  - Use charts and diagrams and highlight the bigger picture of what is being taught
    Do ___  Try ___
  - Use mime and gesture to help the kinesthetic learner. For example, drama is a good type of kinesthetic activity.
    - Add pictures to text. Do ___  Try ___
  - Use colour to highlight key words Do ___  Try ___
  - Label diagrams and charts. Do ___  Try ___
  - Use games to consolidate vocabulary, make packs of pocket-sized cards showing important words. Do ___  Try ___
    - Use different colours for different purposes. Do ___  Try ___
    - Use mind-maps and spidergrams. Do ___  Try ___
  - Present information in small amounts with frequent opportunities for repetition and revision. Do ___  Try ___
• Discuss with all the classroom pupils about the classroom environment they like to work in: quiet or with noise? Talk to people while working or work quietly by yourselves? Listen to music while working? Do you like a lot of space in the classroom? Do you like to have your own desk and work space or are you happy sharing it with someone else? Would like to move around while learning?

Do ___  Try ___

• Help all the classroom pupils manage their time by: PRIORITIZING the tasks that need to do for English each week and estimating the time they think each task will take them, PLANNING when they will tackle urgent tasks (and insert them in a weekly timetable), REFLECTING -going through their work and asking themselves whether they reached their targets, how much time they spent on studying English, what distracted them from using their time efficiently and maybe how can they improve in managing their time.

• Do ___  Try ___
Appendix 3: Sources of literature for the Literature Review chapter

**FIRST STAGE**
searching for sources (place, time, mode)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>Stronger</th>
<th>Type of sources</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greek sources</strong></td>
<td>Dyslexia</td>
<td>Google Greece, hand searching in bookshops and schools,</td>
<td>Mainly during data collection (March 2012-June 2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dyslexia - language learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English language learning</td>
<td>requesting information from educational advisors/specialist teachers</td>
<td>In some cases contact with educational advisors while in the UK (2012-2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teachers - inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teachers - dyslexia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greece Laws, Acts- Special Education, dyslexia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFL/EAL/ESL, inclusion-language learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greek EFL, dyslexia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>motivation, language learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dyslexia, self-esteem/self-concept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>British sources</strong></td>
<td>Dyslexia</td>
<td>Google UK, hand searching in University of Manchester Library, on line library search (University of</td>
<td>From the start of MSc study (September 2010) continued until the end</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dyslexia - language learning</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English language learning</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers - inclusion</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Manchester eScholar, Manchester library: Manchester eScholar, PsychInfo, requesting information from supervisors of PhD study (January 2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers - dyslexia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laws, Acts-Special Education, UK, dyslexia</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFL/EAL/ESL, inclusion-language learning</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivation, language learning</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dyslexia, self-esteem/self-concept</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECOND STAGE**
Selection of sources to focus (September 2010- January 2015).
Guided by the general theme: 'promoting inclusion for language learners with dyslexia by developing dyslexia-friendly classrooms in Greek EFL education and addressing EFL teachers' and pupils' needs'.

**THIRD STAGE**
Selection of sources to be used in the literature review (September 2013- January 2015): Is what I am reading important and relevant with my study? If yes, why? What is the relationship of these sources with my results (so far)?

**FOURTH STAGE**
Final literature included: while writing the literature review section (September 2014) guided by the questions from the third stage though constrained by word limit regulations for PhD theses.
Appendix 4: Questionnaire (Clement et al., 1994)

English Language Learning Survey

[Please note: the items in each section were randomly mixed up; background questions not included]

INSTRUCTIONS FOR LIKERT ITEMS

Following are a number of statements with which some people agree and others disagree. We would like you to indicate your opinion after each statement by putting an ‘X’ in the box that best describes the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement. Thank you very much for your help.

For example:

Pickled cucumbers are unhealthy

- - - - - + ++

Strongly disagree  Slightly disagree  Partly agree  Agree  Strongly agree

If you think, for example, that there is something to this statement but it is somewhat exaggerated, you could put an ‘X’ in the fourth box ...

- - - +

1. ...
2. etc.

16. so that I can understand English-speaking films, videos, TV or radio.
17. so that I can understand English pop music.
18. so that I can read English books, newspapers or magazines.
19. because I would like to travel to countries where English is used.
20. because I would like to spend some time abroad.

It is important for me to know English . . . (this sentence beginning was added to all the following statements and it is left out here only for the sake of space economy):

21. in order to think and behave like the English/Americans do.
22. in order to be similar to the British/Americans.
23. in order to know the life of the English-speaking nations.
24. in order to better understand the English-speaking nations’ behaviour and problems.
Section 1 (six-point Likert scales)

*Studying English is important to me* . . . (this sentence beginning was added to all the following statements and it is left out here only for the sake of space economy):

1. because I would like to meet foreigners with whom I can speak English.
2. because I would like to make friends with foreigners.
3. because it will enable me to get to know new people from different parts of the world.
4. so that I can keep in touch with foreign friends and acquaintances.
5. because I would like to learn as many foreign languages as possible.
6. because it will help me when travelling.
7. because it will enable me to get to know various cultures and peoples.
8. because it will enable me to learn more about the English world.
9. because it will enable me to learn more about what is happening in the world.
10. because an educated person is supposed to be able to speak English.
11. so that I can be a more knowledgeable person.
12. because without it one cannot be successful in any field.
13. so that I can broaden my outlook.
14. because I may need it later (for job, studies).
15. because without English I won't be able to travel a lot.
Further items in this section

25. I do not particularly like the process of learning English and I do it only because I may need the language.
26. I would rather spend my time on subjects other than English.
27. I really like learning English.
28. The British are open-minded and modern people.
29. The more I learn about the British, the more I like them.
30. The British are usually reliable and honest.
31. The British are kind and friendly.
32. I would like to know more British people.
33. The Americans are sociable and hospitable.
34. I like the way the Americans behave.
35. I would like to know more American people.
36. The Americans are friendly people.
37. The Americans are kind and cheerful.
38. I enjoy hard work.
39. I easily give up goals which prove hard to reach.
40. I hate to do a job with less than my best effort.
41. In my work I seldom do more than is necessary.
42. If my teacher wanted someone to do an extra English assignment, I would certainly volunteer.
43. I frequently think over what we have learnt in my English class.
44. To be honest, I very often skimp on my English homework.
45. I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my English class.
46. I always feel that the other students speak English better than I do.
47. It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in our English class.
48. I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking English in our English class.
49. I am afraid that other students will laugh at me when I speak English.
50. I usually get uneasy when I have to speak in English.
51. I feel calm and confident in the company of English-speaking people.
52. I do not find it embarrassing at all if I have to give directions in English to English-speaking tourists.
53. When I have to speak English on the phone I easily become confused.
54. Compared to other groups like mine, I feel my group is better than most.
55. There are some cliques in this group.
56. If I were to participate in another group like this one, I would want it to include people who are very similar to the ones in this group.
57. This group is composed of people who fit together.
58. There are some people in this group who do not really like each other.
59. I am dissatisfied with my group.
Section 2 (six-point rating scales ranging from 'absolutely not' to 'definitely yes')

60. Are you satisfied with your work in the English course?
61. Are you satisfied with your English proficiency?

Section 3 (five-point rating scales ranging from 'elementary' to 'advanced')

62. Please indicate on the following scale the level of English that would already satisfy you.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALES

The following section of the questionnaire aims at finding out about your ideas and impressions about SOMETHING. In answering the questions we would like to ask you to rate these concepts on a number of scales. These all have pairs of opposites at each end, and between these there are 7 dashes. You are to place a check mark on one of the seven positions, indicating how you feel about the particular concept in view of the two poles. For example, if the scales refer to "plumbing manuals", which you find rather boring but fairly useful, you can place your check marks as follows:

| Exciting | ::::: | ::::: | ::::: | ::::: | ::::: | ::::: | boring |
| Useless  | ::::: | ::::: | ::::: | ::::: | ::::: | ::::: | useful  |

In the following items please place your check marks rapidly and don’t stop to think about each scale. We are interested in your immediate impression. Remember, this is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers. The "right" answer is the one that is true for you. Be sure to make only one check mark on each scale. Thank you!

Section 4 (seven-point semantic differential scales)

Appraisal of the English teacher

63. imaginative–unimaginative
64. interesting–boring
65. suited–unsuited
66. consistent–inconsistent
67. conscientious–slapdash
68. enthusiastic–unenthusiastic
69. hardworking–lazy
70. helpful–unhelpful
71. fair–unfair
72. sympathetic–unsympathetic

Appraisal of the English classes

73. varied–uniform
74. good atmosphere–bad atmosphere
75. interesting–boring
76. easy–difficult
77. useful–useless
78. meaningful–meaningless
## Appendix 5: Observation schedule

### Classroom observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>On-task</th>
<th>Off-task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Listens instructions &amp; responds (verbally/non-verb.)</td>
<td>Engaged in tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6: Timeframe - approaching the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2012</td>
<td>Agreed with gatekeeper about the processes to be followed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-27 Jan 2012</td>
<td>Gatekeeper approaching the schools (accessed allowed due to established relationship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Jan - Feb 2012</td>
<td>(approval obtained from the university) gatekeeper and researcher contacting the three schools -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>gatekeeper</strong>: visits, <strong>researcher</strong>: telephone calls (mostly with the EFL teachers after some point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Feb</td>
<td>Start of teacher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2012</td>
<td>Arrival in Greece - meeting teachers and head teachers in person, agreeing on the procedures,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>obtaining consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Mar 2012</td>
<td>First classroom observation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7: Information sheets

a. Information sheet for parents:

Study Title

Dyslexia friendly practices in the Greek EFL classroom

Participant Information Sheet

You are being invited to take part in a study as part of my PhD Project at the University of Manchester, United Kingdom. My aim is to provide better understandings of the ways pupils with dyslexia can be included in the mainstream EFL education. Although there are many studies on dyslexia support, little research has been done for pupils with dyslexia that learn English as a Second or Foreign Language. For this reason, my study will look into the issue of support of Greek pupils with dyslexia that learn English as a Foreign Language.

More specifically, I would like to explore the impact dyslexia friendly practices have on the performance and motivation of dyslexic and non-dyslexic EFL pupils. The term dyslexia friendly means that they are designed for the support of dyslexic learners who usually have reading and spelling difficulties. This issue may help all different pupils be supported in the mainstream EFL classroom without having to leave the classroom and be cut off from the classroom activities. Other studies have shown that dyslexia friendly practices have positive effects on all pupils and this is why I am going to explore the affect these practices have on the whole classroom. Therefore, every pupil’s participation is important for my project.

Everyone in the class receives this leaflet.

Before you decide it is important for you to understand why the study is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Please ask if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether or not you wish to take part. Thank you for reading this.
Who will conduct the study?

Maria Reraki, PhD student at the University of Manchester, United Kingdom

Address: School of Education, The University of Manchester, Ellen Wilkinson Building, Oxford Road, Manchester, UK, M13 9PL

Title of the study

Dyslexia Friendly practices in the Greek EFL classroom

What is the aim of the study?

The aim of the study is to provide opportunities for support for learners with dyslexia that learn English as a Second or Foreign Language. By asking the teacher to employ practices that are dyslexia friendly, I intend to explore whether these help dyslexic learners in the EFL classroom. The aim is to see whether pupils with dyslexia may have less or no problems in the language classroom when these practices are used. Because I am interested in mainstream education, I would also like to examine whether these support all EFL pupils and not only the pupils that have learning difficulties. So the present study may have positive affects to all pupils. It may also provide future directions for research on dyslexia and EFL/ESL/EAL settings.

Why have I been chosen?

The specific classroom has been chosen because I believe it will contribute meaningfully to my study. This may be because of the school’s very good reputation. For the same reason, one more classroom from another school will be involved.

What would the pupils be asked to do if they took part?

Most of the research process will rely on me (researcher) and the EFL classroom teacher. Before the study begins resources will be provided to the EFL teacher so as to enhance his/her understanding of dyslexia. Later on, some practices that are especially designed for the support of learners with dyslexia will be suggested to the EFL teacher. The teacher will select those that he/she thinks can be used in the specific classroom. For example, he/she may use pictures next to a text to make it easier for all the pupils to read.
One month before the teacher starts using the dyslexia friendly practices I will be observing some lessons. During the observations I will be sitting in the back of the class writing notes that will focus on pupils’ behaviour. Please note that my aim is not to assess the classroom pupils. I will have no contact with the pupils during the observations and I will not intervene in the lesson. The same period I will have two interviews with the teacher during which we will discuss his/her views about each pupil’s performance and motivation. An examination of pupils’ tests, dictations and writings will help me gain further insights into pupils’ performance.

It is important to also discuss with the pupils about their motivation towards learning English language. For this reason, one interview with each pupil and two focus group with two groups of pupils will be conducted in the school to discuss about issues such as whether or not they like learning English or if they enjoy their English language classes.

The same processes (pupil’s assessment tools, observations, teacher interviews, pupils interviews, focus group) will be followed during the period which the teacher uses the dyslexia friendly practices. This means that one interview and two focus groups will be conducted with the pupils after the dyslexia friendly practices were used. The issues discussed in the second interview and the second focus group will be the same as the first time (whether or not they like English etc.). In this part I will also ask them whether they have noticed the teacher using something different and (if yes) their views about it. The interview and the focus groups may take place during a time where the pupils would have an English language class. This depends on the EFL teacher and the head teacher of the school. If they do not agree, I will have to reschedule these at another time (e.g. during a break).

All the data from the period before the use of the dyslexia friendly practices will be then analysed to examine whether there has been any difference (positive or negative) on pupils’ performance and motivation.

I would also like to take your permission and tape record the pupils’ answers since it will be very difficult for me to be able to write down everything they say during the interviews and the focus groups (you can see below about confidentiality issues). Please also note that no reference will be made to pupils’ learning difficulties at any of the interviews or focus groups.

What happens to the data collected?

The data will be used to inform my doctoral theses and answer my research questions. Publications may also arise from this research. Some of them will be analysed during the study but most of them will be analysed after the study has finished. After submitting my theses the data will be kept -encrypted- in my personal computer which is always password protected (see confidentiality below). After the study has finished, the data will be kept for five years. If
you want, you will be able to see the data at any time after my project ends but you won’t be able to alter the results. After this time, the notes from the observations and the assessment tools as well as the tapes from the interviews and the focus groups will be destroyed. My thesis will be also available to you in case you are interested.

How is confidentiality maintained?

Your privacy is very important for both me and the University. For this reason, all the data will be encrypted and stored in my personal computer in which I will only have access to. My computer is located at my personal study room at my home and will always be password protected. The notes from the examination of the pupil’s assessment tools, the observations and the tapes from the interviews and the focus groups will be kept in a drawer in my desk in my study room. The drawer will lock and I will be the only one having access to it.

My activity will be confidential and the data will be anonymous. That is, I will not share with anyone what I am collecting and no references to places or schools will made. Each participant and the school will be referred with pseudonyms I will have created. In case I want to publish something relevant to this study the same pseudonyms will be used. There will be no personally identifying information.

What happens if I do not want my child to take part or if I or my child changes his/her mind?

It is up to you to decide whether or not to you want your child to take part in the present study. If you do decide your child to take part you will be given this information sheet to keep and be asked to sign a consent form. Your child will also be given an information sheet and an assent form to take home and sign. Please note that the content of the information sheets and the assent forms will be also explained orally to the children at school. If you and your child decide that you want to take part in the study I will respect your right to withdraw at any time without explaining the reason.

Will I be paid for participating in the study?

Your participation in the study is voluntary.

What is the duration of the study?

The classroom observations will last three to four months.
The interviews with the pupils will last maximum 30 minutes in both phases of the study. The same applies to the focus groups.

Where will the study be conducted?

The study will be conducted in your child's school, in Rethymno, Crete, Greece.

Will the outcomes of the study be published?

Details of the study will be included in my thesis or in articles that may be published in academic journals or books.

Criminal Records Check (if applicable)

I have received an official certificate from the Hellenic ministry of Education which gives me permission to work in state schools and private language institutes as an English language teacher. I have successfully passed all the medical and psychological exams for obtaining this certificate. I have previously worked for three years as an English language teacher in private institutes and public schools.

I have a Clear Criminal Status checked by the Hellenic Ministry of Justice (article 576 element b’3 CCP as modified by the article 9 of L. 1805/1988 GOG 199).

Contact for further information

In case you need further clarifications for my study and you can contact me at any time. My contact details are:

Maria Reraki
School of Education, The University of Manchester
Eilen Wilkinson Building, Oxford Road
Manchester, UK
M13 9PL

email: maria_reraki@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk
You can also contact my academic supervisors:

Dr Garry Squires:

email: Garry.Squires@manchester.ac.uk

Dr Juup Stelma:

email: Juup.Stelma@manchester.ac.uk

What if something goes wrong?

In case something goes wrong you should contact me or my supervisors.

If there are any issues regarding this research that you would prefer not to discuss with members of the research team, please contact the Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator by either writing to ‘The Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator, Research Office, Christie Building, The University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL’, by emailing: Research-Governance@manchester.ac.uk, or by telephoning 0161 275 7583 or 275 8093
b. Information sheet for pupils:

Your English language classroom: what do you think?

Pupils' Information Sheet

Hello! My name is Maria Reraki and I am an English Language Teacher. For the last two years I am studying for a PhD at the University of Manchester in England.

You are being invited to take part in a study for my PhD project. What I want to do is explore what is happening in your classroom during your English language classes for the period of three or four months. I want to see whether the practices your teacher is using and what do you think about his/her practices.

I am giving you this paper to provide you with information about my study so that you can decide whether or not you want to participate.
Before you decide it is important for you to understand why the study is being done and what will happen. Please take time to read this information sheet carefully. You can discuss it with your parents, your teacher or anyone else you wish. Please ask me if there is anything that you don’t understand or if you want to find out more about my project. Take time to decide whether or not you wish to take part. Thank you for reading this.

Here are the answers to some questions you may have:

**Who will do this project?**

- PhD student Maria Reraki will do this project.

**Why do you want to do this study?**

- I want to observe what is happening in your English language classroom to see what are you and the teacher is doing during the lessons. This may help me understand in which activities you are interested in and which you enjoy more so that I can suggest them to other teachers as well.

**How are you going to do that?**
- I want to do that by observing in which activities you engage more, in which you like to participate more and which you find boring. Because observing the classroom will not be enough I would also like to hear what you have to say. For this reason, I would like to meet in school to discuss about your English language classes. If during our discussions you do not want to say something about a specific issue you should tell me and we will immediately change the topic. The first time I would like to discuss this with each one of you personally, while the second time you will be divided in groups and we will discuss these things together, as a group. These discussions will take place only two times: one at the beginning of the study and one at the end. Because I will not have time to write all of your answers I would like to take your permission to record them in a tape recorder I will have with me. No one will grade you and I won’t show to your teacher what we discussed.

Don’t worry, our discussions won’t last long! The maximum they can last is only thirty minutes!

Why has our classroom been chosen?

- I chose your classroom because I heard that you are very good pupils and because I believe that you and your teacher will help me finish my project. One more classroom from another school was chosen to help me do my study for the same reasons.
So what do we have to do again?

- All you have to do is participate in our discussions about whether or not and how much you like your English language classes.

What are you going to do with the information we will give you?

- The information you will give me about your English language lessons will be kept only between us and I will not reveal to anyone what we said until the study finishes. They will be used to help me understand what you like and what you don’t like in your English language classes. You will also be able to see what I found out but you won’t be able to change anything!

Moreover, the tapes from our conversations will be locked in my drawer in my desk at home and I will only have the keys to this drawer so no one can open it! When I start to store this information in my computer I will write them in a secret code so that I will only understand what it means. The tapes will then be destroyed.

Will other people know who said what?

- I will always use pseudonyms and not your real names and I will never mention where the study took place. So, when I present my project to the University or a journal they will not know who participated in my study and where the study took place.
What happens if I do not want to take part or if I change my mind?

- If you decide to participate this information sheet will be given to you to keep and a form in which you say that you agree to take part. You have every right not wanting to participate or changing your mind and dropping out of the study after a while. No one will ask you why.

How long are you going to be in our school?

- I will be here for almost four months (or less).

Is your study going to take place only in the school?

- Yes, my study will take place only in the school.

If we want to find out more things about your study who should we ask?

- You can ask me anything you want any time when I am at school. If you think of something you want to ask me and I am not in the school at that moment, write it down so that you can remember it next time I come!

What if, during the study something I didn’t like happens?

- In case something you didn’t like happens during the study you should immediately tell me, your teacher or your parents.
c. Information sheet for head teachers:

Dyslexia friendly practices in the Greek EFL classroom

Participant Information Sheet

You are being invited to take part in a study as part of my PhD Project at the University of Manchester, United Kingdom. My aim is to provide better understandings of the ways pupils with dyslexia can be included in the mainstream EFL education. Although there are many studies on dyslexia support, little research has been done for pupils with dyslexia that learn English as a Second or Foreign Language. For this reason, my study will look into the issue of support of Greek pupils with dyslexia that learn English as a Foreign Language.

More specifically, I would like to explore the impact dyslexia friendly practices have on the performance and motivation of dyslexic and non-dyslexic EFL pupils. The term dyslexia friendly means that they are designed for the support of dyslexic learners that usually have reading and spelling difficulties. This issue may help all different pupils be supported in the mainstream EFL classroom without having to leave the classroom and be cut off from the classroom activities. Other studies have shown that dyslexia friendly practices have positive effects on all pupils and this is why I am going to explore the affect these practices have on the whole classroom. Therefore, every pupil’s participation is important for my project.

Before you decide it is important for you to understand why the study is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Please ask if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether or not you wish to take part. Thank you for reading this.
Who will conduct the study?

Maria Reraki, PhD student at the University of Manchester, United Kingdom

Address: School of Education, The University of Manchester, Ellen Wilkinson Building, Oxford Road, Manchester, UK, M13 9PL

Title of the study

Dyslexia Friendly practices in the Greek EFL classroom

What is the aim of the study?

The aim of the study is to provide opportunities for support for learners with dyslexia that learn English as a Second or Foreign Language. By asking the EFL teacher to employ practices that are dyslexia friendly, I intend to explore whether these help dyslexic learners in the EFL classroom. The aim is to see whether pupils with dyslexia may have less or no problems in the language classroom when these practices are used. Because I am interested in mainstream education, I would also like to examine whether these support all EFL pupils and not only the pupils that have learning difficulties. So the present study may have positive affects to all pupils. My project may also provide future directions for research on dyslexia and EFL/ESL/EAL settings.

Why have I been chosen?

Your school has been chosen because I believe it will contribute meaningfully to my research project. This may be because of the school’s very good reputation and successful presence. It also includes officially recognised pupils with dyslexia which is a necessary requirement for my study. For the same reasons, one more classroom from another school will be involved.

What would I be asked to do I took part?

Because the aim of the study is to explore the affect dyslexia friendly practices have in the EFL context, I will ask the EFL teacher to employ some of these in the classroom so that I will be able to evaluate their impact.

Based on the fact that the teacher needs to have awareness of dyslexia to be able to support dyslexic learners, before the study begins I will provide the teacher with some resources on dyslexia in case he/she wants to learn more about the issue. This is to help him/her understand better where the dyslexia friendly practices were based on. However, if he/she thinks she/he has extensive knowledge on the issue and he/she feels that reading these documents is not
necessary then it is up to the teacher to decide whether or not to read them. If she/he decides to have a look at them and there are issues that he/she does not understand and needs clarifications, I will have provided him/her with my email and a phone number to contact me. If I am still in England we will be able to exchange emails, talk on the phone or via internet calls. If I am already in Greece, she/he will be able to ask me to meet in the school or call me on the phone number I will have given him/her.

After this part, practices and recommendations for supporting dyslexic learners will be provided to the teacher in written form. The decision on which practices to use will rely entirely on him/her.

Because the aim is to evaluate the impact these practices have on the motivation and performance of all EFL pupils, I want to examine these two aspects before and after the employment of the dyslexia friendly practices. Therefore, data will be gathered in two distinct phases.

One month before the study begins I will conduct classroom observations to gain insights into the pupils’ performance and motivation. The EFL teacher will already know the learners well so I would like to have two interviews with him/her at this stage in which we will discuss about these issues. I will also ask him/her if she/he can provide me with pupils’ previous tests, dictations and writings to gain a better conceptualisation of pupils’ performance.

The issue of motivation will be further explored by conducting one interview with each pupil and two focus groups: one with the pupils with dyslexia and another one with their non-dyslexic classmates.

The same procedures will be followed during the period in which the dyslexia practices were used. At this phase, the interviews with the teacher and the pupils as well as the focus group will be conducted towards the end of the study. The questions will be the same while I will also want to discuss whether the EFL teacher saw any differences in pupils’ performance and motivation. I will also want to see whether the pupils have noticed something new during their lessons. During this phase the only differences will be that during the observations I will note down which of the practices the teacher uses each time. The interview and the focus group may take place at a time where an English language lesson would normally take place. If you or the EFL teacher won’t agree with that we will have to decide together when it would be convenient for everyone to conduct these.

It should be noted that my aim is not to assess you or evaluate the teacher’s work. The only aim is to examine how these specific practices work in the Greek EFL context.
Finally, I would like to mention that it would be helpful for me to record with a tape recorder the interviews we are going to have with the teacher and the pupils as well as the focus groups so as to be able to capture the most of what they say.

What happens to the data collected?

The data will be used to inform my doctoral theses and answer my research questions. Publications may also arise from this research. Some of them will be analysed during the study but most of them will be analysed after the study has finished. After submitting my theses the data will be kept encrypted in my personal computer which is always password protected (see about confidentiality below). If you want, you will be able to see the data at any time after my project ends. However, you won’t be able to alter any results.

The data will be kept for five years after the study has finished. After this time, the notes from the observations and the assessment tools as well as the tapes from the interviews and the focus groups will be destroyed.

How is confidentiality maintained?

Your privacy is very important for both me and the University. For this reason, all the data will be encrypted and stored in my personal computer in which I will only have access to. My computer is and will always be password protected and is located at my personal study room at my home. The notes from the examination of the pupil’s assessment tools, the observations and the tapes from the interviews and the focus groups will be kept in a drawer in my desk. The desk is located in my personal study room. The drawer will lock and I will be the only one having access to it.

My activity will be confidential and the data will be anonymous. That is, I will not share with anyone what I am collecting and no references to places or schools will made. Each participant and the school will be referred with pseudonyms I will have created. In case I want to publish something relevant to this study the same pseudonyms will be used. There will be no personally identifying information.

What happens if I do not want my school to take part or if I change my mind?

It is up to you to decide whether or not to you want your school to take part in the present study. If you do decide to take part you will be given this information sheet to keep and be
asked to sign a consent form. If you decide that you want your school to take part in the study
I will respect your right to withdraw at any time without explaining the reason.

Will I be paid for participating in the study?

Your participation in the study is voluntary.

What is the duration of the study?

The classroom observations will last three to four months. Our interviews will last maximum
thirty minutes in both phases of the study. The interviews and the focus groups with the pupils
will also last maximum thirty minutes.

Where will the study be conducted?

The study will be conducted in your school, in Rethymno, Crete, Greece.

Will the outcomes of the study be published?

Details of the study will be included in my thesis or in articles that may be published in
academic journals or books.

Criminal Records Check (if applicable)

I have received an official certificate from the Hellenic ministry of Education which gives me
permission to work in state schools and private language institutes. I have successfully passed
all the medical and psychological exams for obtaining this certificate. I have previously worked
for three years as an English language teacher in private and public schools.

I have a Clear Criminal Status checked by the Hellenic Ministry of Justice (article 576 element
b’ 3 CCP as modified by the article 9 of L. 1805/1988 GOG 199).
Contact for further information

In case you need further clarifications for my study and you can contact me at any time. My contact details are:

Maria Reraki
School of Education, The University of Manchester
Ellen Wilkinson Building, Oxford Road
Manchester, UK
M13 9PL

e-mail: maria.reraki@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk

You can also contact my academic supervisors:

Dr Garry Squires:

e-mail: Garry.Squires@manchester.ac.uk

Dr Juup Stelma:

e-mail: Juup.Stelma@manchester.ac.uk

What if something goes wrong?

In case something goes wrong please feel free to contact me or my supervisors.

If there are any issues regarding this research that you would prefer not to discuss with members of the research team, please contact the Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator by either writing to "The Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator, Research Office, Christie Building, The University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL", by emailing: Research-Governance@manchester.ac.uk, or by telephoning 0161 275 7583 or 275 8093.
d. Information sheet for EFL teachers:

Dyslexia friendly practices in the Greek EFL classroom

Participant Information Sheet

You are being invited to take part in a study as part of my PhD Project at the University of Manchester, United Kingdom. My aim is to provide better understandings of the ways pupils with dyslexia can be included in the mainstream EFL education. Although there are many studies on dyslexia support, little research has been done for pupils with dyslexia that learn English as a Second or Foreign Language. For this reason, my study will look into the issue of support of Greek pupils with dyslexia that learn English as a Foreign Language.

More specifically, I would like to explore the impact dyslexia friendly practices have on the performance and motivation of dyslexic and non-dyslexic EFL pupils. The term dyslexia friendly means that they are designed for the support of dyslexic learners that usually have reading and spelling difficulties. This issue may help all different pupils be supported in the mainstream EFL classroom without having to leave the classroom and be cut off from the classroom activities. Other studies have shown that dyslexia friendly practices have positive affects to all pupils and this is why I am going to explore the affect these practices have on the whole classroom. Therefore, every pupil’s participation is important for my project.

Before you decide it is important for you to understand why the study is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Please ask if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether or not you wish to take part. Thank you for reading this.
Who will conduct the study?

Maria Reraki, PhD student at the University of Manchester, United Kingdom

Address: School of Education, The University of Manchester, Ellen Wilkinson Building, Oxford Road, Manchester, UK, M13 9PL

Title of the study

Dyslexia Friendly practices in the Greek EFL classroom

What is the aim of the study?

The aim of the study is to provide opportunities for support for learners with dyslexia that learn English as a Second or Foreign Language. By asking you - the classroom teacher - to employ practices that are dyslexia friendly, I intend to explore whether these help dyslexic learners in the EFL classroom. The aim is to see whether pupils with dyslexia may have less or no problems in the language classroom when these practices are used. Because I am interested in mainstream education, I would also like to examine whether these support all EFL pupils and not only the pupils that have learning difficulties. So the present study may have positive affects to all pupils. There is also the case where these practices may make no difference to either the dyslexic or the non-dyslexic pupils. However, it may provide future directions for research on dyslexia and EFL/ESL/EAL settings.

Why have I been chosen?

The specific classroom has been chosen because I believe it will contribute meaningfully to my research project. This may be because of the school’s very good reputation. It also includes officially recognised pupils with dyslexia which is a necessary requirement for my study. For the same reasons, one more classroom from another school will be involved.

What would I be asked to do I took part?

Because the aim of the study is to explore the affect dyslexia friendly practices have in the EFL classroom, I will ask you to employ some of these in the classroom so that I will be able to evaluate their impact.

Based on the fact that the teacher needs to have awareness of dyslexia to be able to support dyslexic learners, before the study begins I will provide you with some resources on dyslexia in case you want to learn more about the issue. This is to help you understand better where the dyslexia friendly practices were based on. However, if you think you already have
knowledge on the issue and you feel that reading these documents is not necessary then it is up to you to decide whether or not to read them. If you decide to have a look at them and there are issues that you do not understand and need you need some clarifications, I will have provided you with my email and telephone number to contact me. If I am still in England we will be able to exchange emails or talk on the phone or via internet calls. If I am already in Greece, you can ask me to meet in the school or call me on the phone number I will have given you.

After this part, practices and recommendations for supporting dyslexic learners will be provided to you in written form. The decision on which practices to use will rely entirely on you.

Because the aim is to evaluate the impact these practices have on the motivation and performance of all EFL pupils, I will want to explore these two aspects before and after the employment of the dyslexia friendly practices. Therefore, data will be gathered in two distinct phases.

One month before the study begins I will conduct classroom observations to gain insights on pupils’ performance and motivation as language learners. Since you are the classroom teacher and you already know the learners well, I would like to have two interviews with you at these phases. In the interviews we will discuss about pupils’ performance and motivation. However, in case you feel uncomfortable with some issues during our discussion you will have to let me know and we will change topic. We will arrange together when you want to have the interviews. They must take place in the school but if we cannot find a time that is convenient for you, we will have to do it via telephone or internet call. However, I would prefer if we could have face to face interviews. I will also ask you if you can provide me with pupils’ tests, dictations and writings to gain a better conceptualisation of their performance. The issue of motivation will be further explored by conducting one interview with each pupil and two focus groups: one with the pupils with dyslexia and another one with their non-dyslexic classmates.

The same procedures will be followed during the period in which the dyslexia practices were used. The interviews with you and the pupils as well as the focus groups will be conducted towards the end of the study. The questions will be the same while I will also want to discuss whether you saw any differences in pupil’s performance and motivation. I will also ask the pupils whether they have understood any differences in their English lessons. During this phase the only difference during the observations will be that I will note down which of the practices I see you use each time.
The interviews and the focus group may take place in a time were you would have a class. If you or the head teacher won’t agree with this we will reschedule to do conduct these at another time – always in the school.

It should be noted that my aim is not to assess you or evaluate how you work. The only aim is to examine how these specific practices work in the Greek EFL context.

Finally, I would like to ask your permission to record the interviews we are going to have with a tape recorder so as to be able to capture the most of what we discuss.

What happens to the data collected?

The data will be used to inform my doctoral theses and answer my research questions. Publications may also arise from this research. Some of them will be analysed during the study but most of them will be analysed after the study has finished. After submitting my thesis the data will be kept encrypted in my personal computer which is always password protected (see about confidentiality below). If you want, you will be able to see the data at any time after my project ends but you wont be able to alter the results.

The data will be kept for five years after the study has finished. After this time, the notes from the observations and the assessment tools as well as the tapes from the interviews and the focus groups will be destroyed.

How is confidentiality maintained?

Your privacy is very important for both me and the University. For this reason, all the data will be encrypted and stored in my personal computer in which I will only have access to. My computer will always be password protected and will be located at my personal study room at my home. The notes from the examination of the pupil’s assessment tools, the observations and the tapes from the interviews and the focus groups will be kept in a drawer in my desk. The desk is located in my personal study room while I will be the only one having access to it.

My activity will be confidential and the data will be anonymous. That is, I will not share with anyone what I am collecting and no references to places or schools will made. Each participant and the school will be referred with pseudonyms I will have created. In case I want to publish something relevant to this study the same pseudonyms will be used. There will be no personally identifying information.
What happens if I do not want to take part or if I change my mind?

It is up to you to decide whether or not to you want to take part in the present study. If you do decide to take part you will be given this information sheet to keep and be asked to sign a consent form. If you decide that you want to take part in the study I will respect your right to withdraw at any time without explaining the reason.

Will I be paid for participating in the study?

Your participation in the study is voluntary.

What is the duration of the study?

The classroom observations will last three to four months. Our interviews will last maximum thirty minutes in both phases of the study. The interviews and the focus groups with the pupils will also last maximum thirty minutes.

Where will the study be conducted?

The study will be conducted in your school, in Rethymno, Crete, Greece.

Will the outcomes of the study be published?

Details of the study will be included in my thesis or in articles that may be published in academic journals or books.

Criminal Records Check (if applicable)

I have received an official certificate from the Hellenic ministry of Education which gives me permission to work in state schools and private language institutes. I have successfully passed all the medical and psychological exams for obtaining this certificate. I have previously worked for three years as an English language teacher in private and public schools.

I have a Clear Criminal Status checked by the Hellenic Ministry of Justice (article 576 element b’ 3 CCP as modified by the article 9 of L. 1805/1988 GOG 199).
Contact for further information

In case you need further clarifications for my study and you can contact me at any time. My contact details are:

Maria Reraki
School of Education, The University of Manchester
Eileen Wilkinson Building, Oxford Road
Manchester, UK
M13 9PL

email: maria.reraki@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk

You can also contact my academic supervisors:

Dr Garry Squires:

email: Garry.Squires@manchester.ac.uk

Dr Juup Stelma:

email: Juup.Stelma@manchester.ac.uk

What if something goes wrong?

In case something goes wrong please feel free to contact me or my supervisors.

If there are any issues regarding this research that you would prefer not to discuss with members of the research team, please contact the Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator by either writing to ‘The Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator, Research Office, Christie Building, The University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL’, by emailing: Research-Governance@manchester.ac.uk, or by telephoning 0161 275 7583 or 275 8083
Πρακτικές φυλικές προς τους δυσλεξικούς στην τάξη των Αγγλικών

Ενημερωτικό φυλλάδιο συμμετεχόντων

Σας δίνουμε αυτό το φυλλάδιο για να σας ενημερώσουμε για την έρευνα που κάνω στο σχολείο ως μέρος του διδακτορικού μου το οποίο κάνω στο Πανεπιστήμιο του Μάντσεστερ στην Αγγλία. Στόχος μου είναι να ερευνήσω τον τρόπο με τον οποίο οι μαθητές με δυσλεξία μπορούν να συμπεριληφθούν στην τάξη των Αγγλικών. Αν και υπάρχουν πολλές μελέτες για την έναρξη των μαθητών με δυσλεξία δεν υπάρχουν πολλές μελέτες για τους μαθητές με δυσλεξία που μαθαίνουν Αγγλικά ως δεύτερη ή ως ξένη γλώσσα. Για το λόγο αυτό, στη μελέτη μου, θα εξετάσουμε το θέμα της στήριξης των Ελλήνων μαθητών με δυσλεξία που μαθαίνουν Αγγλικά ως Ξένη Γλώσσα.

Περαιτέρω, θα ζητήσουμε την απασχόληση μαθητών να έχουν πρακτικές φυλικές προς τα παιδιά που έχουν δυσλεξία στην απόδοσή και τα κόντρα των δυσλεξικών και μη δυσλεξικών μαθητών που μαθαίνουν Αγγλικά. Ο όρος 'φυλικές προς τα δυσλεξικά' σημαίνει ότι έχουν σχεδιαστεί για την υποστήριξη των μαθητών που έχουν αναγνωστικές και ορθογραφικές δυσκολίες. Αυτές παρέχουν όλους τους μαθητές που είναι διαφορετικοί ώστε να υποστηρίζονται στο μάθημα των Αγγλικών χωρίς να χρειάζονται να εγκαταλείψουν την τάξη και να αποκοπήσουν από τις δραστηριότητες που κάνουν τα υπόλοιπα παιδιά.

'Όλοι στη τάξη παίρνουμε αυτό το φυλλάδιο.

Σας παρέχουμε αυτές τις πληροφορίες για θεωρώ ότι είναι σημαντικό για σας να καταλάβετε γιατί κάνω την έρευνα μου και τι θα περιλαμβάνει. Παρακαλώ σας παρέχω τα στοιχεία μου σε περίπτωση που θέλετε περισσότερες πληροφορίες ή για τυχόν ερωτήσεις που μπορεί να σας δημιουργήσουν. Σας ευχαριστώ για την ανάγκη του παρόντος εγγράφου.

Ποιος θα κάνει αυτή την έρευνα;

Η Μαρία Ρέρακη, καθηγήτρια Αγγλικών και διδακτορική φοιτήτρια στο Πανεπιστήμιο του Μάντσεστερ, Αγγλία.

Τίτλος της έρευνας

Πρακτικές φυλικές προς τους δυσλεξικούς στην τάξη των Αγγλικών.
Ποιος είναι ο σκοπός της μελέτης;
Ο σκοπός της μελέτης είναι να παρέχει ευκαιρίες για την υποστήριξη των μαθητών με δυσλεξία στη διδακτική εκμάθηση των Αγγλικών. Σημειώνεται από τον δάσκαλο να χρησιμοποιεί πρακτικές που είναι φιλικές προς τους δυσλεξικούς μαθητές. Θα έθελε να διερευνήσει κατά πόσον αυτές βοηθούν τους μαθητές με δυσλεξία στην τάξη των Αγγλικών. Ο στόχος είναι να δούμε κατά πόσο οι μαθητές αυτοί μπορεί να έχουν λογότητα ή καθόλου προβλήματα στη γλώσσα όταν αυτές οι πρακτικές χρησιμοποιηθούν μέσα στην τάξη. Επιπλέον με ενδιαφέρει η γενική εκπαίδευση και όχι η τάξη ένταξης. Θα έθελε εξετάσει κατά πόσο υποστηρίζονται όλοι οι μαθητές και όχι μόνο οι μαθητές που έχουν μαθητικές δυσκολίες. Έτσι, η παρούσα μελέτη θα έχει θετικές επιπτώσεις σε όλη την τάξη.

Γιατί επιλέξατε το σχολείο μας;
Επέλεξα το σχολείο σας γιατί πιστεύω ότι θα συμβάλει σημαντικά στην μελέτη μου. Αυτό μπορεί να φέρει και στην πολύ καλή φήμη που έχει το σχολείο. Για τον ιδίο λόγο, θα συμμετάσχουμε και άλλες τάξεις από άλλα σχολεία.

Τι θα πρέπει να κάνουν τα παιδιά;
Το μεγαλύτερο μέρος της ερευνητικής διαδικασίας θα εξαρτηθεί από μένα (ερευνητής) και το δάσκαλο των Αγγλικών της τάξης. Πριν ξεκινήσει η μελέτη θα δούμε στο δάσκαλο Αγγλικών εντομορριχεία φυλλάδια και σφάλματα σχετικά με τη δυσλεξία. Αργότερα, κάποιες πρακτικές οι οποίες είναι ειδικά σχεδιασμένες για την υποστήριξη των μαθητών με δυσλεξία θα προταθούν στον καθηγητή. Εκείνος θα επιλέξει τις πρακτικές που αυτοσκευάστηκε θεωρεί ότι μπορεί να χρησιμοποιηθούν στη συγκεκριμένη τάξη. Για παράδειγμα, μπορεί να χρησιμοποιηθούν φωτογραφίες δίπλα σε ένα κέρμα ειτέ για να καθεστώσετε την ανάγκη ης. Ένα μήνα πριν ο δάσκαλος ξεκινήσει με τη χρήση των πρακτικών φυλλάδιων της δυσλεξίας θα παρακολουθώ τα μαθήματα των Αγγλικών έτσι ώστε να δώ τι γίνεται μέσα στην τάξη. Κατά τη διάρκεια των παρατηρήσεών μας θα έχουμε μέρος της τάξης και κριτικά κάποιες σημειώσεις. Παρακαλώ σημειώστε ότι στόχος μου δεν είναι να αξιολογήσω τους μαθητές στην τάξη και ότι δεν θα παραμετρώνω στο μαθήματα.

Είναι επίσης σημαντικό για την έρευνα μου να συζητήσω με τους μαθητές τα κίνητρα και τα συναισθήματα που έχουν όταν μαθαίνουν Αγγλικά. Γι αυτό το λόγο μία συζήτηση με κάθε μαθητή και δύο ομαδικές συζητήσεις με δύο γραμμές μαθητών θα διεξαχθούν στο σχολείο για να ΔΩ αν τους ορίστε μαθαίνουν Αγγλικά ή ποιο γενικά αν τους ορίστε τα μαθήματα των Αγγλικών.

Οι ιδées διαδικασίες θα ακολουθηθούν και την περίοδο κατά την οποία ο καθηγητής των Αγγλικών θα χρησιμοποιεί κάποιες πρακτικές φυλλάδιων προς τους δυσλεξικούς. Αυτό σημαίνει ότι άλλη μία ατομική και ομαδική συζήτηση θα γίνει με τους μαθητές αυτή την περίοδο. Τα θέματα που θα συζητηθούν με τους μαθητές θα είναι τα ίδια με την πρώτη φορά με σκοπό να δώ αν έχει αλλαγή κάτι. Αυτή η φορά θα ρωτήσει τα παιδιά αν έχουν παρατηρήσει τον δάσκαλο εάν κάνει κάτι διαφορετικό και εάν απολαμβάνουν περαιτέρω το μαθήματα. Η ομαδική και η ομαδική συζήτηση θα διεξαχθούν μάλλον σε κάποια ώρα την οποία οι μαθητές θα είχαν Αγγλικά. Αυτό θα εξαρτηθεί βέβαια από τη συγκατάθεση του καθηγητή των Αγγλικών και από τον διευθυντή του σχολείου. Εάν δεν συμφωνήσουν θα οριστεί κάποια άλλη ώρα (π.χ. σε κάποιο διάλειμμα).

Όλες οι πληροφορίες πριν και μετά την περίοδο κατά την οποία ο καθηγητής χρησιμοποιούσε τις πρακτικές θα εξεταστούν και θα αναλυθούν για να εξεταστεί εάν υπήρξε κάποια διαφορά (θετική ή αρνητική) στην απόδοση και στα κίνητρα των μαθητών της τάξης.
Θα ήθελα να σας ενημερώσω ότι οι συζητήσεις με τους μαθητές θα καταγράφονται γιατί θα είναι πολύ διάσημο για εμένα να γράψω ό,τι λένε κατά τη διάρκεια των συζητήσεων. Είναι σημαντικό επίσης να θυμάστε ότι δεν θα γίνει καμία αναφορά σε μαθησιακές δυσκολίες που ισχως έχουν κάποιοι μαθητές σε καμία από τις συζητήσεις (ομικρικές ή ατομικές).

Τι θα κάνετε με τις πληροφορίες που θα συλλέξετε;

Η διατήρηση της ανωνυμίας σας είναι πολύ σημαντική και για εμένα και για το Πανεπιστήμιό μου. Γι' αυτό το λόγο όλες οι πληροφορίες που θα συλλέξω θα κρατώνται κλειστές στον υπολογιστή μου στον οποίο μόνο εγώ έχω πρόσβαση. Όλες οι πληροφορίες από τις παρακολούθησης, τις συζητήσεις και τα γραπτά των μαθητών θα κρατώνται στον προσωπικό μου χώρο.

Ο,ι κάνω να είμαι απόρρητος και όλες οι πληροφορίες θα είναι ανώνυμες. Δεν θα μοιράζομαι με κανέναν τις πληροφορίες που θα μαζέω και δεν θα γίνει καμία αναφορά στο μέρος ή σε ποιά σχολεία έγινε η έρευνα μου.

Θα χρησιμοποιούμε δεδομένα για όλα τα σχολεία που συμμετέχουν. Σε περίπτωση που θέλω να δημοσιεύσω κάτι σχετικό με την έρευνα μου θα δηλώσω ότι είμαι χρησιμοποιημένος. Εν τελέυταία, δεν θα υπάρχουν καθόλου προσωπικές πληροφορίες.

Τι γίνεται εάν κάποια στημή αποφασίσεις; Θα δεν θέλω να συμμετάσχω στην έρευνα;

Εάν κάποιο στιγμή αποφασίσεις να δεν θέλετε να συμμετάσχετε στην έρευνα έχετε κάθε δικαίωμα να το κάνετε χωρίς να εξηγηθείτε τον λόγο. Σημειώσετε επίσης ότι έχω εξηγηθεί στα παραπάνω θέλω να κάνω και γιατί είμαι στο σχολείο.

Θα πληρωθεί που θα συμμετάσχω στην έρευνα;

Η συμμετοχή σας στην έρευνα είναι εθελοντική.

Πόσο διαρκέσει η έρευνα σου;

Οι παρακολουθήσεις στην τάξη θα διαρκέσουν μέχρι τον Ιούνιο.

Οι συζητήσεις που θα γίνουν με τους μαθητές θα διαρκέσουν το μέγιστο μισή ώρα και τις δύο φορές. Το ίδιο ισχύει και για τις ομικρικές συζητήσεις.

Πού θα γίνει η έρευνα;

Η έρευνα μου θα γίνει στο σχολείο σας.

Τα αποτελέσματα της έρευνας σου θα εκδοθούν;

Ολες οι πληροφορίες της έρευνας θα διαμερίστηκαν στην εργασία μου και σε ακαδημαϊκά περιοδικά ή βιβλία.
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Στοιχεία επικοινωνίας για παραπάνω πληροφορίες:

Μαρία Ρεράκη

Καθηγήτρια Αγγλικών και Υποψηφία Διδάκτωρ του Πανεπιστημίου του Μάντσεστερ, Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο

τηλέφωνο: 6976466532

e-mail: mareraki@gmail.com

Άλλες μελέτες έχουν δείξει ότι πρακτικές φιλικές προς τα παιδιά με διαλείψεις έχουν θετικές επιπτώσεις σε όλη την τάξη. Γι’ αυτό θέλω να διερευνήσω την επιρροή που αυτές οι πρακτικές έχουν σε όλα τα παιδιά.
Appendix 8: Research diary (preliminary reflections)

a. 01/02/12

...the head teachers from primary school A' and primary school B' asked me if there are going to be any extra expenses (during the study) (!)

b. 03/02/12

I spoke with Penelope today, the EFL teacher in Primary School A'. She sounds young which is good. She sounded willing to learn more about the study and she was saying yes to everything! However, she told me that it would be better if we met in person and I told her that I will be there the beginning of March. She gave me her email and she told me to send her whatever I want to.

I also spoke with Myrtle the teacher in Primary School C'. We both realised that we know each other from the past since her father was my teacher and we were going in the same secondary school. Because she changed her name I hadn’t realised it was her. After that point I felt more comfortable talking to her while she was sounding comfortable from the beginning. She also said that we should meet in person and that if I want to send her something she will check her email during the weekend. She sounded more curious that Penelope.

I think Minos the teacher from Primary School B' is the least motivated. I spoke with him today - I called at school and it was like he wanted to hang up all the time. He wanted to show me that he understood what he had to do during the study and that it was OK- he would do it. He also told me that he doesn’t have internet at home and he won’t be able to check his email very often but he gave me his email account to send him whatever I wanted. He also said that we need to speak in person but he didn’t ask me about any dates (e.g. when I will be going there, when the study will start exactly etc.) Maybe he was a bit nervous because
the head teacher was standing next to him. Let’s see how that goes...doubts...doubts...doubts :(

c. 10/02/12

...Penelope said that she needs the materials on dyslexia. However, she knows some things on dyslexia due to a seminar she attended in the past.

d. 10/02/12

I will ask link person to print the resources and give them to the head teacher and he can pass them to the EFL teacher

e. 17/02/12

All the teachers got the resources yesterday...I feel a bit nervous...I will wait and then I will call and ask if they have any questions so as to check if they had a look. I hope Minos took the photocopies with him at home.

I will wait and I will call them again after the weekend when they’re gonna have more time to have a look.

f. 21/02/12

I spoke with the teachers today. Myrtle and Penelope said that they had a look at the resources but that it would be better if these were in print- they said they would do that. Myrtle said that she will have more time next week and she will have a closer look then.

Minos didn’t look at them because he didn’t have time - he said he prefers to do it at the same time when he starts using the practices. We spoke 2 or three times on the phone but very shortly, he always sounded like he wanted to hung up (maybe
he is avoiding me). I have to find a way to make him have a look at the resources before the use of the practices... but how?...

I went to school B’ today and because Minos had said he can’t read the resources now and that he will start when he uses the practices. I brought with me one of the documents so as for him to tell me what he can understand. He said he hadn’t read a document in English for a long time and that it seemed a bit difficult. Some of the terms were underlined. I explained him (based on what he said) that the sooner he starts reading them the better even if he reads the shortest articles. He said he would start but I’m not sure... I also told him that if he reads these and the practices at the same time it will be too much for him.
Appendix 9: Consent forms

a. Consent forms for parents

Study Title

CONSENT FORM

If you are happy to participate please complete and sign the consent form below. Please Initial Box.

1. I confirm that I have read the attached information sheet on the above study and have had the opportunity to consider the information and ask questions and had these answered satisfactorily.

2. I understand that my participation in the study is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason.

3. I understand that the interviews will be audio/video-recorded

4. I agree to the use of anonymous quotes

5. I agree that any data collected may be passed to other researchers

6. I agree that any data collected may be published in anonymous form in academic books or journals.

I agree to take part in the above project

Name of participant: Maria Reraki

Date ____________________________
Signature ____________________________

Name of person taking consent

Date ____________________________
Signature ____________________________
b. Consent forms for pupils

**CONSENT FORM**

So, if you agree with the sentences below circle the smiley face, if not circle the sad face.

1. I confirm that I have read the information sheet on the above study and have had time to think what this paper says. I also asked questions and I am satisfied with the answers I got.

2. I participate in this study because I want to help Ms Maria but if I want to quit at some point I will do it without having to explain why.

3. I understand that the discussions I will have with Ms Maria and my classmates will be audio recorded.

4. I agree to the use of anonymous quotes.

5. I agree that maybe other students like Ms Maria will see what we discussed.

6. I agree that the information that Ms Maria has from us may be published in anonymous forms in books or journals.

I agree to take part in the above project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of participant</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maria Reraki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of person taking consent</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. Consent forms for the head teachers

CONSENT FORM

If you are happy to participate please complete and sign the consent form below. Please Initial Box.

1. I confirm that I have read the attached information sheet on the above study and have had the opportunity to consider the information and ask questions and had these answered satisfactorily.

2. I understand that my participation in the study is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason.

3. I understand that the interviews will be audio/video-recorded

4. I agree to the use of anonymous quotes

5. I agree that any data collected may be passed to other researchers

6. I agree that any data collected may be published in anonymous form in academic books or journals.

I agree to take part in the above project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of participant</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maria Reraki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of person taking consent</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. Consent forms for EFL teachers

CONSENT FORM

If you are happy to participate please complete and sign the consent form below. Please Initial Box.

1. I confirm that I have read the attached information sheet on the above study and have had the opportunity to consider the information and ask questions and had these answered satisfactorily.

2. I understand that my participation in the study is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason.

3. I understand that the interviews will be audio/video-recorded

4. I agree to the use of anonymous quotes

5. I agree that any data collected may be passed to other researchers

6. I agree that any data collected may be published in anonymous form in academic books or journals.

I agree to take part in the above project

Name of participant    Date    Signature
Maria Reraki

Name of person taking consent    Date    Signature
### A) Self assessment grid for A2 level learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDERSTANDING</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Listening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can read very short, simple texts. I can find specific, predictable information in simple everyday material such as advertisements, prospectuses, menus and timetables and I can understand short simple personal letters.</td>
<td>I can understand phrases and the highest frequency vocabulary related to areas of most immediate personal relevance (e.g. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local area, employment). I can catch the main point in short, clear, simple messages and announcements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SPEAKING       | PRODUCTION: I can use a series of phrases and sentences to describe in simple terms my family and other people, living conditions, my educational background and my present or most recent job. |
|               | INTERACTION: I can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar topics and activities. I can handle very short social exchanges, even though I can't usually understand enough to keep the conversation going myself. |

| WRITING        | I can write short, simple notes and messages relating to matters in areas of immediate need. I can write a very simple personal letter, for example thanking someone for something |

(Common European framework for reference of languages, 2001, p.26)
### b) Vocabulary and Grammar skills at A2 level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>vocabulary range</th>
<th>Has sufficient vocabulary to conduct routine, everyday transactions involving familiar situations and topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Has a sufficient vocabulary for the expression of basic communicative needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Has a sufficient vocabulary for coping with simple survival needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Can control a narrow repertoire dealing with concrete everyday needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uses some simple structures correctly, but still systematically makes basic mistakes - for example tends to mix up tenses and forget to mark agreement; nevertheless, it is usually clear what he/she is trying to say</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 11: Extract from classroom observation notes

16/03/12

10.05 Teacher corrects it, somebody reads a word correctly
Pupil praises teacher, dyslexic pupil gets up to erase the board
Pupils underline some words, a pupil writes on the board
Some pupils distracted, dyslexic pupil moves around, stands next to the pupil that writes on the board and observes her
One pupil moves around and is not paying attention
One pupil asks surprised "Is Alex* writing the words?!" (Pupils surprised)
Dyslexic pupil wants to participate - he stands next to the girl on the board

10.10 One pupil has taken another's notebook other pupils write - classroom is generally quiet but some pupils talk at me and ask me questions - (observer effects) I just smile
dyslexic pupil tries to help the girl on the board, Teacher asks sth many pupils want to answer, 2 pupils talk and don't participate in the exercise, dyslexic pupil still stands, pretends he checks what the girl writes on the board, dyslexic pupil helps her sometimes check the text another teacher also observes with me
one pupil doesn't have books the words they write are from the text on the book the other teacher talks to some pupils - dyslexic pupil tries to answer sometimes struggles to participate, say sth and write
Pupils say they want me to teach and the teacher says ok dyslexic pupil stands on the door, looks outside other pupils say that he stands there to the teacher
Teacher sits on the desk all the time
4 pupils are distracted - talk to each other- the other teacher acts like a participant observer sometimes
Pupils ask my name - (observer effects), dyslexic pupil moves around close to the girl on the board
4 pupils keep talking to each other
1 or 2 pupils usually participate in tasks and answer questions

Alex: pupil with dyslexia in Highgarden classroom
Appendix 12: Research diary (EFL teachers’ and head teachers’ response)

a. 31/01/12

In school A the head teacher sounded very willing (to participate). Maybe because my mother was the head teacher there before him and he wants to show that he wants to help. He told me to call again on Friday and tell to Penelope the EFL teacher.

In school B the head teacher sounded a bit weird although willing. He also told me to call this Friday because all the teachers have a meeting and the EFL teacher will be there as well.

In school C I called but no one replied. I will call again on Friday as well when I call the other schools too.

...The two head teachers I spoke to asked me about whether there would be any extra expenses (during the study) (!)

b. 31/03/12

I feel a bit disappointed. Minas hasn’t realised what I am doing there- I think he hasn’t even properly read the information sheets.

In Myrtle’s class there is a mess- there are a lot of pupils and she cannot impose herself as a teacher. I am not sure how she is going to apply the practices.

Penelope seems better than the other two - she is more organised and she imposes herself in the classroom. However, her lesson is really slow.
Appendix 13: Teacher interview questions

Questions

1. Let’s talk about your pupils’ reading skills…Do your pupils have any reading problems?
   - type of reading problems;
   - performance in the classroom (e.g. finish reading the whole text or paragraph);
   - reading comprehension;
   - what levels in the classroom;
   - what about dyslexic learners

2. Let’s talk about your pupils’ speaking skills…Do you see any problems in speaking?
   - use of language properly (use of grammar and vocabulary);
   - communicate meaning;
   - what kind of problems (if any) in communicating meaning;
   - levels in speaking;
   - dyslexic learners;

3. I would also like to ask you about your pupils’ listening skills? How are they doing in the listening tasks?
   - (to what extend) complete listening exercises;
   - good grasp of language when listening;
   - how often do they ask you to replay something;
   - pupils’ level on listening
   - pupils with dyslexia
4. I would like you to tell me about your pupils' skills in grammar. How are they doing in the grammar tasks?
   - good grasp in grammar rules;
   - connect with previous knowledge;
   - use grammar properly in other tasks (writing, speaking...);
   - pupils' level in grammar;
   - dyslexic learners

5. What would you say about your pupils' competence in writing? Do they have problems in writing?
   - (if yes) Type of writing problems;
   - amount of written work produced (could some pupils write more)
   - easy to understand their compositions/ the meaning they want to convey;
   - spelling, use of grammar/expressions/vocabulary in writings;
   - pupils' level in writing tasks;
   - dyslexic learners

6. Finally let's talk about their dictations? How are they doing in their dictations?
   - spelling mistakes (amount, type);
   - translating the words;
   - use of vocabulary in other tasks (writings, speaking tasks...);
   - pupils' level in dictation;
   - pupils with dyslexia
I would now like to tackle pupils’ motivation.

7. Would you say it is a classroom motivated to learn English?
   - if yes/no why;
   - some pupils more motivated than others;
   - what shows you that they are/aren't motivated;
   - what about learners with dyslexia

8. To what extent do they engage in tasks in the classroom?
   - participation in activities;
   - participate only when asked;
   - how often they take initiatives;
   - what about dyslexic pupils

9. What about their homework?
   - do it regularly;
   - how often give excuses (if not);
   - well-prepared;
   - dyslexic pupils

10. What about their classwork? Do they orient towards the tasks in the classroom?
    - follow your instructions;
    - focused/distracted;
    - dyslexic pupils

11. How often do you see them use English?
    - only when asked/other instances too;
    - ask questions for clarification/out of interest;
    - dyslexic pupils
12. Thank you for telling me about your class - it sounds like an interesting mix of pupils. How do you manage to teach them as a group, given that they seem to have a number of differences?

Additional questions at the second phase:

13. Tell me what things have you done differently since we last met..? How are these going?

14. Have you noticed any differences in pupils' performance and motivation after you started using the dyslexia-friendly practices?

15. Thanks again for telling me about your class which - as we said last time - it is a mixed ability class. How do you think you manage to teach them as a group now that some new practices were suggested to you?
Appendix 14: Pupils' dictations
The words were dictated in English and the pupils have to write the Greek translation.

11.11.11

1) name

Name has written most of the words correctly in English apart from three (10 words overall) in which he had spelling mistakes. He has written the translation in six correctly.

Teacher has written: almost Excellent!

2) name

Name is writing weird letters some make sense. She has written the translation in most of the words correctly but she hasn’t written all the words dictated. (8 words only)

Teacher hasn’t corrected anything- she has written Excellent

3) name

Name has written all the words correctly and their translation - the word environmental is misspelled and she has forgotten the ‘e’ in the word Ukraine.

Teacher: Almost Excellent

4) name

Everything is written and translated correctly - she has also forgotten the ‘e’ in the word Ukraine

Teacher: Excellent

5) name
Only two of the words are misspelled (accicent & penisula). All the translations are correct.

Teacher: almost excellent (however, letters seem to be Harris' letters)

22.11.12

1) name

Everything is correct and the translations - two words are slightly misspelled (Polland & language)

T: Excellent

2) name

Everything is correct.

T: Excellent

3) name

Everything is correct - only two words are slightly misspelled (amerikan & llanguage)

T: Almost excellent

4) name

Everything is correct apart from the word 'amerikan'

T: almost Excellent

5) name
She has written most of the words dictated, not all. No translations. Has misspelled Bulgaria- weird letters

T: Excellent

6) name

Has written all the translations correctly and the English words- apart from three slightly misspelled words (nationality, Great Britain, language)

T: Very Good

24.11.12

1) name

Everything is correct.

T: Excellent

2) name

Everything is correct - he only forgot the t in the word ‘ancient’

T: Excellent

3) name

 hasn’t written any translations- some words are spelled correctly - three not:

T: almost excellent

4) name
everything is correct - three words slightly misspelled (‘nan’ for nun, ‘humanitarian’ & ‘homeland’)

T: almost excellent

5) name

One spelling mistake in the English words - no translation in three words - all the others are correct.

T: almost excellent
Appendix 15: Pupil interviews and focus group questions

a) Pupil interviews

Questions

1. Do you think it is important to learn English? If yes/no why?

2. Why do you think English is obligatory in Greek state education?

3. What is like learning English in your school? - What kinds of things help? What kinds of things make it difficult? What do you find interesting about the EFL lessons?

4. Would you like to meet people that have English as their first language (Americans, British)? - Why?

5. Would you prefer to spend your time learning English or doing another subject instead? Why?

6. If I asked your best friend how you were doing in English, what would they say? Why would they say that?

7. How do you feel when you speak (English) in class and sometimes in front of all of your classmates? Confident, relaxed, anxious, stressed, nervous?

8. What experiences do you have from learning English so far?
   - Good or bad
   - Previous teachers (in the school/ language institute)
9. Are you satisfied with how much you study for English? Do you think you should study more or less?

10. Do you enjoy your EFL classes this year? Do you find them interesting/boring? Easy/difficult?
   - The activities meaningful/meaningless, useful/useless, helpful or not
   - Classroom atmosphere (good/ bad)

11. What about your teacher? What do you think?
   - Interesting/ boring, imaginative, helpful
   - Fair, enthusiastic, sympathetic

12. In what ways do you work with your classmates? What do you like about this?
   - Are you close with your classmates?
   - help each other
   - co-operate
   - do you like working with your classmates in groups?
   - If yes/no why?

13) If you were in charge of the school and wanted to make the EFL lesson better, what would you do?

*Additional question in the second part of the study:*

14) Have you noticed the teacher doing something different lately? If yes, what do you think of these changes.
Based on how you feel as a pupil that learns English, I would like you to point me the emoticons that you think represents your feelings in the English language classroom:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emoji</th>
<th>Emotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>😞</td>
<td>Sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😊</td>
<td>Happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😕</td>
<td>Confused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😵</td>
<td>Bored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😎</td>
<td>Confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😡</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🙁</td>
<td>Worried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>😍</td>
<td>Interested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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b) Focus groups

Questions

1. I guess everybody tells you that you should know English and some of you may go to a private language institute in the afternoon because you have to learn English well. Why do you think it is so important to learn English? Why do you think everybody is saying that you have to learn?

2. In which countries around the world do people have English as their first language? Do you know any people whose native language is English? Would you be interested to meet people from these countries?

3. Do you prefer to study for other classes instead of studying for English?
   - Which level in English would you like to reach? When would you say that you have succeeded in learning English?

4. Talk to me about yourself as an EFL pupil? Would you say you are an excellent EFL pupil, very good, something else? If you had to mark yourself what would you say?

5. In the classroom, when you answer teacher's questions or when you the teacher asks you to read or speak in English or even do something else in front of the whole class how do you feel at that moment? Do you want to do it? How do you feel when doing it? Do you feel nervous like everyone is looking at you or do you feel confident?
Would you say there are some asks that make you feel nervous and other that make you feel confident?

6. Tell me for how many years have you been studying English? Are you happy with your experiences as a learner of English so far? Did you enjoy all the previous school years as an EFL pupil? Tell me about your experiences so far. Previous teachers, classmates you have good or bad memories from.

7. How much time do you usually spend in doing your homework for your English classes? Do you think it is enough? Are you satisfied with yourself? Would you say you study more or less that you should?

8. Tell me about the classroom atmosphere and your classmates. How do you feel in class? Are you close with your classmates? If no/yes why is that? Are there any instances that you feel uncomfortable or do you always feel fine?

9. Let’s talk about your teacher. What would you say for your EFL teacher? Are you happy with the way he/she teaches? Would you like something to be different? How would you describe your EFL teacher?

10. Do you do group work activities in the classroom? Do you feel you belong in a group that you are a 'team' in this way? If yes/no why?

Additional question in the second phase of the study:

11. Is there something different in your English classes lately?
Something that the teacher hasn't done before? If yes, do you want to discuss your thoughts and feelings about it?

Based on how you feel as a pupil that learns English, I would like you to point me the emoticons that you think represents your feelings in the English language classroom:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sad</th>
<th>Happy</th>
<th>Confused</th>
<th>Bored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>Worried</td>
<td>Interested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 16: Example of typical classroom in Greek public primary school

Source: www.imerisia.gr
Appendix 17: Assessment tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Designed by the Teacher (Highgarden Classroom)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Test designed by the teacher (Highgarden classroom)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the nationalities (Γράψε τις εθνοτήτες) (5 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italy → Italian √</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the meaning (Γράψε την σημασία) (5 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
b. test from the course book (Winterfell classroom)
Present Continuous

5. Put the words in the correct order to make sentences as in the example:

1. playing / he’s / violin / the
   He’s playing the violin.
2. school / going / we’re / to
   We’re going to school.
3. aren’t / they / the / playing / in / park
   They aren’t playing in the park.
4. me / aren’t / listening / you / to
   You aren’t listening to me.
5. playing / is / he / the / guitar
   He’s playing the guitar.
6. isn’t / he / sleeping
   He isn’t sleeping.

6. Circle five differences. Write sentences.

In picture B:
1. Mike isn’t playing the violin. He’s playing the guitar.
2. Isabel and Maya aren’t reading a book. They’re dancing.
3. Jean isn’t listening to music. She’s eating a burger.
4. Peter and Ahmed aren’t working in the house. They’re sleeping.
5. Ahmed and Ahmed aren’t playing. They’re watching TV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Short answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am I working?</td>
<td>Are you working?</td>
<td>Yes, I am.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you working?</td>
<td>Is he/she/it working?</td>
<td>No, I’m not. Yes, he/she/it is. No, he/she/it isn’t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is he working?</td>
<td>Are they working?</td>
<td>Yes, they are. No, they aren’t.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Present Continuous

7 Answer the questions.

1. Is he sleeping?
   Yes, he is.

2. Is she driving?
   Yes, she is.

3. Is it running?
   No, it isn't.

4. Are you sending an email?
   Yes, we are.

5. Are they listening to music?
   No, they aren't.

6. Is he playing the piano?
   No, he isn't.

8 Write the questions and answers.

1. he eat a cake
   Is he eating a cake?
   Yes, he is.
   No, he isn't.

2. they play with a kite
   Are they playing with a kite?
   Yes, they are.
   No, they aren't.

3. he drive a car
   Is he driving a car?
   Yes, he is.
   No, he isn't.

4. she pick flowers
   Is she picking flowers?
   Yes, she is.
   No, she isn't.

5. they sing
   Are they singing?
   Yes, they are.
   No, they aren't.

6. she cook chicken
   Is she cooking a chicken?
   Yes, she is.
   No, she isn't.

The answers are written in colored ink.
c. test from the course book (Riverlands classroom)

Test Unit 2

A) Put the words in the box in the correct column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Adverb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>walk</td>
<td>going</td>
<td>mechanic</td>
<td>busy</td>
<td>turn</td>
<td>left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public</td>
<td>back</td>
<td>elderly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B) Read what Nadine says and answer the following questions.

Nadine: "Well, my family and I live in the centre of Marseilles, which is a big city in the south of France. My parents work in a factory outside the city and they go to work by bus. Many of their colleagues drive to work but it seems to me my parents are doing the right thing. It's better to take the bus; the traffic is so heavy!"

Questions

1) Where do Nadine and her family live?
2) Where do her parents work?
3) How do they go to work?
4) Why is it better to take the bus?
C) Your friend has invited you to his party on Friday. The directions to his home are in the invitation below but they are jumbled. Put them in the right order so that it makes sense!

Come to my party this Saturday, March 10th!
It's easy to find me!

1) Turn left. My house is on the right next to a café.
2) Then, walk for about five minutes.
3) When you arrive at your Marilyn's square, turn right into Andistasseos street.
4) Go down this street until you meet a wall.
5) Just get to the town hall and go along Koumoudiotou Avenue.

Can't wait to see you!
Nick

Correct order: [5, 3, 4, 2, 1]......

D) Unscramble the words!
1) rekobosta: ..................
2) acrytto: ..................
3) marla: ..................
4) fili: ..................
5) suburb: ..................

(5 marks)
Test Unit 2

A) Complete the dialogue with the appropriate phrase.

1) Here you are. How much is it? Can I have a cheese pie, please?
2) Yes, of course!
3) __________ is it?
4) It’s 1.20 €. __________?
5) __________.

B) i) Fill in the correct prepositions.
1) __________ Christmas Eve
2) __________ the morning
3) __________ night
4) __________ my birthday
5) __________ 2012
6) __________ Christmas

ii) Say how you feel in the following situations!
How do you feel...
1) when you don’t like a party but you can’t leave?
2) when someone takes your pen without asking?
3) when your pet gets killed?
4) when you get a good grade?

C) Write the questions!
1) ____________________________ ? I go to bed around 11 p.m.
2) ____________________________ ? Ben goes to work by car.
3) ____________________________ ? She has chicken for lunch.
4) ____________________________ ? They eat out on Sundays.
5) ____________________________ ? They spend their summer holiday abroad.

D) Correct the sentences!
1) I doesn’t like school. ____________________________
2) I listen sometimes to songs ____________________________
3) Does you study? ____________________________
4) She never is late. ____________________________
5) Does he watches TV late at night? ____________________________
Appendix 18: Example of observation notes relevant to pupils' performance

- George reads now, minor mistakes when reading
- They start checking the exercise
- Teacher asks Chris to say the answer: correct
- Teacher asks Ben: correct

- Andreas is reading now: pronunciation mistakes
- They read ok
Appendix 19: Model of L2 Motivation

Appendix 20: my notes on motivation

motivation = desire + ability + attitude towards -
1) integrative motive
2) socioeducational model
3) AMT
4) L2 motivation construct (with Tremblay)
Appendix 21: Nodes on pupils' motivation
Appendix 22: pupils’ choices of emoticon pictures

a. Albert and Ken’s choices of the emoticon pictures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Part A</th>
<th>Part B</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>2? (not sure about once picture)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Interview images

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Images / Participant</th>
<th>PART A</th>
<th>PART B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NDP*</td>
<td>6 5 4 5 9 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEN</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP*</td>
<td>1 5 3 8 3 8 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### c. Emoticons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emoticon / Participant</th>
<th>🙁</th>
<th>🙂</th>
<th>😰</th>
<th>😡</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emoticon / Participant</th>
<th>🙄</th>
<th>😯</th>
<th>😬</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>(✓)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 23 - Nodes from Riverlands classroom

Realism Part A
Realism Part B