

Links between teachers' beliefs and practices and research on reading

Irena Kuzborska
University of Essex
United Kingdom

Abstract

Teachers' beliefs are thought to have a profound influence on their classroom practices. An understanding of this relationship is important for the improvement of teachers' professional preparation and the successful implementation of new curricula. However, there is little previous research on this issue in the Lithuanian university context. This evaluative-interpretative study investigated the relationship between the beliefs of eight teachers and their practices in the teaching of reading to advanced learners. It used video stimulated recall to obtain measures of teachers' beliefs, while comparing those beliefs and behaviors against the research norms. The beliefs that were identified as congruent with practices of the majority of the teachers reflected a skills-based approach to reading instruction, emphasizing vocabulary, reading aloud, translation, and whole class discussion of texts. However, a metacognitive-strategy approach is largely supported by research and regarded as most appropriate in academic contexts.

Keywords: reading, beliefs, practices, academic, approach, metacognitive-strategy

Language teachers' beliefs and understandings of teaching as well as learning play an important role in their classroom practices and in their professional growth. As Harste and Burke (1977) postulated, teachers make decisions about classroom instruction in light of theoretical beliefs they hold about teaching and learning. Teachers' beliefs influence their goals, procedures, materials, classroom interaction patterns, their roles, their students, and the schools they work in. Similarly, Richards and Rodgers (2001) affirmed that teachers possess assumptions about language and language learning, and that these provide the basis for a particular approach to language instruction. Hence, it is argued that if theoretical orientation is a major determinant of how teachers act during language instruction, then teacher educators can affect classroom practice by ensuring that teachers develop a theoretical orientation that is "reflective of current and pertinent research in the field" (Cummins, Cheek, & Lindsey, 2004, p. 183).

However, beliefs also impact training. Studies examining the impact of teacher education on teacher cognition have continuously reported that the anticipated transfer from course input to practice is greatly affected by teachers' prior knowledge and beliefs (Cabaroglu & Roberts, 2000; Freeman, 1993; Sendan & Roberts, 1998). That is, teachers interpret and respond to

innovations only in the ways which relate to their existing beliefs and practices. Thus, it follows that ignoring teachers' prior experiences is likely to hinder the assimilation of the new ideas and practices that teachers are encouraged to adopt; and encouraging teachers to reflect on their existing beliefs and behaviors could help them become more receptive to alternative perspectives and be prepared to modify their knowledge and work in ways that are consistent with their developing views and research-based standards.

Rationale of the Present Study

It is generally acknowledged that teachers possess theoretical beliefs about language learning and teaching and that such beliefs and theories tend to shape the nature of their instructional practices (Davis & Wilson, 1999; Gebel & Schrier, 2002; Johnson, 1992; Richardson, Anders, Tidwell, & Lloyd, 1991; Woods, 1996). However, while significant contributions to understanding the relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices have been made in first language (L1) education contexts, studies investigating teachers' cognitions in foreign language (FL) contexts have been limited (Borg, 2003, 2006). Furthermore, little work has been done on in-service teachers' beliefs and practices in a FL university setting (Borg, 2009). Similarly, scant attention has been paid to teachers' beliefs in Lithuania, with the exception of Galinienė's (1999) report on 13 in-service secondary school English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers' beliefs about learner autonomy and Mačianskienė and Tuomaitė's (2004) study of 145 in-service primary and secondary school EFL teachers' perceptions of learning strategies. Moreover, no study to date has focused on beliefs about reading in a Lithuanian university context.

The present qualitative study addresses the need to identify the belief system of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) teachers regarding their teaching of reading to advanced learners of English in the context of a state university in Lithuania. This need stemmed from the fact that the language teaching and learning at the university is essentially text-based, with a number of activities based on these texts. English teachers are required to develop students' academic and professional communicative competence, enabling them to effectively communicate in academic and professional contexts. Thus, by examining the links between personal theories and practices and the research on academic reading this study hoped to help teachers become better professionals and increase student achievement in core subject areas.

In order to gain insights into teachers' theoretical orientations towards academic reading instruction, the study posed the following research questions:

1. What are teachers' beliefs about:
 - 1.1. the reading process?
 - 1.2. the learning of reading?
 - 1.3. the teaching of reading?
2. What are teachers' reading instructional practices in an EAP Lithuanian university classroom?
3. How do teachers' beliefs and classroom practices compare with current research literature on reading?

The Definition of Reading

Reading can be viewed from a number of different perspectives, including socio-cultural, physiological, affective, philosophical, educational, and cognitive. However, most researchers' efforts to describe the nature of reading abilities and their development have focused on the cognitive aspects of reading—the mental processes readers actually use in comprehending texts when engaging in different types of real life reading. Reading, in its broad sense, is defined as “a combination of text input, appropriate cognitive processes, and the information that we already know” (Grabe, 2009, p. 74). In trying to define the process of reading in a more detailed way, researchers have increasingly come to agree on a view of reading as involving a set of common underlying processes and knowledge bases. Two groups of processes are distinguished in the reading literature: the processes for decoding words and the processes for comprehending a text, or so-called *lower-level* and *higher-level* processes (Birch, 2007; Grabe, 2009; Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Hudson, 2007; Koda, 2004; Weir & Khalifa, 2008). These two types of processes are equally important if reading is to occur, and the understanding of these component processes is thus considered essential in order to identify appropriate implications for instruction.

Lower-level processes, according to Grabe and Stoller (2002), represent the more automatic linguistic processes and are typically viewed as more skills oriented. These processes involve rapid and automatic word recognition (or lexical access), rapid syntactic parsing (using grammatical information), and semantic proposition formation (building clause-level meaning from word meanings and grammatical information).

Higher-level processes generally represent comprehension processes and are typically viewed as involving specific component abilities controlled by a reader and carried out under some degree of attention, in contrast to the automatic lower-level processes. These component abilities include a reader's ability to establish purposes for reading, to monitor comprehension, to use reading strategies, to make inferences of many types, to draw on background knowledge (or also called prior knowledge or schemata), to recognize and process discourse structure and discourse signaling in texts, and to critically evaluate the information being read (Birch, 2007; Grabe, 2009; Grabe & Stoller, 2002).

The higher-level cognitive processes in combination with the lower-level processes form the cognitive processing resources that allow readers to carry out reading for various purposes. Depending on the purpose, the reading processes will vary.

A corollary of such conceptualizations of the nature of reading is the view that learning to read should include learning the processes for comprehending a text. Specifically, knowledge of text structure and discourse organization may be particularly important for students who read FL texts in more advanced academic settings, and patterns of discourse organization may need explicit attention (Grabe, 2009; Hudson, 2007; Hyland, 2006). The explicit teaching of reading aims to equip learners with the strategies relevant to their varying reading purposes, the nature of text, and the context of situation. In line with this view, English teachers are encouraged to help learners reading for academic purposes to develop into strategic readers (Grabe, 2009; Hudson, 2007). In short, these assumptions have provided the basis for the *metacognitive-strategy*

approach to reading instruction (Thompson & Nicholson, 1999), which is now deemed to be the most appropriate approach in the university academic context and capable of meeting the needs of advanced level readers.

Methodology

Research Design

This case study examines teachers' beliefs about reading by applying an evaluative-interpretative paradigm. The goal of such research is to understand and accurately represent teachers' experiences as well as their interpretations of those experiences in a particular setting (Duff, 2008; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Viewed from an evaluative perspective, such research also compares teachers' beliefs and behaviors against established norms (cf. Grabe, 2009; Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Hudson, 2007; Hyland, 2006).

Participants of the Study

This study, which spanned five months, explores the beliefs and practices of eight Lithuanian EAP teachers all from the same state university in Lithuania. Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of these teachers (the teachers' names in the table are pseudonyms). All the teachers had been teaching English for academic purposes to advanced level students for about four years at the time of the data collection (February-June 2007). The teachers' English teaching experiences in general (including English teaching at the university) ranged from eight to 24 years. Five of the teachers held university diplomas (issued by universities up to 1994, the year when the system of awarding university degrees was re-established), one of which also held a PhD in Sociology, and the remaining three teachers held an MA (in Education, English, and English Literature). None of the teachers, however, possessed Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) qualifications. In addition, seven teachers indicated that they had not received any training in teaching reading in the last three years, and one teacher noted that she had had only a one-day training workshop in the last three years. Six teachers used in-house textbooks (designed by the teachers themselves), and two teachers were teaching from commercial textbooks (e.g., "Market Leader"). The number of students in their classes ranged from 20 to 28.

Table 1. *Teachers' qualifications and experience*

Teacher	EAP experience	EFL experience	Qualifications	Training*	Textbook**	No. of students
Laura	4	24	University Diploma***	0	C	22
Rima	4	20	University Diploma, PhD Sociology	0	I	20
Laima	4	20	University Diploma	0	I	24
Vyte	4	14	University Diploma	0	I	24
Lina	4	11	University Diploma	0	I	28
Viava	4	10	BA English Language & Literature; MA Education	0	I	26
Aiste	4	10	BA Economics; MA English	0	I	23
Ingrida	4	8	BA English Language; MA English Literature	1	C	21

Note. * 0 – no training, 1 – one day training; **C – commercial, I – in-house, ***University Diploma (6 yrs) in The Teaching of English & Literature

The students were first-year undergraduates, most of whom had entered the university directly from secondary school. All the students were of an advanced English level who were obliged to take a compulsory two semester EFL course based on their field of study. They studied English in a university classroom for one and a half hours three times a week. All the students were Lithuanian and their first language was Lithuanian.

Data Collection

The methods utilized in the study were:

- lesson observation;
- video stimulated recall (hereafter VSR), along with a follow-up semi-structured interview (hereafter Interview); and
- document data analysis (i.e., syllabuses, textbooks, and tests).

Lesson Observation

Lesson observations in this study aimed to obtain direct information on teaching practices. Three successive 90-minute lessons per teacher were observed. The lessons were audio and video recorded and later analyzed for key reading episodes, which included the use of a particular activity relating to the teaching of reading (e.g., activating prior knowledge before reading a text), the preference for a particular reading mode (reading aloud or silently), or the inclusion of a discussion about a text (in groups or with the whole class). I was able to gain insights into the factors behind the teachers' behaviors as they prompted questions. A schedule recording the questions generated by the observation data was also produced after each lesson and used for interviews with the teachers (see Appendix A for an example of a post-observation interview schedule).

Video-Stimulated Recall

Typically, *stimulated recall* involves the use of a stimulus (e.g., of audiotapes or videotapes of recorded behavior or of lesson transcripts), which serves to aid "a participant's recall of his thought processes at the time of that behavior" (Calderhead, 1981, p. 212). Teachers are video or audio taped in a series of lessons and they view or listen to the tape and explain what they were thinking or doing at the time.

In earlier research a stimulus had been used to elicit teachers' concurrent thought processes during lessons (Gass & Mackey, 2000). Recently, however, stimulated recall has been used for rather different purposes: for instance, Borg (2006, p. 219) used this method as "the basis of concrete discussions of what the teachers were doing, their interpretations of the events represented in the stimuli and of their reasons for the instructional decisions they were taking." Hence, the method of stimulated recall in the present study was used to help make the teachers' implicit theories about reading explicit (see Appendix B for an example of video-based stimulated recall).

In addition to asking the teachers to comment on their observed reading instruction practices highlighted by the video, the teachers were also asked general questions about reading. That is, after commenting on their practices, the teachers were invited to provide their understandings of the reading process and of how reading for academic purposes can be learned and taught.

Stimulated recall sessions were arranged soon after all three successive lessons were recorded to ensure that they were carried out within as short a time interval as possible. This is because, according to Gass and Mackey (2000, p. 105), stimulated recall generates more valid data when the time between the event and the recall is minimized. In the present study, all the stimulated recall interviews were conducted within a week of the observations.

The stimulated recall sessions were conducted in Lithuanian, the teachers' L1, in order to encourage the teachers to comment freely and to reduce any anxiety, which might occur when communicating in a non-native language.

Document Data

Various forms of document data were collected from the eight teachers to provide further information on the actual practice of teaching reading. These included the syllabi, textbooks, and tests that had been prepared by the teachers.

Data Analysis

The data was analyzed combining *deductive* and *inductive* approaches (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Applying existing frameworks from the literature (e.g., Birch, 2007; Carrell, Devine, & Eskey, 1988; Grabe, 2009; Hudson, 2007; Hyland, 2006; Krashen, 1993; McIntyre & Pressley, 1996; Singhal, 2006; Smith, 1986; Urquhart & Weir, 1998) to the analysis of the data, a deductive approach was utilized in order to compare the teachers' beliefs and behaviors against the norms established in the research on reading. For example, the following initial categories emerged from the literature and were applied in the data analysis:

- the process of reading (reading as a decoding process, a meaning construction process, or a strategic process);
- the learning of reading (focusing on learning language skills, on how to read meaningfully, or on learning reading strategies); and
- the teaching of reading (focusing on the teaching of language skills, of meaningful interaction with texts, or raising students' awareness of reading processes).

On the other hand, although the research base is critical to the success of better reading instruction and effective student learning, the application of theory to practice, according to Lincoln and Guba (1985), must also be dialectical and not merely an application. That is, the contexts in which teachers work along with their reflections on their experiences should also be considered and examined. Therefore, in order to encompass the multiple realities that are likely to be encountered and to fully describe the setting in which the teachers worked, an inductive approach to data analysis was also applied in the study.

Thus, I started my data analysis with initially defined categories, but later identified additional ones. To help keep track of the coded data I constructed a table and listed all the categories that I had identified. Then I clustered similar categories together under broader category labels so that only a few manageable categories remained. By forming such relationships I was already beginning to highlight and place certain categories into the core categories that were the focal point of my research study. That is, I was able to determine which approach(es) the teachers preferred when teaching reading to the students: a *skills-based* approach (viewing reading as a decoding process and focusing on the teaching of language skills, such as vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation, as the learning of language skills was believed to facilitate reading acquisition); a *whole-language* approach (viewing reading as a meaning construction process and focusing on the teaching of meaningful interaction with texts, as learning how to read meaningfully was believed to facilitate the acquisition of reading skills); and/or a *metacognitive-strategy* approach (viewing reading as a strategic process and focusing on the teaching of reading

processes, as learning reading strategies was perceived to improve reading). Finally, I wrote a profile for each teacher in order to highlight their individual practices and the manner in which they were similar or different.

Findings: Classroom Practices and Beliefs

Table 2 below illustrates the results of the teachers' practices and their beliefs in terms of the skills-based, the whole-language, and the metacognitive-strategy approaches. Classroom practices and beliefs are presented for each teacher, starting with the most experienced teacher.

Table 2. *Teachers' practices and beliefs*

Teacher names		Laura	Rima	Laima	Vyte	Lina	Vaiva	Aiste	Ingrida
O observed practices; S stated beliefs		O S	O S	O S	O S	O S	O S	O S	O S
Skills-Based Approach	Understand all words	x	x	x	x	x			x
	Extract meaning	x	x	x	x	x	x		x
	Focus on factual meaning (No. of questions asked)	x x 10	x x 15	x x 6	x - 7	x x 7	x x 4	x x 5	x x 6
	Focus on reading aloud (No. of sentences or paragraphs (P))	x x 9	x x 28	x x 39	x x 14	x x 17	x - 18	x x 4(P)	x x 11
	Focus on vocabulary (No. of activities & exercises)	x x 10	x x 5	x x 11	x x 4	x x 8	x x 7	x x 10	x x 7
	Focus on translation (No. of words & sentences)	x x 48	R x 3	x x 15	x x 91	x x 41	R - 9	x x 17	R x 8
	Discuss texts with class (No. of discussed texts with class)	x 4	x x 4	x 3	x x 3	x 5	x 3	x x 3	x 4
Whole-Language Approach	Guess words		x				x	x	
	Construct meaning						x		x
	Let learn to read naturally (No. of home readings)	x x 3	x x 3	x x 3	x x 3	x x 3	x x 1	x x 1	x x 2
	Do pre-reading activities (No. of activities)	-	-	-	-	-	x x 3	R x 1	R x 1
	Focus on inferential meaning (No. of questions)	x 6	x x 24	R 3	R x 1	-	R x 2	R 1	x x 11
	Set communicative activities (e.g., role play) (No. of activities)	- x	- -	- -	- -	-	R x 1	- -	x x 3
	Discuss texts in groups (No. of discussed texts in groups)	- x	x - 1	- x	-	-	x x 1	x - 1	x x 2
Metacognitive Strategy Approach	Read with purpose							x	
	Monitor reading								x
	Teach to monitor reading* (No. of instances)	x 3	x 1	-	-	- x	-	-	x x 2
	Teach to solve comprehension problems (No. of instances)	-	- x	-	-	- x	-	-	x 1
	Teach to identify main ideas	- x	- -	- -	- x	- x	- x	- x	-
Teach to evaluate text info (No. of instances)	- -	x x 20	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- x	
* Teach to monitor reading (e.g., to recognize and attend to comprehension difficulties); Teach to solve comprehension problems (e.g., to use text structure awareness); Teach to evaluate text info (e.g., to think of arguments for and against the ideas presented in a text).									
O (observed practices): xobserved practices; -absent practices; R rare practices (in comparison to other teachers).					S (stated beliefs): xstated beliefs; -stated beliefs which are opposed to the practice; Empty cells occur when teachers did not talk about their beliefs about the practice.				

Note. Cells in grey display identified congruence (the comparison was made for the beliefs and practices presented in the dash-dot frames).

Reading for Homework

As Table 2 illustrates, all the teachers assigned texts for the students to read at home in advance of the lesson. The students were required to read a text in detail, to discover meanings of unknown words—their definitions, synonyms, and antonyms—and to translate new words.

Sometimes the teachers also asked the students to do exercises presented in a text, answer comprehension questions, or write a text summary. The main reasons cited for assigning the students to read texts at home in advance were difficult texts and the lack of dictionaries in class. Vyte, for instance, explained that if the students had to read texts in class, then she herself would have to do their job. To use Vyte's words, she "would have to translate words...to explain situations...to do everything" (VSR). But, "at home," continued Vyte, "they anyway read a bit, translate those underlined words" (VSR).

The teachers' practice of assigning texts for homework seemed to be closely related to their beliefs about the learning of reading. The majority of the teachers believed that university students did not need to learn how to read in FL, as they had already mastered this skill at school. Laura, for example, noted the following:

All the basics are already learned at school. They have read a lot and if they have reached this level, so it is so. (Interview)

Furthermore, the teachers' perceptions of the reading process also seemed to guide their reading instructions to read texts from the beginning through to the end. Reading for these teachers was a linear processing of a text, with the reader reading each word and each sentence in detail. When asked to provide a definition of reading, Rima, for example, claimed that students would have to read complete texts, not omitting any section, because, otherwise, how would they know:

which parts are relevant and which are necessary? If he doesn't read everything, so how will he know that? Maybe he can omit something when reading for the second time. (Interview)

While Discussing Texts: Focus on Vocabulary and Factual Meaning

When class discussion centered on texts, a considerable amount of classroom time was spent on the vocabulary supplied above a text or in boldface in a text. The teachers usually invited the students to explain words in English, to provide synonyms or antonyms, and to provide a suitable translation of the word in the L1. The following excerpt from Aiste's lesson exemplifies these practices. The extract is taken from a lesson when the class was asked to read a text entitled "Computer Applications" paragraph by paragraph aloud and comment on the vocabulary in boldface.

Excerpt 1. *Focus on vocabulary*

Key. T=teacher; D=initial letter of a student's name; SF=female students; M=male student

Note. See transcription notation in Appendix B.

T: yes, as as speed tracks in police stations. Okay thank you and let's maybe look through the words that are () in your section, okay? So 'increasingly', how would you translate it?

D: *augantis daugėjantis* [growing, increasing]

SF: *čia gal daugiau* [here maybe it's more]

T: *daugėjančiai, augančiai ar ne? Kažkas tas vis daugiau taip vyksta-* [increasingly, growingly, yeah? Something that is becoming more-] increasingly, okay. Aha *kq-* [what] what what other words could you form from the word 'increasingly'?

- D: grow
 T: uh so this is the synonym but from the word increasingly some some other forms
 D: increase
 T: increase aha
 SM: decrease
 T: uh decreased, this is like opposite =
 SM: = yes
 T: yes, opposite meaning. Okay mhm good, thank you. 'Sophisticated'? So what is it?
-

The discussion of new words took most of the lesson time. Only a relatively short time (approximately 15 minutes of the 90 minute lesson) was devoted to text comprehension. This is because vocabulary knowledge was believed to be crucial for the students' achieving overall academic success as well as for their understanding of individual texts. Such beliefs were prevalent in all the teachers' statements about the learning of reading. One teacher, Laima, for example, asserted that "if they [students] understand the vocabulary, then texts are not very difficult" (Interview).

Comprehension involved surface meanings, asking the students to find information and ideas explicitly stated in a text. In other words, comprehension questions in the majority of the teachers' lessons were factual and answered in a few minutes without attending to text content in more detail. The following three questions accompanying a text entitled "Computers Controlled by the Human Eye" were typical of the teachers' textbooks.

Excerpt 2. *Focus on factual text information*

Extract from the text	Questions from the text
[Beginning of the text]: Soon computers and many other household devices <u>will guess the owner's will by a slightly seen gesture or a frowned brow</u>	How will computers guess the owner's will?
[The first sentence of the second paragraph]: The first thing to understand the meaning of the owner's face expression is that the computer needs to see <u>the face</u>	What does the computer need to see to understand the owner's face expression?
[The beginning of the third paragraph]: Imagine a situation, when a man controls a computer with eye movements. <u>In this case, the data is to contain eye images. The camera takes a face expression of the man who is sitting by the computer and transfers it to the program. The program scans the image, compares it with an eye model</u> ...	What happens in the imagined situation when a man controls the computer with eye movements?

Note. *The underlined words are to illustrate how the answers to the questions can be easily located.

As these textbook extracts demonstrate, anyone with a little knowledge of English would be able to answer the questions. All the answers were provided in the text and were easy to locate. No prior knowledge or inferencing was involved. What the reader was required to do in this kind of reading was to simply retrieve information and report it to the teacher.

The reason for eliciting factual text information was attributed to the inappropriateness of the textbooks. Aiste, for instance, explained that “there are only facts...in the textbook texts” and therefore the texts were not suitable for asking the students inferential questions (VSR). However, it is worth remembering at this point that the teachers themselves designed the textbooks; hence a more likely explanation for the focus on factual text meaning could be the teachers' beliefs about the process of reading. The teachers referred to reading as “reading for getting information” (Laima), “taking something [from reading]” (Laura), “an acquaintance with certain information, the decoding of that information” (Ingrida), “an understanding of what is written in a text” (Lina). As these statements reveal, meaning was perceived to be a commodity that resides in the text only, and reading as a passive activity of the reader who uses retrieval to establish meaning, with no or little interference from his or her prior knowledge.

There were only two teachers, Rima and Ingrida, who encouraged their students to think about text content in a deeper way. That is to say, they invited the students not only to identify the literal meaning of the text but also asked them to make inferences (to find information not explicitly stated in a text), to evaluate text information, and to provide their opinions about the text they had read. Rima, for example, always referred to the students' background knowledge and helped them connect text information with what the students already knew. Commenting on her practice, Rima explained that she always integrated “a so-called intercultural element” in her lessons, asking the students to compare and evaluate the situations presented in a text with the practices of other cultures, especially those of Lithuania.

While Discussing Texts: Focus on Reading Aloud

Reading texts aloud were featured in Rima, Vyte, and Aiste's lessons; however, there were instances when the students had to read exercise sentences or exercise answers aloud in all the teachers' lessons. During this time, the teachers were concerned with the correct pronunciation of words and almost always tried to correct the students' reading mistakes immediately. The following extract from Lina's lesson is an example of the teacher's focus on correct pronunciation. The students in the extract had completed a gap fill exercise and were invited to read the exercise sentences aloud to the whole class.

Excerpt 3. Focus on pronunciation

SM [reading aloud]: ‘to obtain results by rigorous’ [mispronounces the word]

T [correcting]: rigorous

SM: ‘geometric proof’

T: hm

SM: ‘Euclid also established’

T: *irodė?* [proved?]

SM2: proved

T: *irodė?* [proved?]

SM: ‘proved what is generally known as Euclid's second theorem, the number of primes is infinite’

T: yes

SM: ‘the beautiful proof Euclid gave of this theorem is still a gem and is generally acknowledged to be one of the classic proofs of all times in terms of its conciseness’ [mispronounces the word]

T[correcting]: conciseness

SM: ‘and clarity’.

As the example illustrates, Lina immediately pointed out the student's pronunciation mistakes during his reading, regardless of the (apparent) purpose of the task. This was because, as Lina explained, accuracy was important. Similarly, other teachers also argued that the correct pronunciation of words, particularly of key words, was essential in enhancing the students' reading of technical texts. In addition to improving students' reading accuracy, reading aloud was believed to help to develop vocabulary (Aiste), to answer specific questions (Aiste), to understand difficult texts better (Rima), or was "for a change" (Rima), "not to do the same all the time" (Aiste).

These reading aloud practices were likely to be the corollary of the teachers' beliefs about the process of reading. The majority of the teachers referred to reading as reading aloud and contended that such a practice could improve the students' reading pronunciation. Reading aloud was of an even greater importance than the comprehension of a text to Laima, because texts written for specific purposes, according to her, were difficult to comprehend. Laima put it in the following way,

There are specific texts about those metals, not all of them [are specific] but some, which you neither can retell nor anything. There are terribly many words and all of them are technical. So then they read them aloud, we look at pronunciation, language fluency and that's all, and we only try to translate them [words]. (Interview)

Post-Reading Activities: Focus on Vocabulary and Translation

Most of the teachers' post-reading activities related to vocabulary and the translation of words, phrases, and sentences. There were such vocabulary exercises as the matching of words with their definitions, finding the odd word out, and also word formation tasks. The teaching of vocabulary usually involved assigning the students words for their homework and just checking them in class. As Lina commented, "words have to be prepared at home;" in class, they only "check them...[students] either write sentences with those words or do exercises, synonyms" (VSR).

The teachers' beliefs about the process of reading and the teaching of reading were also likely to have led to their preoccupation with vocabulary knowledge. Throughout the interviews the teachers emphasized that "reading is working with vocabulary" (Vaiva), "reading is learning new words" (Vyte), or "reading [is] to absorb technical vocabulary and use it when discussing a text" (Laima).

Furthermore, a considerable amount of time was spent on various translation tasks in many of the teachers' lessons. The teachers argued that translation could help the students understand a text or certain words better, and that by asking the students to translate words they could also check whether they really understood the words. The translation of words and sentences were particularly frequent activities in Laura, Vyte, and Lina's lessons. The teachers believed that translation was essential for advanced level students and that the full comprehension of a text could only occur through its translation into L1. The following excerpt from Laura's lesson, where students are reading a text entitled "Bonds," illustrates the teacher's scrupulous attention

to the translation of the English concepts into Lithuanian.

Excerpt 4. Focus on translation

T: yeah 'profits on the sale of assets'*O lietuviškai tai būtų 'kapitalo prieaugis', ir tai yra* [reading from her notes] *'skirtumas tarp vertybinių popierių pirkimo ir pardavimo kainos'. ... Šitaip aiškinamas yra tas lietuviškai...kapitalo prieaugis. Tai yra skirtumas tarp vertybinių popierių supirkimo ir pardavimo kainos. Nu logiška... perkam pigiau, dažniausiai norim parduot brangiau. Tai yra skirtumas ir būtų 'capital gains'.... Ir tada dar kitas pratimėlis su žodynu... 2c. 'Equity financing', kas yra iš viso tas 'equity'? [And in Lithuanian it would be 'capital increase'. And 'it is the difference in the price of the purchase of securities and of the sale of securities.' ... The capital increase is explained in Lithuanian in such a way. It is the difference in the price of the purchase of securities and of the sale of securities. Well, logical... we buy cheaper and often we want to sell more expensively. It is this difference, which is 'capital gains'.... And then there is another exercise on vocabulary... 2c. 'Equity financing', what in general is that 'equity'?]*

SM: *paprastos akcijos* [simple shares]

Once again, it would seem this focus on translation practice reflects the teachers' beliefs about the process of reading, with the teachers frequently claiming that the translation of words and sentences was necessary in order to better comprehend texts. As Laura, for instance, maintained, reading comprehension is the translation of what you read; a reader reads a text and "he has to translate it anyway, everything goes through your language" (VSR).

Classroom Interaction Mode

The whole class discussion of texts was the prevailing mode in all the teachers' lessons. Usually it was the teachers who invited a particular student to contribute. Text discussion in groups was observed in four teachers' lessons; however, two of these teachers, Rima and Aiste, believed that group work was of little value to their students. As Rima commented, although the students would work in groups initially, later everything would turn into a whole class discussion; "[s]o it's the same, no matter how you will start it" (VSR). For her part, Aiste believed that students should not spend most of their reading time working in groups, because in groups, they did not speak in English much when working in this way.

Only two teachers, Vaiva and Ingrida, believed that group work was beneficial for the students and listed the following benefits of group work:

- the students are "braver to speak than if they had to speak straightaway" to the class;
- each student has a chance to speak when working in groups;
- the students listen to each other when discussing text in groups; and
- the students learn how to work in a team and how to solve group problems if they arise.

No group work was performed in other teachers' lessons. The absence of such a practice could be linked to the teachers' lack of knowledge of how to perform group work as well as to their teacher-centered habits of controlling the whole learning process. As Vyte, for instance, noted,

with all the students she had had so far, she had only held whole class discussions, “because if in groups, so it’s not clear what they are doing there” (VSR). In addition, Vyte added that she actually did not know “how to work with groups” and admitted that she needed “to go to some courses to learn that” (VSR).

To summarize, this section has discussed the results obtained from the interviews and classroom observations of the eight EAP teachers. The teachers believed that a focus on vocabulary, translation, reading aloud, and whole class work played crucial roles in English language learning for their advanced level students. These beliefs also guided the teachers’ classroom practices. Classroom activities were vocabulary and translation based, and when discussing texts, the focus was almost exclusively on word level meaning. Furthermore, there was almost no group work in class. Thus, the beliefs that were identified as congruent with the classroom practices of the majority of the teachers reflect a skills-based approach to reading instruction.

Implications: Links Between Teachers’ Beliefs and Practices and Research on Reading

This section examines the implications of reading research for expanding the current understandings of reading and reading instruction for academic purposes in a Lithuanian context.

The Process of Reading

Reading was believed to be a decoding process with a reader decoding words and sentences in a linear fashion merely to obtain “correct” answers. As the teachers indicated, a reader should read a text from beginning to end, not omitting any part of it, and should translate a text if it was difficult to comprehend. The teachers also believed that a reader had to understand all the words in order to understand a text. In line with these beliefs, the teachers directed the students to analyze texts in detail, study words, and translate sentences.

However, while the literature emphasizes that it is important to comprehend what the text itself is trying to signal, the ability to construct text meaning by combining a reader’s prior knowledge with the information given in the text is said to be “the hallmark of expert reading in a topical domain” (Grabe & Stoller, 2002, p. 8). In addition, it is likely that by requiring students to pay attention to every detail of a text, teachers can only strengthen students’ belief that reading is merely a decoding process. As Hamp-Lyons (1984, p. 307) states, the classroom:

in which students are asked to read short passages very carefully and expected to understand them in minute detail, being tested on this comprehension by questions mainly at the lexical level, reinforces concrete level process strategies...it also reinforces the tendency to read slowly and discourages the development of sufficient reading speed to synthesize meaning from the passage.

Moreover, not all the words are equally important, suggested Nuttall (2005, p. 63). Students are able to comprehend texts without understanding every word in a text, for it is their background knowledge that compensates for gaps in vocabulary knowledge. As Nuttall (2005, p. 73) puts it, “[o]ur knowledge of the world helps us to narrow down the possibilities when we are looking for

a concept to fill a gap in the sense.” Thus, it is students' prior knowledge and experience that should be acknowledged and incorporated into the reading and discussion of texts in the teachers' lessons.

Learning of Reading

Learning of reading was limited to: learning vocabulary; translating words and texts; reading accurately; and discussing texts with the whole class. The learning of specific vocabulary in order to enhance students' reading abilities was emphasized most by the teachers. The teachers claimed that this belief guided their work and all of them regarded it as a very high priority in their pedagogies.

Vocabulary

The importance of vocabulary knowledge in the FL reading proficiency of language learners and vocabulary instruction has been frequently addressed in the reading literature (Grabe, 2009; Grabe & Stoller, 2002). A large vocabulary is critical not only for reading but also for all FL skills, for academic performance and for related background knowledge (Klingner & Vaughn, 2004). Recent studies suggest that focused vocabulary instruction can have a positive effect on vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension of language students in academic settings (Grabe, 2009; Grabe & Stoller, 2002; Meltzer & Hamann, 2005).

Teachers are thus encouraged to develop students' knowledge of vocabulary strategies and how to successfully apply them when reading texts. Nuttall (2005) identified so-called *word attack skills* which should be taught explicitly. These are, for instance, showing students how the vocabulary of the language is structured, how words relate to one another, how to make proper use of a dictionary, how to identify words that can be ignored, or how to use structural as well as contextual information to deal with words that really block comprehension (Nuttall, 2005, pp. 69–76). Moreover, raising students' awareness of how individual words tend to have different frequencies and meanings in different disciplines and genres could also facilitate vocabulary acquisition (Hyland, 2006, p. 12). The use of language corpora could greatly assist learners to develop such awareness (Lee & Swales, 2006; Sinclair, 1991). Visuals and graphic organizers can further help students better understand and remember words and their meanings (Short & Fitzsimmons, 2007).

Translation

Translation of words was considered by the majority of the teachers to be an appropriate practice for their advanced level students, as it could help them comprehend concepts and difficult texts better. This belief was also reflected in the teachers' classroom practices. There was much word translation into L1 throughout the majority of the teachers' lessons.

The role of using translation in language learning has remained relatively unexplored. Until now translation has played a controversial role in English teaching and learning. Language educators subscribing to the Communicative Language Teaching approach usually assume that the most effective way to master English is to learn and think directly in English rather than to use

translation, which would interfere with students' English acquisition. Such an assumption, however, seems to lack much empirical evidence. Corder (1981) and Kobayashi and Rinnert (1992) argued rather that translation can be used as a strategy to compensate for learners' limitations in learning a FL. Prince (1996) further maintained that translation can be employed as a memory strategy to help in vocabulary acquisition. In fact, an increasing number of studies have suggested a positive and facilitative role for translation in students' language learning (Atkinson, 1987; Cohen & Brooks-Carson, 2001; Ellis, 1985; Wenden, 1986). However, as research findings also suggest, higher proficiency levels of learners use less (or no) translation strategies than lower level learners (Wen & Johnson, 1997).

Thus, according to the research, translation can be a valuable tool in students' learning, provided teachers plan translation activities carefully. Kaye (2009), for example, advises having short translation tasks, always performed in groups, and maintaining the element of a communication gap where possible.

Reading Aloud

Reading aloud and the accurate pronunciation of portions of text were important for all the teachers. Guided by this belief, the teachers asked their students to read texts or exercise sentences and exercise answers aloud and corrected the students' oral reading mistakes immediately, regardless of the type of the activity.

In FL research on reading, little attention is paid to reading aloud. Rather, considerable research has been carried out to demonstrate the value of silent reading. The emphasis on silent reading reflects the whole-language approach, which highlights the centrality of meaning in the reading process, as the goal of reading is to understand the ideas of the writer (Goodman, 1989; Smith, 1986).

In contrast to the aims of silent reading, reading aloud deals with the form of the language, focusing on vocabulary, sentence structure, and pronunciation. However, although the mastery of the language form has been recognized as essential in the reading process (Birch, 2007; Grabe, 2009), reading aloud attracts adverse criticism. Reading aloud is regarded as time consuming, as not real reading, to encourage slow reading, and as a boring activity for those who have to listen to a classmate rather than read aloud themselves (Dwyer, 1983; Gardner, 1986). Moreover, reading aloud does not help a reader reading aloud to learn much about the meaning of the text. As Nuttall (2005, p. 202) points out, those who read aloud fluently have often only a superficial impression of what they have just read. This is because when a reader concentrates on pronunciation or expression, "the mind lacks the capacity to process the meaning as well" (Nuttall, 2005, p. 202).

Yet, although considerable research has been conducted to support the value of silent reading, some language educators also argue that reading aloud is beneficial, both in the early stages of reading development, aiming to improve learners' reading fluency, accuracy, and pronunciation (Dhaif, 1990; Swaffer, Arnes, & Byrnes, 1991), as well as in the advanced stages of reading, where a need to improve reading speed and accuracy still exists (Kailani, 1998), or, for example, if the advanced level learners need to practice speech delivery skills.

Thus, different language contexts may require different reading modes. However, as the reading literature also suggests, if reading aloud is to be practiced in the classroom (for the purposes of the development of students' linguistic skills, for example), reading aloud should be used after the class has worked on the interpretation of the text, not before (Nuttall, 2005, p. 202). In addition, the rationale of reading aloud should be also explained to the students so that they can focus on the objectives.

Whole Class Discussion

The discussion of words or paragraphs with the whole class was the prevalent mode of interaction in all the teachers' lessons, as it was the teachers' stated beliefs. Importantly, some of the teachers also admitted that they did not know why and how group work should be implemented.

Text-based discussion and collaborative learning emerge in the reading literature as two key instructional approaches for engaging English language learners with content-area learning and literacy development. Much evidence exists that collaborative learning is beneficial for both general and content-area literacy (Donato, 1994). For example, Meltzer and Hamann (2004, p. 36) report that the cooperative learning in content-area classrooms motivates students' participation and supports their achievement; it also allows "the social construction of meaning" (Meltzer & Hamann, 2004, p. 36). In addition, it offers the learners an opportunity "to practise the vocabularies and genres specific to various content areas" (Meltzer & Hamann, 2005, p. 35).

Successful collaborative learning can usually occur when students work in groups. It is because in groups,

[i]ndividuals participate more actively, partly because it is less threatening than participating in front of the whole class and partly because it is more obvious that everyone's contribution counts. And the discussion helps students to see how to read thoughtfully. (Nuttall, 2005, p. 162)

Good strategies for assigning students to groups are claimed to include creating groups around interest (Meltzer & Hamann, 2004, p. 36); forming groups of no more than five members, otherwise "it is too easy for people to opt out"; or grouping students "who like to let others do the work together," as it may encourage them to participate (Nuttall, 2005, pp. 164–165).

Teaching of Reading

A commonly held belief by all the teachers was that the advanced level students had already developed their reading skills and that they could read and study new words by themselves. No teacher "intervention" was thus believed to be necessary to help their students learn how to read for academic purposes or deal with new vocabulary. As a result, the teaching of reading was associated with assigning students tasks for their homework, and in class, just checking the answers.

However, as Grabe and Stoller (2002, p. 71) argue, reading and writing are not the same as speaking and listening abilities, which could develop naturally. This is because there are many people “who can speak and listen with ease,” but “cannot read or write.” Students need to be introduced to and taught reading abilities more explicitly, because then they will become better readers. Thus, as the researchers suggest, we teachers have to be more informed about

(a) central issues in reading theory and research, (b) unsupportable claims, which are too often made about reading and (c) instructional practices that are based on wrong assumptions about reading abilities and their development. (Grabe & Stoller, 2002, p. 72)

Overall, as the findings of the study reveal, although the theories of reading and the learning and teaching of reading have been widely discussed in the reading literature, connections between these theories and classroom practices have rarely been made in this teaching context. No doubt implications from research do not translate directly into classroom instruction or curriculum design. FL reading instruction should also be sensitive to the institutional context, to resource support as well as to the students' needs and goals. However, the most likely explanation of this gap between practice and theory seems to be the lack of adequate support for these teachers to reflect on and question their existing classroom practices and teaching rationales. The teachers' behaviors appeared to be dominated by their beliefs, which may have originated from the methodological approaches that were prominent when they were learning or began teaching EFL, and which unfortunately do not seem to have been greatly re-evaluated or modified during the course of their teacher development. Interestingly, however, as the teachers claimed, they did attend English Language Teaching (ELT) seminars, conferences, or participated in language teacher exchange programs. The seminars were usually organized by the British Council or local schools and universities and were between an hour and a day in duration. Thus, what appears to be missing in this academic context is the congruence between what teachers want and need to learn and what language educators teach them. As the teachers noted, the ELT seminars focused on how to teach English in general, but not on reading (Laura, Lina, Aiste). In addition, the impact of seminar ideas on teachers' classroom practices seemed to be minimal. As Laura confessed, for example, the ideas acquired in teacher education programs did not work for her in class, because she could not understand their usefulness for her students. This seems to resonate with Gutierrez Almarza's (1996) finding that trainees who were taught a specific teaching method in a teacher education program adopted it during their practicum, but if they did not believe in the method, they would not persist with it once the practicum was over. Needless to say, therefore, if teachers are to move beyond traditional models of teaching and to reconceptualize their theories of language learning and teaching, they need not only to be made aware of alternative models and approaches, but they also need to be provided with opportunities to evaluate new theories and approaches in the light of their existing beliefs.

By describing the complex nature of reading and the various components of the reading process, I hoped to expand the understanding of the reading process, to broaden interpretations of skills needed for fluent reading, and so to consider appropriate implications for EFL reading instruction in a Lithuanian context. As the definition of the process of reading shows, reading involves a broad range of abilities and knowledge resources coordinated in very complex and rapid ways. These cognitive concepts provide the basis not only for how reading comprehension works, but also for how it develops. The three basic processes, lexical access or word

recognition, syntactic parsing and semantic proposition formation, were presented as *lower-level* processes that occur automatically for the fluent reader. Readers access words, parse them grammatically, and form meanings which are held for a short period of time in *working memory* (Grabe & Stoller, 2002, p. 18). And since working memory keeps information active for only a few seconds, readers must rapidly combine the information to form an accurate sense of meaning. "Speed of processing is essential," confirm Grabe and Stoller (2002, p. 18), because an inability to carry out lower-level processing in a fluent way prevents cognitive resources from being used for comprehension. Thus, recognizing that processing fluency can improve comprehension, teachers should also help students increase their reading rate to somewhat faster than normal rates. In addition, extensive reading and vocabulary growth can also lead to improved fluency in reading (Bamford & Day, 2004; Day & Bamford, 1998).

Moreover, the awareness of how to set and change goals for reading; how to apply comprehension strategies appropriately and how to engage in strategic processing; how to draw on background knowledge and how to engage inferencing that maintains a coherent interpretation of the text; or how to recognize and process discourse structure and discourse signaling in texts were discussed as *higher-level* or comprehension processes that are required to comprehend and interpret a text. In addition, it is important to highlight here that although *higher-level* processes already exist in all readers from the beginning of their literacy learning, "[t]he difficulties for learners," according to Grabe (2009, p. 80), "involve the need to transfer basic and general cognitive abilities to specific reading contexts that are more demanding." Thus, with reference to the implications for instruction, there is the need for the explicit teaching of those cognitive abilities required for more complex academic reading tasks with texts that present new and challenging information. Finally, promoting the motivation for reading should also be considered to be one of the major principles for building a reading curriculum. This is because motivated students read more, their comprehension improves, and their vocabulary increases (see Day & Bamford, 1998; Grabe, 2009; Guthrie, Wigfield, & Perencevich, 2004; Singhal, 2006).

Conclusion

This study examines how EAP teachers' practices in a non-Western state university were guided by their beliefs. The fact that there was a relatively strong relationship between the teachers' beliefs and their classroom practices allows us to assert that this study supports the notion that English teachers teach in accordance with their theoretical beliefs and that differences in theoretical beliefs may result in differences in the nature of literacy instruction (Borg, 2003; Borg, 2006).

However, the appropriacy of the teachers' beliefs is only partly supported by the research. The teachers' approaches to the teaching of reading was rather skills-based, emphasizing vocabulary, translation and reading aloud, and focusing on the whole class discussion of texts. In addition, text reading was usually assigned for homework with a requirement for a commitment to studying new vocabulary and answering comprehension questions. There was little or no prior discussion or any other kind of preparation for reading in the classroom. The students were either given some time to review the text content or would be invited to answer text comprehension

questions without such preparation.

Based on these findings, it is thus suggested that a more strategic approach to reading instruction could be implemented in the Lithuanian university context. This approach could promote practices focused on explicit training in strategy use, enabling students to develop into self-aware and motivated readers. The approach could also provide a natural environment for exploring the linguistic features of academic genres. Combined with the whole-language approach it may create a platform for cooperative learning and student choice in tasks and materials. In addition, it can activate and build on students' background knowledge and support authentic communication. Unfortunately, the teachers within this sample neither held theories of reading that would accommodate these new ways of thinking nor practiced them in their classrooms. Rather, the teachers believed that the advanced level students had already mastered reading skills and teachers did not need to teach them how to read.

On the other hand, the teachers also lacked sufficient exposure to and an understanding of alternative instructional practices, being unable to recall any specific training in reading instruction. For these teachers, moving beyond the traditional approach to reading instruction will require access to alternative approaches. To address these concerns, preparatory programs in Lithuania can provide teachers with a firmer background in the reading process and in appropriate second language (L2) reading instruction methodology. But most importantly, beliefs towards reading and reading instruction first need to change. If teachers are to evolve and learn to teach in new ways, teacher educators, as El-Okda (2005) maintains, should consider the beliefs that they possess and not spend time teaching them ideas that contradict their values. Raising teachers' consciousness about their beliefs about teaching reading can further encourage reflection on how a teacher's tacit knowledge shapes the way they understand and act upon information in the classroom. Hopefully, this study can provide a springboard for discussion and an impetus for teachers' critical self-inquiry on the topic of reading and reading instruction for specific purposes. Specifically, this study highlights the importance of professional development directed toward helping the teachers learn about the process of reading, the learning of reading, and the teaching of reading to advanced level students.

Although the findings of this study relate specifically to the teacher development situation in Lithuania where the study was based, many of these recommendations may be relevant to other educational contexts and to professional development in general. Thus, a study like this one can serve to add to our understanding of EAP teachers' beliefs and practices in the area of academic reading instruction and can act as a catalyst to enable other teachers to reflect on and examine their own beliefs about their teaching of reading in academic contexts. However, this study calls for more research on EAP teachers' beliefs and practices in the area of reading instruction in order to further advance our knowledge of how EAP teachers think and act and how we can better bridge the gap between practice and research.

Acknowledgments

I sincerely thank the Economic and Social Research Council for an ESRC 1+3 award PTA-031-2004-00114 which enabled me to carry out this research. I would also like to thank all the

teachers who so willingly participated in the study and devoted their time and patience to share their stories and classrooms with me. I am also indebted to Dr Nigel Harwood, Dr Julian Good, Mr Phil Scholfield, Mr Tony Lilley, Dr Bojana Petric, Dr Julian Edge, and two anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments and constructive feedback.

References

- Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource? *ELT Journal*, 41(4), 241–247.
- Bamford, J., & Day, R. R. (2004). *Extensive reading activities for teaching language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Birch, B. M. (2007). *English L2 reading: Getting to the bottom*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36, 81–109.
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. London: Continuum.
- Borg, S. (2009). Language teacher cognition. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 163–171). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cabaroglu, N., & Roberts, J. (2000). Development in student teachers' pre-existing beliefs during a 1-year PGCE program. *System*, 28(3), 387–402.
- Calderhead, J. (1981). Stimulated recall: A method for research on teaching. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 51, 211–217.
- Carrell, P. L., Devine, J., & Eskey, D. (1988). *Interactive approaches to second language reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, A. D., & Brooks-Carson, A. (2001). Research on direct versus translated writing: Students' strategies and their results. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(2), 169–188.
- Corder, S. (1981). *Error analysis and interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cummins, C., Cheek, E. H., & Lindsey, J. D. (2004). The relationship between teachers' literacy beliefs and their instructional practices: A brief review of the literature for teacher education. *E-Journal of Teaching & Learning in Diverse Settings*, 1(2), 175–188.
- Davis, M. M., & Wilson, E. K. (1999). A Title 1 teacher's beliefs, decision-making, and instruction at the third and seventh grade levels. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 38(4), 290–299.
- Day, R. R., & Bamford, J. (1998). *Extensive reading in the second language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dhaif, H. (1990). Reading aloud for comprehension: A neglected teaching aid. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 7(1), 457–464.
- Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. Lantolf, & G. Appel (Eds.), *In Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33–56). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Duff, P. (2008). *Case study research in applied linguistics*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dwyer, M. A. (1983). Some strategies for improving reading efficiency. *FORUM*, 12(3), 5–10.

- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- El-Okda, M. (2005). EFL student teachers' cognition about reading instruction. *The Reading Matrix*, 5, 43–60.
- Freeman, D. (1993). Renaming experience/reconstructing practice: Developing new understandings of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 9(5/6), 485–497.
- Galinienè, L. (1999). Learner autonomy through project work. In A. Camilleri (Ed.), *Introducing learner autonomy in teacher education* (pp. 22–32). Malta. Retrieved from http://www.ecml.at/documents/pubCamilleriA_E.pdf
- Gardner, K. (1986). *Reading in today's schools*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd.
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gebel, A., & Schrier, L. L. (2002). Spanish language teachers' beliefs and practices about reading in a second language. In J. H. Sullivan (Ed.), *Literacy and the second language learner (Research in second language learning)* (pp. 85–109). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Goodman, K. S. (1989). Whole-language research: Foundations and development. *Elementary School Journal*, 90, 207–225.
- Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a second language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (2002). *Teaching and researching reading*. Harlow: Longman.
- Guthrie, J., Wigfield, A., & Perencevich, K. (2004). Scaffolding for motivation and engagement in reading. In J. Guthrie, A. Wigfield, & K. Perencevich (Eds.), *Motivating reading comprehension: Concept-oriented reading instruction* (pp. 55–86). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gutierrez Almarza, G. (1996). Student foreign language teachers' growth. In D. Freeman & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Teacher learning in language teaching* (pp. 50–78). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hamp-Lyons, L. (1984). Developing a course to teach extensive reading skills to university-bound learners. *System*, 11, 303–312.
- Harste, J. C., & Burke, C. L. (1977). A new hypothesis for reading teacher research: Both the teaching and learning of reading is theoretically based. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), *Reading: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 32–40). Clemson, S.C.: National Reading Conference.
- Hudson, T. (2007). *Teaching second language reading*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2006). *English for Academic Purposes: An advanced resource book*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, K. E. (1992). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices during literacy instruction for non-native speakers of English. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 24(1), 83–108.
- Kailani, T. Z. (1998). Reading aloud in EFL revisited. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 12(1), 281–294.
- Kaye, P. (2009). Translation activities in the language classroom. British Council. Teaching English. Retrieved from <http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/think/articles/translation-activities-language-classroom>
- Klingner, J. K., & Vaughn, S. (2004). Strategies for struggling second-language readers. In T. L. Jetton & J. A. Dole (Eds.), *Adolescent literacy research and practice* (pp. 183–209). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (1992). Effects of first language on second language writing: translation versus direct composition. *Language Learning*, 42(2), 183–215.

- Koda, K. (2004). *Insight into second language reading: A cross-linguistic approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krashen, S. (1993). *The power of reading: Insights from the research*. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.
- Lee, D., & Swales, J. (2006). A corpus-based EAP course for NNS doctoral students: Moving from available specialized corpora to self-compiled corpora. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26, 56–75.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mačianskienė, N., & Tuomaitė, V. (2004). Learning strategies in foreign language teacher professional development. *European added value in teacher education: The role of teachers as promoters of basic skills acquisition and facilitators of learning* (pp. 40–46). Collection of the selected papers presented at the ATEE 7th Spring University. Retrieved from <http://66.102.1.104/scholar?hl=en&lr=&q=cache:e9NU-wkcmLwJ:www.ut.ee/teacher/springuniv/articles/Macianskiene.pdf+Learning+Strategies+in+Foreign+Language+Teacher+Professional+Development+Lithuania>
- McIntyre, E., & Pressley, M. (1996). *Balanced instruction: Strategies and skills in whole language*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.
- Meltzer, J., & Hamann, E. T. (2004). *Meeting the literacy development needs of adolescent English language learners through content area learning: Part one: Focus on motivation and engagement*. Providence, RI: The Education Alliance at Brown University. Retrieved from http://www.alliance.brown.edu/pubs/adlit/adell_litdv1.pdf
- Meltzer, J., & Hamann, E. T. (2005). *Meeting the literacy development needs of adolescent English language learners through content-area learning: Part two: Focus on classroom teaching and learning strategies*. Providence, RI: The Education Alliance at Brown University. Retrieved from http://www.alliance.brown.edu/pubs/adlit/adell_litdv1.pdf
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Nuttall, C. (2005). *Teaching reading skills in a foreign language*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.
- Prince, P. (1996). Second language vocabulary learning: The role of context versus translation as a function of proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, 80, 478–493.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richardson, V., Anders, P., Tidwell, D., & Lloyd, C. (1991). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices in reading comprehension instruction. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28(3), 559–586.
- Sendan, F., & Roberts, J. (1998). Orhan: A case study in the development of a student teacher's personal theories. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 4, 229–244.
- Short, D., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). *Double the work: Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English language learners: A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved from <http://www.carnegie.org/literacy/pdf/DoubletheWork.pdf>
- Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Singhal, M. (2006). *Teaching reading to adult second language learners: Theoretical foundations, pedagogical applications, and current issues*. USA: The Reading Matrix.
- Smith, F. (1986). *Understanding reading: A psycholinguistic analysis of reading and learning to read* (3rd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Swaffar, J., Arens, M., & Byrnes, H. (1991). *Reading for meaning: An integrated approach to language learning*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Thompson, G. B., & Nicholson, T. (1999). *Learning to read: Beyond phonics and whole language*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Urquhart, S., & Weir, C. (1998). *Reading in a second language: Process, product and practice*. London: Longman.
- Weir, C., & Khalifa, H. (2008). A cognitive processing approach toward defining reading comprehension. *Cambridge ESOL: Research Notes*, 31, 2–10.
- Wen, G., & Johnson, R. K. (1997). L2 learner variables and English achievement: A study of tertiary-level English majors in China. *Applied Linguistics*, 18(1), 27–48.
- Wenden, A. (1986). What do second-language learners know about their language learning? A second look at retrospective accounts. *Applied Linguistics*, 7(2), 186–201.
- Woods, D. (1996). *Teacher cognition in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix A

An Example of a Post-Observation Interview Schedule with Aiste

Observation data were analyzed after each lesson. Key episodes were identified, and a list of questions generated by these episodes compiled. Questions were collated by category and summarized in analytic memo. In the extract below, the words in italics are the categories that emerged from the lesson on which the memo was based.

LESSON 1

- *A pre-reading activity*: T invites SS to discuss ideas about computers before discussing a text entitled “Computer Applications” (Task 1, Unit 1).
 - o What is the purpose of this activity? Why do you ask SS to discuss ideas about computers first?
- *Reading aloud* in class:
 - o Why do you ask SS to read the text aloud in class?
- *Correction of oral reading mistakes*: S mispronounces the word character, T corrects the word.
 - o Why do you correct S’s pronunciation? Do you usually try to correct mispronounced words? Why?
- *Paragraph discussion* and the *clarification of unknown words* after reading the paragraph:
 - o Why do you ask SS to retell the text paragraph by paragraph?
 - o Unknown words: why do you ask SS to clarify the meanings of the unknown words after reading each paragraph? In this case, did SS have to read the text in advance at home? Did they have to find out the meanings of these new words before coming to a lesson?
- *Translation of words*: ‘T: or verčiant bouncing ‘rubuilis’, trigger ‘jungiklis’, etc.’.
 - o Why do you ask SS to provide the Lithuanian translation of the English words or sentences?
- *Word building*:
 - o Why do you ask SS to form other words from the given ones?
 - o The focus on prefixes (from textbook, lesson 3, p 18)
- *Answering questions after the text*.
 - o What is the purpose of answering these questions?

Appendix B

An Example of Video-Based Stimulated Recall

Transcription notation

<i>Word</i>	Italics indicate Lithuanian words.
'word'	Inverted commas indicate cited words from texts.
word-	Hyphen indicates word has been cut off abruptly.
()	Empty parenthesis indicates the presence of an unclear fragment of speech.
(guess)	The words within a single bracket indicate the best guess at an unclear utterance.
...	Untimed pause (lasting 0.2 seconds or more).
[]	Square brackets indicate a description of non-verbal behavior or visual information. Alternatively square brackets may enclose the comments on contextual or other features, such as, for instance, English translation provided after Lithuanian utterances.
[Indicates the point at which overlap with another speaker begins.
=	The 'equals' sign indicates that utterance follows immediately on previous utterance, or is latched to separate parts of a continuous utterance by the same speaker.
.	A full stop indicates a stopping fall in tone. It does not necessarily indicate the end of a sentence.
,	A comma indicates a 'list' intonation.
?	A question mark indicates a rising inflection. It does not necessarily indicate a question.
!	Exclamation marks indicate an excited intonation.
uh, um	Marginal words.

Note. The language mistakes made in the classroom are not corrected in order to preserve the real classroom interaction.

An extract from Aiste's lesson on the discussion of a text entitled "Computer Applications"

Key. I=interviewer; T=teacher; A=initial letter of a student's name

T: Okay maybe maybe maybe let's start with unit first, okay? So you have task No 1 which asks you to think about the usage of computers in different places. So you have some supermarkets, hospitals, airports, police headquarters and and other places, yes. And what can you say where and how do we use computers nowadays? Andrius?

A: [Andrius]: how we use? To search for information

T: mhm right

A: in the Internet

T: yes hm

A: what else?

T: what else? [smiling]

A: to read books

T: yes hm

[Later]:

T: yes okay [laughing] so many different places, many many usages and-. Okay, so maybe let's read, first of all, read "Computer Applications," yes? Text first, which is in your book on page No 5. So maybe let's look through the text, first of all, and we will see other other places where we can use computer. Okay, Dainiau, could you start reading- maybe- I don't know the paragraph is very very long but just maybe some short okay- one paragraph for Dainius. [Dainius reads the first paragraph aloud]

Stimulated recall

I: first of all I would like to ask about your teaching that I observed

T: hm

I: in the first lesson you started with asking the students to talk about computers

T: hm it was so

I: it was before the text reading because later it was reading aloud

T: yes yes yes

I: so why did you ask them to talk about computers before reading the text?

T: well, you know, you give it if it's possible, if it's a little interesting, so you give it then. Well, it's like warming up, you know, what they already know. And they really know about those computers a lot, about everything, so really. So that's why I gave them, you know. Because it was related with what they- what knowledge they have, and then they read what was in the text. So that's all.

I: hm hm okay. And then you asked the students to read the text aloud. Did they read the text before, [at home?

T:[no no

I: it was new, [wasn't it?

T: [well, it was new, yes. They hadn't read it at home

I: hm. And do you often ask them to read texts aloud in class?

T: no, you know, occasionally

I: hm

T: not often. Well, how to say, I ask them to read [aloud] because I really noticed that if you don't ask them at all, after some time when you ask [to read] something, so I noticed that then they- let's those skills somehow, well, you know, weaken. And they really read poorly. Now they came, let's say, from their holiday [the university vacation] and now again after some time to read, they haven't read- they have to read plus, well, you know, reading aloud

I: hm

T: those various things and, of course, they make pronunciation mistakes anyway. But, for example, after some time if you don't give them something [to read], so then they read poorly somehow. That's the point. Of course, I don't ask [to read] often because it's boring, you know.

I: hm

About the Author

Irena Kuzborska recently completed her Ph.D. studies in Applied Linguistics at the University of Essex in the United Kingdom. She has taught English as a Foreign Language in Lithuania and in the United Kingdom. Her research interests include reading, teacher education, and English for specific purposes. Email: irkuzi@gmail.com