



The Reading Matrix © 2012

Volume 12, Number 2, September 2012

Issues in Supporting the Teaching of Reading in English as a Second Language to Arabic-Speaking Children

Mark Wyatt

University of Portsmouth

ABSTRACT

In this paper, I argue that in-service language-teacher education programs should consider all elements of the linguistic, geographical and cultural context of the teachers the course is designed for, and respond to this context in a constructivist way in program design and implementation. Using qualitative case-study data, I focused on the development over time of an English teacher of young learners in Oman who was studying at an in-service teacher education program that appeared to meet various criteria for constructivism. However, findings indicate the teacher's growth was uneven, and conclusions are that input on initial literacy and the teaching and assessment of reading in English as a second language (ESL) could have been better tailored to the context.

INTRODUCTION

While developing reading skills is challenging for learners in a first language, it is even more so for second or foreign language learners. Debates over how to support reading development in English have raged for years, characterized by clashes between proponents of *top-down* (starting with experience of the world and then guessing and predicting to decode meaning) and *bottom-up* (focusing first on the sound-symbol associations of English through the use of phonics) approaches (Beard, 1993). Yet, as Cameron (2001) points out, many researchers now agree that these approaches can be combined to support reading development *interactively*; the process of developing the ability to read is a highly complex one, which requires flexibility of teachers as they seek to support individual reading needs.

In this paper, I examine the extent to which a teacher-education program in the Middle East was able to influence the cognitions and practices of a non-native English teacher over an extended period, during which time he was studying for a three-year in-service university degree in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages). After reviewing the literature, I explore the research context and describe the qualitative methodology used.

PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' COGNITIONS IN TEACHING ESL READING

If a teacher-education program is to change the way teachers teach, it needs to address their beliefs. As Borg (2006) argues, teachers' prior cognitions "act as a filter through which input and experience during teacher education is processed." It is therefore important to help

teachers “examine and reconsider these [cognitions] in the light of new information and experience” (p. 276).

El-Okda (2005), working at Sultan Qaboos University in Oman, surveyed 57 student teachers of ESL in their third year, just prior to them taking a methodology course that included a focus on teaching reading. His findings, which are surprising in light of current ideas, e.g. as represented by Nuttall (1996), are of particular interest to my research since these pre-service teachers shared the same geographical and linguistic context with the teacher I investigated. After eliciting beliefs in relation to three vignettes (focused on teaching literacy, text exploitation, and teaching long stories), El-Okda discovered the following: Regarding initial literacy, the great majority believed we do not know our first language orally before we know its letters, and that learning a language means primarily being able to read its alphabet. Second, regarding text exploitation, they believed that reading aloud around the class is an essential skill, that it improves learners’ pronunciation and makes silent reading easier. They almost unanimously rejected the argument that reading aloud is a waste of time, while an identical proportion (98.2%) disagreed with the notion that people rarely read aloud in real life. They also believed that learners would not understand a text unless they knew all the vocabulary. As to the third vignette, a large majority disagreed with the argument that we read stories for fun and not for the structures and new words that occur in them. Summarizing these findings, El-Okda points out that, in these student teachers’ cognitions, reading seems confined to verbalizing, and stories are perceived as vehicles for grammar and vocabulary learning.

“Arabic-speaking nations have an unusually strong tradition of oral language” (Palmer, El-Ashry, Leclere, & Chang, 2007, p. 13), with reading aloud and recitation common practices. As these authors explain, Middle-Eastern children learn colloquial Arabic at home, followed by Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) at school, where their first lessons start with the alphabet (as pre-service teachers in El-Okda’s study recalled). Arabic is a phonetically regular language, and the teaching of initial literacy focuses on phonics. Children are introduced to the relationships between sounds and letters and, once they have learned these, are able to read whole words through a process of *serial decoding*, which, as Emery (2005) points out, allows them “to correctly read aloud previously unseen words – something not always possible in English” (p. 10). As a result, Arab children learning English, but dependant on the strategy they had employed learning Arabic, are likely to struggle with the unpredictable phoneme-grapheme patterns found in English. They therefore also need to be introduced to *whole-word reading*, and the skill of learning to recognize words as symbols. Indeed, research conducted by Fender (2003), who contrasted the word-level reading difficulties of Japanese and Arab students of a similar language level, found the Arabs’ problems related to word recognition.

Clearly, then, there were issues for El-Okda’s reading skills methodology course to address, issues that arguably all such courses for Arabic-speaking teachers of English should consider. For, though there is limited evidence available in this specific field, research conducted in an American context has suggested that (a) foreign language teachers’ practices regarding reading skills’ development tend to reflect their beliefs in the same area (Graden, 1996, as cited in Borg, 2006), and (b) such beliefs are open to change when a constructivist view of teaching reading is promoted (Grisham, 2000). As I explain below, the teacher-education program that is the focus of this study contained constructivist elements (Dangel & Guyton, 2004).

THE RESEARCH CONTEXT

The three-year BA TESOL was designed for over 900 diploma-holding teachers of English in the Sultanate of Oman, a country in which educational change has been rapid. The Omani teachers were organized in six successive cohorts; my research was conducted with

Cohort 4 (2003-2005). They studied intensively during summer and winter schools, and then attended day-release sessions throughout the rest of the year, where they had opportunities to put new ideas into practice, as they were teaching four days per week. Once a semester, they were observed in their schools by regional tutors, who used feedback sessions to help them relate theory to practice. Besides providing the opportunity to get feedback on their teaching, the program design was constructivist (Dangel & Guyton, 2004) because, first, the context of the in-service teachers was considered in the design of course materials; second, assignments invited them to draw on this context; and third, opportunities for engagement and reflection were built into sessions through practical activities and discussion. Course content included a focus on the development of ESL reading skills, with modules on Initial Literacy in English (IL), Stories in English-language learning (Stories), Language Acquisition and Learning (LAL), Teaching Reading and Writing (TR&W) and Teaching English to Young Learners (TEYL) (see Atkins, Lamb & Wedell, 2009, for details).

Halfway through the program, one of the 35 students in my regional cohort, a teacher I had been doing exploratory research with as part of a larger study (Wyatt, 2008), informed me that, for his dissertation, he wished to investigate the biggest problems his Grade 7 learners faced in reading aloud around the class (or *chain reading*, as the practice is known locally). This surprised me because this traditional practice is at odds both with the learner-centered philosophy of the course, as well as specific learner-centered practices to which he had been introduced. It was also contrary to my advice and to advice in the teachers' book he used (ELCD, 1998). Nuttall (1996, pp. 201-202) is particularly scathing of the practice of getting language learners to read aloud around the class in English, describing it, when overdone, as dreary, demotivating, and useless.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The teacher, Omar (pseudonym), was one of five teachers I followed throughout the program while investigating changing *cognitions* and practices (see Wyatt, 2009, 2010a, 2010b, 2010c, 2011; Wyatt & Borg, 2011, for accounts of the development of other teachers). In conducting the research, I adhered to strict ethical guidelines. First, Omar was a volunteer who signed an informed consent form, which promised anonymity and the right to withdraw at any time. Second, by aligning my research interests with Omar's concerns, I aimed for *ecological validity*, which requires a focus on naturally-occurring data (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000). Omar would be portrayed sympathetically, as would his culture (Wyatt, 2008). I sent an early draft of my findings to Omar and conducted a follow-up interview as part of the *member checking process* (Stake, 1995). My specific research questions were: (1) What influence did the BA TESOL have on his cognitions and practices regarding teaching reading in ESL (in the first half of the course)? (2) Did these cognitions and practices change through the remainder of the program?

This qualitative case study (Stake, 1995) offers a rich description of events blended with analysis, focusing on the individual and seeking to understand his perspectives (Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995). I hope to facilitate vicarious experience and provide a sufficiently clear picture of the phenomenon being studied to allow the reader to function as a coanalyst (Borg, 1997).

My primary means of collecting data was through the qualitative semi-structured interview (Kvale, 1996). I also drew upon direct observational data, gained chiefly in the natural setting of classrooms in which my role was as a 'non-participant observer' (Cohen et al., 2000). Besides these methods, I analyzed documents, including University of Leeds teaching materials, assignments produced by Omar as part of the course, feedback on these produced by university assessment professionals and field notes.

FINDINGS

What influence did the BA TESOL have on Omar's cognitions and practices regarding teaching reading in ESL (in the first half of the course)?

Data collected in November 2004 when he was planning his dissertation suggest: Omar seemed to believe he could identify his learners' problems by observing them in class, recording their reading individually and conducting a *miscue analysis*, which involves inferring from how a text is read aloud the various cognitive strategies a reader has employed in processing it, e.g., the bottom-up approach, associated with a primary focus on initial letters and sounds (Arnold, 1982). Interviewing pupils, parents and teachers could provide additional data. Omar believed the learners' problems related to complex individual and environmental factors. These included the pupils' "physical and psychological development and the possible effects of many factors such as low intelligence, emotional and personality problems, poor language development, absenteeism and poor school conditions."

Omar bemoaned the lack of motivating stories available in the environment. Without a school library, he argued "students cannot develop a positive attitude towards reading," and without interesting materials, "the danger is that pupils read only for tests." He was also concerned about the amount of whole-word reading in the coursebook he was using (ELCD, 1998). Omar felt that "techniques such as *look-and-say*... based on the conception that pupils see words as whole-patterns... memorize the look... and associate the printed word with meaning" involved drilling, were old-fashioned, and caused boredom. Furthermore, he complained that look-and-say did not help learners tackle unfamiliar words, so that many pupils were "unable to work on their own." In short, he felt they needed phonics through chain reading, declaring: "we can help weaker pupils by saying the sound of the initial consonant of the difficult word. Also, we can encourage and motivate them by getting them to read easier sentences and better pupils to read more difficult sentences." However, while he used chain reading with pupils in Grade 6, in Grade 7 and above "all the activities ask them to read silently only." He summarized the Grade 7 teachers' book (ELCD, 1998) by saying "reading aloud is done only by weaker classes or pupils". The same source declares that reading aloud around the class is potentially "a slow, difficult and thus demotivating process," from which we cannot necessarily infer understanding of the text; "the amount of reading aloud pupils are asked to do is reduced as they progress," while sight vocabulary is developed (ELCD, 1998, p. 18). Omar held strong beliefs regarding the teaching of reading contrary to ideas in the teacher's book.

It seems Omar's thinking regarding teaching reading were similar to those of the pre-service teachers in El-Okda's (2005) study. Like them, he saw reading, at least to some extent, as verbalizing, evident in his proclivity toward chain reading and phonics, and his rejection of whole-word reading. It seems likely that, as with the teachers in El-Okda's study, Omar was heavily influenced by his own experience of learning Arabic, and considered learning phonics to be of paramount importance. His faith in chain reading may also have been influenced by the strong oral tradition in Arabic referred to earlier. However, his sensitivity to environmental issues regarding the development of initial literacy finds no precedent in El-Okda's study, while his belief in the importance of having interesting stories to read (for pleasure and not just grammar and vocabulary) runs counter to the beliefs of El-Okda's pre-service teachers. This leads me to ask in what ways the BA TESOL may already have impacted his cognitions and practices, in the first half of the course.

Firstly, Omar was invited to reflect on the experience of learning to read. In the first session of the IL module in 2003, the BA students discussed how they had learned to read and write in their own L1, and then watched a video of children learning Arabic in a modern, state-of-the-art urban school, with a female teacher. Omar recalled growing up in a small village in the

mountains that lacked electricity and was sometimes cut off by floods. An old man with a long beard taught him to read. Lessons took place in the shade of a big tree, with the children sitting in a circle. Once, when it was Omar's turn to read aloud, he came to a halt before a word he did not recognize. There was a nervous silence until the teacher angrily hit him with the branch of a palm tree. The old man did not tell him what the word was, though, or how to pronounce it, and it was another five days before Omar learned the word from his friend.

In the same summer-school session, the importance of a language-rich environment in developing literacy was emphasized, which led Omar to reflect on how there had been very little print around him in his village. There had been no shop signs or advertisements. He remembers once, though, when he was about five-years old, making the long dusty, bumpy drive out of the mountains in his uncle's old battered pickup. As they got closer to the town, Omar noticed a brand new road sign at a *wadi* (dry river-bed) crossing that said in Arabic, "Stop if the water is at the red line." "What does it mean?" he asked in amazement, after reading the sign aloud. "I don't know," his uncle replied, "but I'd better check at the garage. Perhaps, it's something to do with the vehicle's temperature." How the mechanic had laughed as he explained about the new red and white signs, warning cars not to attempt to cross wadis when fast-flowing waters were high.

Omar recalls learning English from Grade 4, starting with the alphabet. The teachers in the village school were from Arabic-speaking North African countries. There were "no materials, like word cards, flashcards, tape recorders," and teaching methods were "old, traditional." The lesson was "like a lecture" and, if you understood, it was "by luck." Omar considered himself to be different, more learner-centered and relational with his students. "I really am happy to join with my pupils," he told me. "They are like my babies, my children. I feel that."

The course also encouraged Omar to research his own practice. In September 2003, Omar transferred from one small remote mountain school to another (near his home village) and immediately complained about the reading level of the seventh graders. They had three years of English behind them, but he reported "many difficulties with them. They are weak, weak pupils." He decided to investigate their reading problems while keeping a journal for the LAL module. In his first entry he wrote,

What can I do? I sometimes feel I am banging my head against a stone wall. I try to give them a lot of silent reading practice, but they can't read so this extra practice is no good ... if they can't recognize the words, they can't understand them.

He tried to collect data to explore the extent of the problem by asking the seventh graders to read sentences on the board aloud individually during the lesson while observing them and making notes. After getting the whole class to do this, he found that "six of them couldn't read any word" at all. After the lesson, he asked why and one shyly told him they were "failures." Some had been in the same class for three years (unable to pass promotion exams). One reported having passed the end-of-year exams for Grades 5 and 6 by chance, but could go no further without the ability to read, so, as Omar put it, his school days were "numbered." In a final journal entry, Omar planned to help by inviting parents to the school where they could discuss the problems together, and Omar could advise them to read to their children, buy books, encourage older siblings to help them and "not waste their time" by making them work in the gardens or feed the camels and goats.

This was encouraging, but I also had misgivings about Omar's use of chain reading. Perhaps he had received insufficient input on conducting research or had misinterpreted summer school IL input emphasizing what a teacher could learn from listening to a child reading aloud. Cameron (2001) recommends that children regularly read aloud individually to their teacher, but warns of problems if this is done in front of the whole class. I had reinforced this message in a day-release session in November 2003, arguing that chain reading could be stressful for the

struggling reader and demotivating for learners listening to a text read badly. It would also produce inaccurate diagnostic results, as we often under-perform under pressure.

Omar came much closer to providing learner-centered reading instruction while working on an assignment for the Stories module. The task was to plan, teach, and evaluate a shared story and follow-up activity from a home-produced *big book* (a teacher-made storybook in large print). The children would be gathered on a mat around the teacher, participating in the telling of the story by predicting, guessing, discussing, repeating phrases, reading whole words, and focusing on initial letters (Wells, 1986). They would thus contribute interactively while developing imagination, emotions, and thinking skills (Cameron, 2001).

For his assignment, Omar adapted a fable about an ant and a grasshopper. While the ant industriously collected food all summer, the latter idled away his hours, singing (in the adapted version), “Head, Shoulders, Knees, and Toes,” until the winter came and he had no food. Omar edited the story by simplifying the vocabulary and shortening the sentences, aiming to present only the key details in an engaging way. After creating a big book with illustrations, he practised many times, entertaining his sister’s children with gestures, facial expressions, attention-holding eye contact, and variations in voice, “giving different tones to different characters,” altering speed and pitch, and throwing in animal noises. In the class, he would use pictures to arouse interest, draw on background knowledge and then “read the story aloud, pointing to the words and using pictorial or semantic clues to get the meaning across,” highlight “key words” to help pupils guess meanings using the “context of the whole sentence.” Sometimes, he would focus on “the first letter and get pupils to sound it out.” After finishing, he would summarize the story again from pictures and cues, encouraging pupils to make actions and noises and join in with the refrain, and the pupils would act it out, taking turns being ant and grasshopper.

This procedure was consistent with the input he had received. However, there was very little evaluation. Omar simply reported using the story with his Grade 6 class, who enjoyed it, seeing it as “a kind of treat.” This lack of evaluation might bring into question how deeply Omar had reflected, but I hoped he would continue with shared reading. There is growing evidence that it helps in the Omani context (e.g., Robinson et al., 2006) and this might relate to the strong oral tradition of Arabic.

As well as innovatively adapting materials for the Stories assignment, Omar supplemented curricular materials in an observed lesson. This was in April 2004, when he used a paper maché model of a garden, complete with plastic animals and trees, while teaching a Grade 4 coursebook narrative, called “Bader and the Goats.” The teaching techniques he used, however, still seemed fairly traditional. At the start, Omar introduced the narrative by sticking flashcards (relating to the story) to the whiteboard, and word cards (all verbs) to the side, making a column. He asked the students to demonstrate the verbs *walk* and *stop* by moving around the classroom, and then he shouted at a boy in Arabic, “Where’s your homework?” afterward telling him it was a joke; he had wanted to demonstrate *shout*.

Omar then focused on the flashcards. He used the model to demonstrate opening a gate, and then, with the help of mime and gesture, **elicited** the first part of the story, referring to the pictures and verbs on the board. ‘Yesterday Bader walked to his garden. He opened the gate. He stopped. He listened. He looked.’ Creating as much suspense as possible, Omar then asked dramatically what they thought Bader saw in his garden, “maybe a snake, maybe something... he was afraid of,” but the pupils, who had looked ahead in their books, told him “you are asking about goats.” “And what did he do? He shouted,” Omar continued, completing the first part of the story, all they would get that day. There followed a matching exercise, with students matching verbs (on the board) to pictures. As they did this, Omar helped them read the verbs, getting them to focus on initial consonants (sh... sh... shouted). Then the class opened their books, listened, and followed as Omar read the first part of the story again, stopping

occasionally, getting students to complete words “to make sure they were following.” In their books, the pupils then had to find verbs and circle them, and for homework, read them again.

Discussing this afterwards, Omar reported that this was the students’ first lesson with the story, although some verbs were familiar. Asked if he had changed the teacher’s-book procedures, Omar replied he had supplemented the flashcards with “the realia on the table.” The story had been divided into two parts “because of the time of the lesson. The story’s too long.” In the first lesson with the story the focus had been on verbs, and in the second it would be on reading, while in the third learners would get the remainder of the story: ‘Bader picked up a stick. He chased the goats. The goats jumped over the wall. Bader walked to his house. He talked to Hani.’ A total of four or five lessons would be based around the complete narrative.

Subsequently, in discussion with Omar, I contrasted the coursebook method of teaching a story in two halves on consecutive days to the shared-reading approach, with the story told right through before more detailed analysis. I also suggested ways of changing a story, when telling it orally, to add an element of unpredictability and fun. I had liked the building up of suspense, and suggested using visual support to provide alternative endings that might stimulate the learners’ imagination. Omar looked puzzled, though, and rejected my suggestion, saying the curriculum had to be followed. (This curriculum, I had argued in a day-release session, adopts a largely bottom-up approach, focusing on look-and-say and phonics, in contrast to the interactive approach recommended by Cameron, 2001, and favoured by a newer curriculum not yet in use in his school, but which was gradually being introduced throughout the country.) While Omar seemed unwilling to adopt this change, he had nevertheless modified his practices in using coursebook narratives, in his use of realia, and his attempt at encouraging prediction (techniques introduced in the TEYL module).

For his IL assignment, Omar was required to investigate a learner’s reading strategies through carrying out a miscue analysis, so inferring cognitive strategies (Arnold, 1982). He needed research questions, a text, and would then observe and record a pupil reading aloud. Errors would be identified and analyzed, with substitutions perhaps of particular interest for their grapho-phonemic, syntactic, or semantic fit (i.e., did the substitute share the same first letter as the word replaced, fit grammatically into the same sentence or possess a similar meaning?).

Omar conducted the miscue analysis with a bright 15-year old boy in his Grade 9 class who was generally good at English but weak at reading, and disadvantaged in various ways. His father had died, his mother was illiterate, and, unlike city children, he had very little English around him. Omar chose a text he thought challenging “but not too difficult,” and planned to make the boy “feel at ease” by selecting a quiet place, simplifying instructions, and using L1.

Omar reported the boy read “quite fast, in the first paragraph without hesitation.” In some places he corrected himself (e.g., *egg* – *engine*, *stopped* – *start*, *fisherman* – *fishermen*). “I think he was reading for meaning,” Omar continued. “He realized his mistake and that is a very positive sign.” In one place, the boy broke down a word, *fam* – *families*. He read “ROP” (Royal Oman Police) as *rop*, as he had “no knowledge of abbreviations.” However, some of his substitutions were “very good,” as they fitted both semantically and syntactically (Arnold, 1982). For example, *helped* for *phoned* (in *they helped the police* rather than *they phoned the police*). However, he classified another substitution, ‘*their* fishermen,’ as negative, though it could also make sense syntactically and semantically.

After the boy had read, Omar asked him a few comprehension questions about the text: “On which day did they leave Barka? How many kilometres did they sail? The word *start*—is it a noun or a verb? Is it in the present or past?” The boy’s answers were correct. However, Omar made no attempt to check for global understanding, a practice suggested by the day-release materials he had recently been exposed to.

Omar concluded the boy “used a bottom-up approach... he started from the word... but he didn’t use knowledge of the world and experience. According to Cameron’s [2001] diagram [he]

moved from sight words to phonics.” However, I wonder about the self-corrections and positive substitution, *helped* for *phoned*, that seemed to indicate the boy was reading for meaning (and therefore using top-down strategies as well). Omar gained a good score, a positive experience likely to support his self-confidence in researching his learners’ reading difficulties. How well, though, had Omar identified the boy’s weaknesses in reading? I thought this was mixed, and was therefore concerned about his ability to diagnose learners’ difficulties.

To summarize, input and accompanying assessment opportunities in the first half of the BA program influenced Omar in various ways. It made him more aware of the importance of a literate environment for the development of initial literacy, and encouraged him to experiment with shared reading, as well as use realia and invite prediction while using a coursebook narrative. It also encouraged him to conduct research, and provided him with a research method: miscue analysis. Most of these influences are clearly discernible in the thinking behind his November 2004 dissertation planning. Input relating to understanding a child’s reading strategies and conducting miscue analysis, for example, may have reinforced his beliefs in the value of chain reading as a teaching strategy, even though he had been warned this methodology might not be learner-friendly. Conversely, while the Stories module may have strengthened his beliefs in the importance of reading for pleasure, the interactive approach to reading skills’ development (promoted through shared reading) had not influenced his dissertation planning. Rather, he had come down against the use of look-and-say, necessarily a part of any interactive approach, in favour of the increased use of phonics. His own experiences of learning Arabic through phonics and the strong oral tradition in his culture may have trumped course content.

Did Omar’s cognitions and practices change through the remainder of the program?

As Omar’s regional tutor, I was concerned, in February 2005, about his proposed research into the problems in reading aloud faced by his Grade 7 learners. I was unsure if he could collect data in a learner-friendly way, make sense of it, or make practical use of it. I had been somewhat disappointed by his teaching of the Grade 4 coursebook narrative “Bader and the Goats,” and by his unwillingness to consider alternative strategies. However, I also recalled his reported shared-story reading and his willingness to tackle environmental literacy issues.

I felt it was my responsibility to seek to influence Omar’s development so that he became a more learner-centered teacher of reading, able to select appropriate strategies with an interactive approach (in keeping with the philosophy of the course). My first step was to set up a tutorial, in February 2005, through which I could encourage him to explore his existing assumptions. Did he see reading simply as verbalizing? In the feedback on his dissertation proposal, the assessment professional had written,

You say that reading is very important and this is true, but you are discussing reading aloud, which is not the same. We usually read silently to gain understanding (as I am when reading your assignment), so you need to justify reading aloud in a different way... the teacher’s book discourages reading aloud.

I asked Omar about the differences between reading aloud and reading silently. “At its most basic, one is when you say the words, but is there anything else that’s different?” I asked him.

- O. In terms of what?
- I. In terms of the eyes. What happens with the eyes?
- O. They follow the words.
- I. One at a time?

- O. No. Some people follow the words also with their finger.
- I. You've written about that in one of your assignments, 'like old people' you wrote. OK, but you're a skilled reader. If you read a book, say a chapter of Cameron, do you read it in the same way, reading silently as reading aloud?
- O. No, when I read it silently, for example, looking for something for my assignment, I read it quickly. I don't read everything. I'm searching for something. I don't read every word that appears in the text, but when reading aloud I must read everything. My eyes must come to every word, to every letter.
- I. So, what is the effect, then, of reading aloud?
- O. To read everything.

When reading silently as an adult, if Omar came to an unfamiliar word, maybe he would "understand it through the context, maybe make use of the dictionary, ask the teacher, ask a friend, or maybe leave it." However, a learner facing an unfamiliar word while reading aloud might be "stuck for a long time... afraid of the teacher," unable "to jump over it." Different processes were involved, which I was pleased to see Omar acknowledge—reading was not just verbalizing. Getting learners to read aloud, though, Omar argued, was a means of encouraging them to read silently.

Was he aware of the dangers of chain reading? I asked Omar about the advantages and disadvantages. Regarding disadvantages, he told me,

It is not possible to give a chance to all the pupils to read aloud in the lesson, especially with a large number of pupils. The second thing is some pupils will become afraid of reading, especially the weaker ones, and thus it might make the pupils hate the subject and hate the teacher.

However, as he had 10-15 pupils per class (rather than the 40-50 of busy urban schools), one minute each would provide "enough time to give them all a chance to read." Furthermore, in a small class, the experience was more "relaxing" for the learners, not just in reading, but also because "they can hear the teacher, they can hear their friends clearly." Even so, some students were afraid of reading aloud: They "make themselves sick and they can't stand up and they can't read." He would discover indirectly that students had skipped lessons. "Teacher, teacher, Abdullah is not sick, but he can't read... he's afraid," a boy told him. Omar reported using many strategies

[To] stop these complaints, for example, in the class when I use chain reading with weaker pupils, I don't ask them to read the whole sentence. I'll always motivate them, ask them to read, "Ok, now start the sentence." I give them many cues, "read the first word" or "read the initial sounds, say the first sound," [or] ask his friend to read for him, then he'll repeat. I will ask, "Ok, now you read it from your friend; you can sit down and I will ask you later." It will be interesting, but not shouting at them, not "OK, Ahmed read sentence number two!" If he can't, I'll stop him. Shouting, no, not like that, he'll not learn like this.

He reported, though, that some teachers did not discriminate between learners, and went around the class in order, getting each student to stand and read a sentence, regardless of the level of difficulty of the text and the ability of the student. Omar seemed to believe his approach more enlightened, better attuned to the learners' needs and more appropriate for his context, even though it generated fear.

I wanted Omar to consider the differences between chain reading and shared reading. Was he conscious of how shared reading could be used to support reading development in an interactive way? Asked to describe shared reading, Omar told me,

The teacher reads a story for pupils using a big book. The pupils sit around him, for example, on a mat, and the teacher sits on a chair, so he can see all the pupils and all the pupils can hear him clearly.

At the end of the story, he continued, there could be a discussion, with the teacher asking questions. Perhaps, once they knew the story, a “fluent pupil” could read it as a whole. The rest of the class “will speak. They will say their ideas, but it will not be reading. They will not read it from a book. They will say their ideas. They will imagine what is coming.” The teacher could use pictures to transfer “from the world to the word,” using the learners’ background knowledge. What about bottom-up processing, I wondered?

- I. Can the teacher get the pupils to read the words in shared reading?
- O. Yes, after he elicits the ideas, the next idea from the pupils, then he can remove the paper covering the writing, and ask them to read that sentence to check. Is it a correct idea or not, or is it nearly only?
- I. So, the teacher can get them to check their predictions?
- O. Yes, but he will not open the book and ask the pupils, ‘Read it, read it Salim, read this one!’ [or] ‘Yes, Abdullah, read page number three.’

I reminded Omar of a video he had seen of a primary school English teacher using various strategies with a big book, and he recalled she had “covered initial letters” to help pupils to guess the word, which “helped them to read, concentrate,” and she had helped them “recognize the shape” of words. Omar felt shared reading could be motivating if he changed the seating, with the class on a mat in a circle around him, if he used realia, and made animal noises (if relevant), if he had a discussion with the learners afterwards, during which the shy pupils would “also talk.” Nevertheless, shared reading essentially involved “one person talking and the others listening.”

I was surprised by Omar’s interpretation here. Perhaps he had not used shared reading much since treating his class to the story of the ant and the grasshopper fourteen months earlier. In that case, perhaps the method had not been assimilated very deeply, and his memory of using it to develop reading interactively had faded. Perhaps, too, getting Salim or Abdullah to “read this one” through chain reading was so deeply ingrained in his teaching (as well as in his childhood memories), that shared-reading seemed inconsequential to him, not ‘real’ reading. Until pressed to think more deeply, Omar seemed to view shared reading more in top-down than interactive terms, revealing the strength of his preference for approaching the teaching of initial reading through phonics; a preference steeped in his first-language learning experience. After the February 2005 tutorial, I observed Omar twice throughout the last year of the course, during which time he completed the TR&W module. I also interviewed him on three further occasions, and analyzed his dissertation for evidence of change.

When I next visited Omar’s school, in April 2005, I saw him use chain reading with his Grade 7 class. Was he using a variety of strategies in a learner-centered way to support reading development? At the beginning, he quietly indicated the four boys he was researching, and when eight pupils, apparently chosen randomly from around the class, were called upon to read short texts aloud, included were these four. Explaining to the class (of eighteen) in advance that not all would read aloud in this lesson, Omar asked the others to follow carefully in their books, using their fingers to track the words. “Ameer went to Sohar. He trifled by car. He stayed for three dies. Zamzan went to Salalah. She travelled by plan.” Whenever there was a mistake, Omar interrupted immediately, firmly but not aggressively: “Is it trifled or travelled?” “Is it plan or plane?” He tried to elicit the correct pronunciation from the reader, or from others if they could not say the word themselves. He then pronounced the word himself and got the class to repeat it.

He seemed to be encouraging trial and error here, apparently assuming students would learn the correct pronunciation through having their mistakes highlighted. I asked if there were any strategies he could teach them to help them achieve correctness in the future. “I think I can ask them to look at the vowels inside the word,” he replied. I explained about the *magic e*, which he had not heard of (making short sounds long); for example adding an *e* to *plan* makes *plane*. Omar immediately thought of another example, *tap* – *tape* and added: “I think we have to teach them the rule and give them examples, so when they face any of these words they will know.” I agreed.

A strategy he had used, one highlighted in day release, was ‘breaking words down’ (Cameron, 2001). This had helped the boys read the word, ‘holiday.’ Then, introducing lexis essential for a speaking activity: ‘suq’, ‘mosque’, ‘turtle’, he used attractive homemade flashcards, before focusing on initial letters and whole word shapes, with word cards he had also made. “We have lots of strategies to help our pupils now,” he told me, sounding confident in saying this, “lots and lots.”

He had, indeed, used various strategies in this lesson; supporting the introduction of lexis visually, drawing on learners’ background knowledge and activating interest. Using simple homemade materials, he had focused on whole words, parts of words, initial letters. The approach was thus interactive.

I was concerned about the chain reading, but at least it was well organized and brief (four minutes). It also had a purpose (in reminding learners of the topic, *holidays*). Furthermore, I observed no obvious distress, though two boys were reading mechanically. Had not Omar told me they were afraid?

Yes. They avoid reading aloud because they are afraid to make mistakes... pupils always think if they make mistakes, they will lose marks. That’s something in their mind, and they will be afraid of their teacher, but always I told them this is the wrong idea.

Omar seemed to think he could convince learners not to be afraid, so that they could benefit from chain reading. He had used the method in a fairly traditional way in this lesson, though; each learner nominated to stand and read a short three-sentence text, with immediate correction of pronunciation, highlighting the mistakes they were afraid of making. He had not shouted at the boys, but he had interrupted them, and there had been no anonymous feedback afterwards, of the type he had been introduced to through numerous modules (involving praise, the highlighting of common errors, and the introduction of strategies to deal with these errors).

Yet there were positive signs, too. Though he had never heard of the *magic e*, he was aware that he could get learners to focus on the vowels “inside the word,” which boded well for the future, and, to his credit, he did break down *holiday* before encouraging whole-word reading and phonics.

I hoped for signs of further growth, and observed some development in September 2005. At the start of a Grade 9 lesson with eleven boys, Omar drew their attention to texts with accompanying photographs showing how Sidab, a fishing village near Muscat, had changed since His Majesty Sultan Qaboos acceded the throne. He asked, “Were there hospitals in 1969? Is there a big mosque?” He was “activating schemata,” he explained afterward, to supply a context for the next activity, influenced by input from the recently studied TR&W module on using pre-reading activities. I was pleased that activating schemata, not suggested in the teacher’s book, had become part of his practice.

Next, to support a listening activity, Omar focused on key words, getting learners to read them aloud around the class, using various strategies to deal with errors. For example, on the board he wrote the word *illness* when it was not said clearly; he broke it down covering the first and then the second half of the word, having learners read each part. When *donkey* was produced

incorrectly, he wrote it on the board and circled the *n*. Sometimes learners guessed from the initial letter (e.g., reading *petrol station* as *police station*). Part of the problem, he reported, was that when they stood to read, the students left their books on their desks, too far from their eyes. “Please, hold up the book to read it well,” he told them. They did not “focus on the words, they just guessed.” This suggests that the inaccuracies were partly due to the way he used chain reading, though Omar did not seem aware of this. If he had let them answer from a seated position, they might have done better, but he wanted them to stand in the more traditional way.

Omar suggested, in September 2005, that his approach to teaching reading was more varied than before. It included “using shared reading, using stories, using new techniques, using phonics,” developing different reading strategies for use before, during, and after interaction with the text, “also using Cameron’s diagram.” In telling me this, he was drawing coherently on input from several modules, including IL and TR&W. With stories, he varied his techniques, depending on whether he was using a coursebook story “essential to the curriculum,” or a story he had either created himself or taken from outside the curriculum.

For example, if I’m teaching a story like this one [pointing at a narrative in a coursebook he was holding up] I may have the word cards, put them on the board and I may first introduce the new vocabulary and focus on the language, as it is in the preparation book. But if I’m teaching a story from outside the book, for example, I may change the seating of the class or I may bring them here in my room, ask them to sit around and tell them the story and then we discuss together. If I feel they need to use pictures or something like that, we will sit in the classroom, so we can use drawings or pictures on the board. So it depends on the story itself, if it’s short or long or if I want them to prepare it before. It depends.

With coursebook stories, Omar emphasized, “I *can* change them, but, as I told you before, we should teach it as it’s here.” There would be “lots of questions to answer after they read,” and he had to think about the learners’ end-of-semester exams. “Are the coursebook stories real stories or are they vehicles for language learning?” I asked him.

We can’t change them. For example, if we have foreign names, we can’t put our names here, but if there’s a story from outside the curriculum, I can choose any names, I can choose any vocabulary, I can make it a story easily, but here we can’t change. We must teach all the things.

He sounded confident in making this distinction, more so than when I had raised the issue seventeen months earlier; now he could articulate reasons for his actions. I asked him if he used chain reading much.

It depends. For example, if I’m teaching a lesson with instructions, ‘how to make an omelette,’ for example, if I have many steps, I ask the pupils to read them using chain reading, and also I can use it with [coursebook] stories, start with the first pupil, read the first sentence, then the second pupil [to] complete, yes.

As to the stories from outside the curriculum, with which he used other techniques, he managed to use these “about once a month, on average,” unless there was extra time. Omar was focusing more on developing environmental literacy and encouraging extensive reading. “As you see here,” he told me in April 2005, pointing to the wall behind him in the school, “we have these posters and cards. I’m trying to give them some books to read, stories...” Later, he made an English Club, stocking a spare room with “a lot of books, stories, dictionaries, audio and video cassettes and many other teaching aids,” purchased with his own money from some traveling salesmen. He decorated the room with colourful posters, and started using it in “free”

lessons (music and art, subjects for which the school had no teacher). He also started to engage his students in making posters and in producing simple short stories, aiming “to change the poor environment of reading in the school”.

While all this was admirable, to find out if the students read the books he encouraged them to borrow, Omar would “get a summary, vocabulary or verbs, something like that.” This was disappointing as in an April 2005 TR&W day-release session on extensive reading, there had been an emphasis on motivating students through response activities that reinforced the idea that reading is enjoyable; Omar was advised that asking detailed comprehension questions might not motivate learners to read extensively.

There is, however, evidence that some of Omar’s ideas became more flexible in the last year of the course. Omar’s position in November 2004, and February 2005, was quite uncompromising. Chain reading was *the* answer. However, by September 2005, he was more relaxed about using chain reading alongside other methods. “It depends,” he said several times, “if I’m teaching... if there’s a story...” He used the word ‘if’ nine times in the short extracts of data I quoted above, while the modal *may* also occurred with greater frequency. This suggests that, perhaps as a result of greater reflection, he became more open-minded about his work. Input on extensive reading encouraged him to tackle issues of environmental literacy, and he took practical steps to improve the school resources to facilitate this.

However, with regard to his classroom teaching, though he recognized that the use of chain reading might spark strong negative emotions, he persisted in using this technique as he believed in its value. Omar’s teaching methodology combined innovative ideas picked up in the course (such as activating schemata, breaking words down, and using appealing materials to create interest), alongside traditional methods (such as having students stand and read aloud, focusing on comprehension questions rather than encouraging personal response). He found a way of using shared reading with extra-curricular materials, but this was outside regular class hours. There were, thus, contradictions in Omar’s practice. Overall, my main finding is that, as a teacher of reading, Omar seemed to grow in many ways, though this growth appeared uneven.

DISCUSSION

It seems the course was only partially successful in influencing changes in Omar’s cognitions and practices with regard to teaching reading. Regarding principles of constructivist teacher education, I believe such courses need to (1) promote reflection that explores every aspect of the teachers’ linguistic, geographical, and educational context, and (2) link input to appropriate methodology with curriculum renewal.

Courses Need to Promote Reflection

If a constructivist approach is to be used in teacher education, reflection is imperative (Dangel & Guyton, 2004). In the first session of the IL module, Omar was encouraged to reflect on the process of becoming literate in his own L1, as reported above. He was asked to consider where he first learned to read and how old he was at the time, which prompted him to recall childhood experiences. Input from a short video showing children learning Arabic at a modern school (with the teacher emphasizing the context of the language, employing word cards, and encouraging role play) was used to invite reflection on whether this was the way he had learned to read and write in Arabic. This particular video clip from a model lesson may have been chosen as it appeared to support an interactive approach to reading; the materials featured a quote from Freire (1983, p. 10), “Before we read the word, we need to read the world”.

As Emery (2005) points out, though, word cards are used in different ways in English and Arabic lessons. Used for symbol recognition in English, frequently with irregularly spelled

words that cannot be broken down easily, they are used after serial decoding in Arabic, as whole-word visual images. In the particular video clip described above, the focus seems to have been on the latter use, though this distinction was not explicit in the module materials. Unfortunately, too, the IL materials did not invite comparisons between phonetic Arabic and English with its irregularities in terms of phoneme-grapheme correspondence, nor did any of the recommended readings address this issue. Subsequently, though, for a later cohort, the Emery (2005) article referred to in this paper was added to the module reading file. For Omar and his Cohort 4 colleagues, though, it appears that research into how Middle-Eastern children learn to read Arabic at school, such as discussed above, was not made use of, with opportunities for reflection missed. Therefore, the linguistic context of the teachers was not adequately dealt with, which limited the module's effectiveness in impacting cognitions and practices.

The educational context of the teachers was also insufficiently considered in the choice of assignment for the IL module. As I have argued above, the introduction of miscue analysis as a research tool may have unwittingly reinforced teachers' faith in the value of chain reading (already significant because of the strong oral tradition in Arabic), and consequently may have led to an increase in the use of this traditional practice. Indeed, once I observed one of Omar's course colleagues (a teacher who also employed miscue analysis for research) devote an entire 40-minute lesson to chain reading. It would have been preferable had an alternative form of assessment been used, one that encouraged practice in line with the program philosophy. In these respects, the IL module was insufficiently constructivist.

However, the geographical context of the teachers was considered; an activity in the first session invited the teachers to reflect on how much there was in the environment for children to read, and compare the value of different types of environment (towns and villages) for promoting environmental literacy. This seemed to help Omar in developing an awareness that he acted on through the course (e.g., creating his English Club and putting up posters in English around his school).

Overall, though, in program design, linguistic and educational features of the teachers' contexts were insufficiently considered in the IL module. Reflection on the linguistic differences between English and Arabic could have been written into the IL module by writers who could have considered more carefully the impact the mode of assessment might have. Unfortunately, it seems the IL module made little overall impact, according to a large-scale evaluation of the BA Project conducted by Freeman (2007). Only one of 55 graduates identified the IL module as amongst those that were useful. Furthermore, the input it provided may have led to confused outcomes, as a beliefs-and-practices survey suggests (administered by Freeman as part of the same evaluation). These teachers were unsure if initial instruction in literacy should rely on one approach (whole word or phonics), and were unclear whether or not the processes involved in learning literacy in L2 were the same as those in L1. Freeman considered these findings a cause for concern.

Courses Need to Link Input to Appropriate Methodology

In contrast to the IL module, both Stories and TR&W appeared to be much more successful in impacting teachers' cognitions. Indeed, they ranked second and third, respectively, in Freeman's (2007) focus-group discussions of the most useful (of nineteen) modules. Furthermore, items that garnered strong agreement on Freeman's beliefs-and-practices survey included, "stories should be adapted to suit the pupils' culture; stories can be used for language learning at any level; pre-reading activities help readers to read more purposefully" (p. 16). These beliefs seemed to accord with those of Omar. Influences of the TR&W module on his work are evident from the way he started to activate schemata and encourage extensive reading.

Omar felt he had a responsibility to teach the coursebook narratives in the way recommended by the teacher's book, despite the limitations of this approach, which restricted his experimentation with new techniques (such as shared reading), and his gains from the course. The curriculum he was using was being phased out, but this change did not come fast enough for him to benefit more from the program. For teachers to put learning into practice in a context-sensitive constructivist way, it is essential they feel able to adapt and experiment with materials, as Dangel and Guyton (2004) argue. Omar felt the challenges of doing this with reading materials were too great, although I thought he could have tried more.

CONCLUSION

In this article, I have focused on the development of one particular teacher through the course who was selected because I was puzzled by the direction of his developing ideas, which indicated a lack of course comprehension (in this respect, he was quite different from other teachers of the same multi-case study; see Wyatt, 2009, 2010a, 2010b, 2010c, 2011; Wyatt & Borg, 2011). Through intervening, by asking Omar to explore the basis of his beliefs, I believe I may have helped Omar gain a more balanced view. Omar did change, but one can also identify similarities between his cognitions and those of the pre-service teachers in El-Okda's (2005) study. Though Omar's ideas were more developed, influences exerted by his L1 learning experiences on his teaching of initial literacy in English are also evident. In some ways, Omar appeared resistant to input.

The course could have done more to challenge Omar's beliefs. Furthermore, if linked to a revised curriculum that provided room for innovation, the program could also have encouraged greater practical experimentation. As his regional tutor, I tried to support Omar's growth in various ways. In retrospect, though, I feel I should have done more in tutorials, while challenging his beliefs, to encourage him to examine the processes involved in becoming literate in Arabic.

The specific problems with the IL module discussed above were flagged by regional tutors and improvements were made, including changing the nature of the assignment for the following cohort from miscue analysis to one that encouraged teachers to focus on promoting environmental literacy. By the sixth cohort of the program,

The [IL] materials were considered good [by regional tutors], with the focus on comparing initial literacy practices in Arabic and English, methods and materials for developing literacy and the role of phonics in literacy development all considered positive elements. (Atkins, 2007, p. 15)

Toward the end of the project, the program appeared to become more constructivist in addressing teachers' needs, which seems a vital quality if, as in Grisham's (2000) study, changes in teachers' cognitions regarding reading instruction are to take place. Further research is required in this complex area.

***Mark Wyatt** is currently a Senior Lecturer in English Language and Linguistics at the University of Portsmouth, UK, where he currently works with pre-service language teachers. Previously, he worked with in-service teachers at the University of Leeds BA TESOL Project in the Sultanate of Oman. His research interests are in growth in practical knowledge and teachers' self-efficacy beliefs, and in constructivist-language teacher education, and he has published in these areas.*

Email: Mark.Wyatt@port.ac.uk

REFERENCES

- Arnold, H. (1982). *Listening to children reading*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Atkins, J. (2007). *BA (TESOL) project manager's report 2006*. Department of Human Sciences, Ministry of Education, Sultanate of Oman.
- Atkins, J., Lamb, M., & Wedell, M. (Eds.). (2009). *International collaboration for educational change: The Oman BA project*. Muscat, Sultanate of Oman: Ministry of Education.
- Beard, R. (1993). *Teaching literacy, balancing perspectives*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Borg, S. (1997). Writing up qualitative research. *Research News (IATEFL [International Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language] Research SIG Newsletter)*, 10, 1-8.
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. London: Continuum.
- Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching languages to young learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education* (5th ed.). London: Routledge Falmer.
- Dangel, J. R., & Guyton, E. (2004). An emerging picture of constructivist teacher education. *The Constructivist*, 15(1), 1-35.
- ELCD (English Language Curriculum Department) (1998). *Our world through English, teacher's book, 1P (A)*. Sultanate of Oman: Ministry of Education.
- El-Okda, M. (2005). EFL student teachers' cognition about reading instruction. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 5(2), 1-18. Retrieved January 27, 2012 from <http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/okda/article.pdf>
- Emery, H. (2005). Learning to read and spell in Arabic. *Journal of Applied Research in Education*, 8, 1-14.
- Fender, M. (2003). English word recognition and word integration skills of native Arabic- and Japanese-speaking learners of English as a second language. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 24(2), 289-315.
- Freeman, D. (2007). *Fourth evaluation of the Ministry of Education, Oman – University of Leeds BA Educational Studies (TESOL) Project*. Ministry of Education, Sultanate of Oman.
- Freire, P. (1983). The importance of the act of reading. *Journal of Education* 165(1), 5-11.
- Grisham, D. L. (2000). Connecting theoretical concepts of reading to practice: A longitudinal study of elementary school teachers. *Reading Psychology*, 21, 145-170.
- Hitchcock, G., & Hughes, D. (1995). *Research and the teacher* (2nd ed). London: Routledge.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nuttall, C. (1996). *Teaching reading skills in a foreign language* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Heinemann.
- Palmer, B. C., El-Ashry, F., Leclere, J. T., & Chang, S. (2007). Learning from Abdallah: A case study of an Arabic-speaking child in a US school. *The Reading Teacher*, 61(1), 8-17.
- Richards, J. C., & Rixon, S. (2002). *Second independent evaluation of the Ministry of Education, Oman – University of Leeds BA Educational Studies (TESOL) Project*. Ministry of Education, Sultanate of Oman.
- Robinson, P., Al-Zedjali, F., Al-Abrawi, N., Al-Balushi, H., Al-Raisi, J., Al-Balushi, M., & Al-Jahdhami, F. (2006). Shared large text activities in YL EFL classrooms. *ELT in Oman*, 2, 7-11.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wells, G. (1986). *The meaning makers: Children learning language and using language to learn*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

- Wyatt, M. (2008). *Growth in practical knowledge and teachers' self-efficacy during an in-service BA (TESOL) program* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). School of Education, University of Leeds, UK.
- Wyatt, M. (2009). Practical knowledge growth in communicative language teaching. *TESL-EJ*, 13(2), 1-23.
- Wyatt, M. (2010a). An English teacher's developing self-efficacy beliefs in using groupwork. *System*, 38(4), 603-613.
- Wyatt, M. (2010b). One teacher's development as a reflective practitioner. *Asian EFL Journal*, 12(2), 235-261.
- Wyatt, M. (2010c, December 27). Teachers researching their own practice. *ELT Journal*. doi:10.1093/elt/ccq074
- Wyatt, M. (2011). Becoming a do-it-yourself designer of English language teaching materials. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung (Forum: Qualitative Social Research)*, 12(1), Art 33, 1-38.
- Wyatt, M., & Borg, S. (2011, January 13). Development in the practical knowledge of language teachers: A comparative study of three teachers designing and using communicative tasks on an in-service BA TESOL programme in the Middle East. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 5(3), 233-252. doi:10.1080/17501229.2010.537340 (informaworld.com, <http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/rill20/current>).