



‘Reading before Class with a Partner’ and ‘Re-reading after Class’: Novel Reading Strategies of Graduate Students

Mahmoud Altalouli

State University of New York Brockport

ABSTRACT

Academic English reading is among the literacies that many students using English as an additional language may need to change in order to meet new demands when they enter a new context of higher education. Academic reading in English involves more than studying in an additional language. Students must also learn and use new academic reading practices of a particular discipline. Drawing on the theoretical lenses of academic literacies and agency, this study presents novel reading strategies that six graduate students for whom English is an additional language at a U.S. university developed to achieve their goals in a graduate course. The study used a qualitative methodology involving data collected through classroom observations of the graduate course over one semester; interviews with each of the six focal students; and the collection of course documents and student written assignments. Results from the study may prove useful to higher education instructors.

INTRODUCTION

Reading plays a foundational role across academic disciplines and levels. Indeed, reading in graduate school is critical because it is key to construct disciplinary knowledge. Graduate students do not simply read for “knowledge telling” rather for “knowledge transforming” (Hirvela, 2016). In reading for writing activities, for instance, summarizing the content of a reading is an example of knowledge telling, and analyzing information is an example of knowledge transforming. Such expectations may be unfamiliar to many international students using English as an additional language (EAL), who need to learn and use new communication practices of a new academic context (Altalouli, 2021; Curry et al., 2021). Learning to succeed in English-speaking universities can be complex for EAL students because of linguistic and sociocultural differences between students’ former and new educational institutions and contexts. Nonetheless, “many instructors, especially in higher education, may assume that EAL students arrive equipped to engage in academic reading in English, yet for several reasons students may struggle with academic reading” (Altalouli & Curry, 2023, p. 19). Research on academic English reading of EAL graduate students has explored issues that they encounter when moving to a new context including the use with of discipline-specific vocabulary (e.g., Liu, 2015) and the amount of reading required (e.g., Kuzborska, 2015).

Many EAL graduate students report specialized and technical words as a major source of problems in reading and thus can be discouraging to students (e.g., Altalouli, 2020, 2021; Liu, 2015). The lack of specialized and technical vocabulary has an influence on the amount of time EAL students spend on reading, and thus on the pace of reading. Most graduate EAL students in these studies (Kuzborska, 2015; Singh, 2015) reported that their reading was slow as they had to spend time looking up professional words. These graduate EAL students heavily relied on strategies such as translating that they have learned in their home countries to approach unknown words at the beginning of their graduate programs. While students as undergraduates in their home countries depend on translation, they reduce their use of dictionary as they progressed in their graduate programs in host universities (Liu, 2015) and use vocabulary guessing as an alternative reading strategy (Singh, 2015).

In addition, most EAL graduate students reported quantity of reading as a concern in graduate courses (e.g., Liu, 2015). The quantity of reading varies from one discipline to another and from one discipline to another. Results of an online survey of 744 doctoral students including international students in clinical psychology across the United States revealed that an average of 330 pages per week was assigned (McMinn et al., 2009). For many EAL graduate students across disciplines, it is difficult to find enough time to complete the significant amounts of reading required (e.g., Kuzborska, 2015) because “it was impossible to stay caught up on the reading when assignments for several classes were due in the same week” (McMinn et al., 2009, p. 237). To deal with the quantity of reading concern, students use several strategies including skimming and not completing the assigned readings (Altalouli, 2021).

The aforementioned issues and strategies seem to be generic and represent the overall reading experiences of international and domestic students alike. However, academic reading is purposeful and is socially constructed by professors, departments, universities, national cultures, and international norms. There appears to be a lack of research examining the nature of academic reading including reading requirements and students’ reading experiences within specific disciplines (Altalouli, 2021; Karakoç et al., 2022). In fact, students are often uncertain about how to read in their disciplines, “a growing concern for educators as university curriculum design needs to cater to an increasingly linguistically, culturally, and socially diverse student cohort” (Griffiths & Davila, 2022, p. 145).

Informed by the academic literacies (Lea & Street, 2006) and creative discursive agency (Collins, 1993), this article aims to increase the visibility of the disciplinary reading practices and experiences (Green, 2022; van Pletzen, 2006) of international EAL graduate students in a graduate course of TESOL master’s program at a U.S. university. This theory of academic literacies (AcLits) views reading as a social practice that varies across contexts rather than a technical skill to be learned in one context and applied to other contexts (Lea & Street, 2006; Lillis & Scott, 2007). In response to the deficit model of literacy, which focuses on student ability to read or write, AcLits emerged to explore the experiences of student academic communications in particular institutional contexts (Lea & Street, 2006). AcLits scholars underscore the role of individual students in meaning making in different contexts (e.g., van Pletzen, 2006).

This role is better understood as agency, which is defined as the capacity of individuals to act in particular contexts and is conditioned by the structure (social world) in which agents live and their positions in the social world (Bourdieu, 1984). In higher education, students are agents whose actions can be constrained by the institutional requirements (the institutional power). Collins (1993), however, posits that students can exercise their agency, as a counterbalance to

the weight of the institutional power. That is, they are able to develop and use creative strategies to help them succeed in particular context. In fact, “the reader is agentive while reading” (van Pletzen, 2006, p. 107) for particular purposes such as reading to write (Altalouli, 2021). In this study, creative discursive agency explains students’ ability to generate strategies to increase their make meaning and success in a social structure.

This study, therefore, makes reading more visible as a social practice in academic literacies research. The study employed a qualitative approach to answer the research question: In what academic reading practices do EAL graduate students engage in a graduate course? In addition to the aforementioned reading strategies, students in this study generated “novel” reading strategies that can help them make meaning of the assigned readings, which in turn, would promote their academic writing and speaking. What makes these strategies “novel” is that the students in this study had not thought of them before taking the graduate course under study. In addition, research has not documented these reading strategies as described below. In the following sections, I present the methods and results and discussion. I finally conclude with study limitations and implications for teaching.

METHODOLOGY

Participants and setting

This qualitative study was part of a larger inquiry into the reading experiences and practices of beginning international graduate students in a graduate level course titled Second Language Acquisition and Bilingualism during fall 2018 at a research university in the United States. The course aimed to develop students’ understanding of issues influencing second language acquisition, raise their awareness of topics in language teaching, and evaluate these issues and teaching ideas for use in their future classrooms. The course met once a week for two hours and 45 minutes, over a 14-week semester. The course reading requirements are 10 chapters of the textbook *Understanding Second Language Acquisition* written by Lourdes Ortega (2009) as well as 29 journal articles (including literature reviews and empirical studies) with an average of 60 pages of reading a week (see Appendix: The Syllabus). The syllabus also shows that assignments in the course included participating in class, leading one discussion of an assigned reading, writing journal entries about the readings, an interview paper about a bilingual speaker, and a literature review.

Following the approval of the University’s Research Subjects Review Board, I sent an email to the instructor requesting her participation in the research study. The instructor was an international student from South Korea who was in the third year of her PhD when data were collected. She had taught the course three times previously. The course had 19 students, five domestic and 14 international students (10 new and four recurrent). All of them major in the master’s program of TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages). I invited the students in the course to participate. Only six international female students agreed to be the focal students whom I informed that they could withdraw from the study at any time without prejudice. The students did not have previous experience within U.S. educational institutions. All of the focal students had completed their undergraduate studies in different home universities. Table 1 displays a summary of the study student profiles.

Table 1. Student Profiles

Student (pseudonym)	Country	Undergraduate Major	Age
Carol	China	Translation	23
Kate	China	Broadcasting	23
Mai	China	Marketing	23
Coco	China	English literature	22
Han	China	Economics	22
Sally*	Japan	English literature	26

*Sally had also earned a master’s degree in English literature in her home country.

To be admitted into the TESOL master’s program, all of them had to prove their language proficiency by scoring high enough on the Test of English as a Foreign Language [TOEFL] or International English Language Testing System, [IELTS]. Five of the focal students had TOEFL scores between 90 and 104 out of 120 (on the Internet-based test); one student had an IELTS score of 7.0 out of 9.0 (equivalent to TOEFL scores from 94 to 101), according to the Educational Testing Service (ETS, 2022a). Table 2 shows students’ proficiency score in reading, writing, listening, and speaking.

Table 2. Student TOEFL and IETLS Scores

Pseudonym	TOEFL score	Reading	Writing	Listening	Speaking
Carol	104	27	25	26	26
Kate	92	25	20	24	23
Mai	93	29	21	21	21
Coco	7.0 IELTS	8	6	8.5	6
Han	90	25	20	24	23
Sally	72	16	21	19	19

ETS (2022a) also compares IELTS and TOEFL scores of each skill, and accordingly Coco’s IELTS scores of “8” in reading, “6” in writing, “8.5” in listening, and “6” in speaking are equivalent to perspective TOEFL scores of “29”, “21-23”, “29” and “18-19. ETS (2022b) further divides the reading skill into four proficiency levels: Advanced (24–30); high-intermediate (18–23); low-intermediate (4–17); and below low-intermediate (0–3). That is, all students but Sally are advanced readers.

Data collection and analysis

The epistemological understanding that reading is a socially situated practice entails qualitative inquiry as a methodology. Qualitative research as an interpretive approach to study phenomena in their natural settings aims “to make sense of, or to interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 3). Qualitative data sources in this study include classroom observations, interviews, and document collection (Marshall & Rossman, 2016). I observed each class meeting and made field notes of my observations. Field notes included records of the course activities such as pair and group discussions about the assigned readings and documentation of informal conversations with the focal students. After

class, I wrote analytic memos in which I noted some reading-based activities and discussions. I video recorded all of the classes to learn about what students did with reading and how reading was connected to other literacy practices including classroom discussions. The camera captured a relatively clear picture, but not clear sound in every class because when students were engaged in group work, many students spoke at the same time. To minimize this problem, I used two audio-recorders: one recording the interactions of the instructor and the other recording the interactions of the focal students. The audio-recorders captured better quality sound of the instructor and different students at a table. In each class, I focused on one or two focal students and thus placed the audio-recorder at their table.

Interviews helped me to learn about students' perspectives, experiences, and feelings about their reading practices in and outside of class. In person semi-structured interviews, lasting 60 to 70 minutes, were carried out with each student: one as a baseline at the beginning of the semester and another at the end of the semester. The audio-recorded interviews focused on the participants' personal information in terms of their demographic and educational backgrounds and academic reading that they were doing for the course. The audiotaped interview data were transcribed verbatim. Finally, I conducted secondary analyses of course documents such as the course syllabus, handouts, and the assigned readings. These documents reinforced my understanding of the nature of reading for this course.

To analyze the data, I engaged in the process of coding with pen and paper (Creswell & Poth, 2018). I started coding the interview transcripts and I became aware of some emerging codes such as 'time', 'quantity of reading', 'technical vocabulary', 'pre-reading', 'post-reading', 'participating in class', and 'reading to write'. I synthesized these codes as analytic categories of "reading issues," "reading expectations," "reading purposes," and "reading strategies." Next, I compared these codes and categories in the field notes and the documents I collected. In tandem with coding, I wrote analytic memos that helped me categorize data and make connections between emerging categories while coding (Saldaña, 2021). I repeated the coding process several times for deeper meaning of the nature of academic reading in this course and the students' strategies to meet the course requirements. Table 3 summarizes the data collection methods, sources, and records.

Table 3. Data Collection Methods, Sources, and Records

Data collection methods	Data sources	Data records
Observations	Classroom observations of course meetings	Field notes of observations, video recordings, and analytic memos
Interviews	Semi-structured interviews with the six focal students	Audio recording of interview and transcriptions of interviews
Documents	Written assignments from focal participants course syllabus; assigned readings	Printed and electronic copies of texts (syllabus, handouts)

RESULTS

Before responding to what academic reading practices do EAL graduate students engage in the graduate course, it is critical to discuss the home country academic English literacies of the six students participating in this study. All students engaged with English-medium texts as undergraduates, both in English for academic purposes (EAP) courses and in courses in their majors using English-medium instruction (EMI). While EAP refers to the teaching of English to improving learners' English proficiency in preparation for academic work in English (Flowerdew, 2016), EMI is defined as the teaching of disciplinary content in English in contexts where English is an additional language (Dearden & Macaro, 2016).

All students reported that their undergraduate EAP courses focused on improving their English writing, reading comprehension, listening, speaking, vocabulary, and grammar. The students used EAP textbooks written by local authors whose English is an additional language; they reported that most of their EAP course textbooks had a particular format, comprising units consisting of lessons on different general and academic topics. Each lesson included short passages or dialogues highlighting specific grammar rules and vocabulary. The students reported needing to read the whole text and answer subsequent comprehension questions. However, the students reported not being required to do reading to prepare for class meetings; rather, they did small amounts of in-class reading. The in-class reading focused on translating and understanding discrete words rather than passages of text. At the end of the EAP courses, the students took final examinations that include reading comprehension followed by multiple choice and fill-in-the gap questions. In preparing for these examinations, participants read texts word-by-word reading for decoding purposes (Liu, 2015). Participants decoded English vocabulary by translating every unfamiliar word and memorizing vocabulary and grammatical structures by rote. The students reported these college reading practices are similar to K-12 English reading practices in EFL contexts (as summarized in Stoller et al., 2013).

In contrast, in their EMI courses, four of six participants engaged in much more reading than in their EAP courses, focusing on both content and language. The participants majoring in English literature (Coco and Sally), English translation (Carol), and marketing (Mai) reported reading long paragraphs or sections from multiple texts including textbooks and novels written by authors from the United Kingdom and United States. While interacting with these English academic texts, participants became aware of text structure, which influenced their reading approach. They reported reading English texts by skimming and scanning the sections and paragraphs. The textbook was the only academic genre read by all participants across the disciplines; textbooks were structured with chapters including introductions, regular sections and summaries, and end-of-chapter questions about key themes.

As a result of both phenomena (which are not mutually exclusive, as discussed above), the students used English-medium texts, local language translations, and dictionaries and engaged in useful English reading practices before entering their graduate program in the U.S. including: 1) translating English vocabulary; 2) using rote memorization of vocabulary, grammar, and content; 3) using English academic text structure; and 4) using contextual clues. Students in this study and other studies (e.g., Kuzborska, 2015; Liu, 2015; Singh, 2015) reported that these strategies helped them in dealing with the quantity of reading they had to do and the technical vocabulary they had to learn and use.

As they gained more experience in their graduate course reading, the focal students recognized which of these reading strategies were more supportive than others. Accordingly,

they reduced the use of the less effective strategies including translating and memorizing words and continued using text structure and contextual clues as effective reading strategies. This finding is also supported by previous research (e.g., Bell, 2011; Liu, 2015). Moreover, the focal students recognized the importance of using other strategies that promote their learning and success and developed ‘reading with partners before class’ and ‘re-reading texts after class’ as two “novel” strategies that helped them make meaning in a theory-focused course in the TESOL master’s program at a U.S. university.

Reading with partners before class

Half of the focal students (Mai, Han, Kate) had found a reading partner. Each partner took the responsibility for reading one text and sharing her understanding of it with the other, who had also read the text before each class meeting. To these students, partner reading before class was effective to understand many new specific-discipline concepts and deal with the amount of reading. Han explained that partner reading before class helped her better understand content and engage in classroom discussions.

I have to do a lot of reading to understand the reading and the teacher [in class]. The first two weeks are too much work. I was tired to do it alone. I asked two classmates to meet before class to do the reading together. They liked the idea, and we started reading together. It was easier to understand the readings before going to class. ... I felt more comfortable in discussion groups. (Interview, September 17, 2018)

This extract shows that partner reading is a collaborative, social practice of constructing meaning. Han reported that she thought of partner reading before class for the first time in her academic experience:

I never thought of it [partner reading before class]. It is useful and I will share it with other friends. (Interview, September 17, 2018)

She also reported that she would not have to ask in class about terms that she could not understand on her own. For instance, in Class 4, Han asked a classmate who uses English as a native language:

What is native speaker fallacy? (Fieldnotes, September 25, 2018).

Han believed that instead of asking what concepts mean in class, she would use class time to contribute to the discussions and learn the big picture. Han reported:

I still remember. In the first class the teacher said, it’s more important to read for the big picture and not read line by line or word by word. Reading with my partners before class helped to get the big picture and not just focus on what each concept means. ... I was able to discuss the big picture. (Interview, December 1, 2018).

Han seemed to remember the instructor’s advice on academic reading. In the first class and as part of introducing the course requirements, the instructor presented a slide on academic reading that reads “Never read word by word. Try to get a big picture.” While presenting the slide, the instructor stated:

It takes time to get this kind of reading. But, technically, I do not want you to spend too much time on each reading. Try to see the big picture of what each reading tries to talk about. (Fieldnotes, September 4, 2018)

One of the classmates Han asked is Mai, who also realized the role of reading as being a requirement in graduate school. As Mai noted:

It's ... an assignment because professor asks us to read before class. There's a grade for it [reading], so we have to read before [class] to participate in the discussions. (Interview, September 17, 2018)

This extract demonstrates academic reading as a practice embedded in relations of power. Specifically, Mai's phrase "have to read" suggests that reading before class is a requirement of a graduate course imposed on students, leaving students with little choice but to read. However, students' mention of the purpose of reading, to "participate in the discussions," exemplifies their understanding of the value of reading before class. Mai further reported:

Once a friend of mine told me about reading with her before class, I liked the idea. Instead of reading alone, reading with my friends is useful. ... It's difficult to do a lot of reading that has a lot of new information. I will sometimes, if the reading material is too difficult, collaborate with some of my classmates, like I will read one chapter and she can read another chapter and we explain and ask questions about the reading with each other. ... We learn a lot when we read together. (Interview, September 17, 2018)

Even though each focal student reported that individually they had done reading before class, they felt it was hard to understand many new concepts that appeared in the assigned readings, and thus it was hard to participate in classroom discussions. Kate reported:

In the first three weeks I felt I did not know how to read and prepare for class. Too many words and concepts. I never heard of these concepts before. So far, we learned many [concepts]: crosslinguistic influences, critical period hypothesis. I did not really understand these terms on my own. I had to ask my classmates about many words and theories. ... So it's just better to read with them outside the class and before we go to class. ... I felt better that way and I can focus on sharing ideas instead of just asking about terms. (Interview, September 17, 2018)

In addition to these terms, the instructor in Class 2 introduced the following theories and concepts: Behaviorism, nativism, cognitivism, constructivism, socio-culturalism, feminist poststructuralism, dialogism, universal grammar, interaction hypothesis, comprehensible input, and pushed output hypothesis (Fieldnotes, September 11, 2018).

The nature of the class being a theory-focused course in the TESOL master's program created an opportunity for student agency. That is, the three focal students generated reading with partners before class to increase their understanding of many theoretical concepts, which in turn encouraged classroom participation in both whole group and small group discussions. While research on international students' classroom participation in seminar-like classrooms attributed student's willingness to talk to cultural reasons, personal confidence levels, and language competence (e.g., Hsu & Huang, 2017; Lu & Hsu, 2008), this study further revealed that doing and understanding the assigned readings plays an important role in building international students' confidence when participating in class.

Here, reading with a partner before class increased students' understanding of the assigned readings, and thus increased their classroom participation. The three focal students' decision to engage in partner reading before class shows their active participation in reading. The syllabus and the instructor did not explicitly or implicitly require students to do the readings alone. Rather, the focal students generated this strategy to make meaning and succeed in a social structure. Their beliefs and the action of partner reading before class manifest students' potential to contest the existing, dominant academic practices (Collins, 1993; Lea & Street, 2006) such as large amount of reading in a graduate school.

Reading with a partner before class is indeed a novel strategy in that the students did not use it before taking this class. Research (e.g., Hirano, 2015; Singh, 2015) has documented that EAL graduate and undergraduate students engaged in partner reading, but during class as a pedagogical activity organized by the instructor. In this study, the participants engaged in partner reading outside of the classroom without a recommendation from the instructor. Han initiated the invitation to Mai and another classmate to join her ‘reading partner’ groups. Kate also knew about partner reading before class from Han and Mai; however, she asked other classmates to join her because of a time conflict.

Re-reading after class

Re-reading seems to be a common practice among international students, as reported in the research literature (e.g., Kuzborska, 2015; Singh 2015). Students may re-read if they initially encounter words, phrases, sentences, or paragraphs that are difficult or unclear. Student will also re-read to complete an assignment about the reading (i.e., read to write) (Altalouli, 2021; Hirvela, 2016). In this study, all focal students re-read some assigned readings to use in their written assignments. For example, in the bilingual interview paper students had to make connections between the interviewee’s experience and one or more theories of second language learning. To produce this assignment, students drew on the assigned readings and the transcript of the interview they conducted.

Students were selective about whom to interview, which quotes to include from the transcript, and which theories to use to explain the interviewee’s language learning experience. Interestingly, all of the focal students used the article, “*Code switching*” in *sociocultural linguistics* by Chad Nilep (2006), an assigned reading in Week 2 (September 11, 2018), while the interview paper draft for peer review was due in Week 6 (October 9, 2018) and the final paper was due in Week 7 (October 16, 2018). Each of these students did not simply remember an idea from Nilep to paraphrase in their paper; in fact, they used a quote from Nilep to connect to their interviewees’ experience with code switching. For instance, Han wrote:

Code-switching, as widely discussed term in linguistics, also attracts my attention in this interview. Nilep (2006) stated that “Code-switching is defined as the practice of selecting or altering linguistic elements so as to contextualize talk in interaction. Speakers use communicative codes in their attempts to communicate with other language users. Listeners use their own codes to make sense of the communicative contributions of this those they interact with” (Nilep 2006). (Interview paper, 10/16, 2018)

Sally also wrote:

I would like to introduce one interesting episode of her [the interviewee] which is related to code switching. ... “Individuals remember and can call on part experience of discourse. These memories from part of a language user’s understanding of discourse functions. Therefore, within a particular setting certain forms may come to recur frequently” (Nilep, 2016: 17). Interview paper, 10/16, 2018)

In addition, each of the focal students re-read other assigned readings to complete the reading journal entries. Students were asked to produce five reading journals in which they summarized an idea(s) discussed in one of the assigned readings and related these ideas to one

another and/or to their experiences. To write this assignment, students needed to summarize, synthesize, and cite at least one source. Like in the interview paper, the focal students made different decisions about reading to produce their reading journals. For example, Coco used the article, *Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching* by Vivian Cook (1999), an assigned reading during Week 4 (September 25, 2018) to write her journal entry submitted in Week 6 (October, 9, 2018). The extracts above and the choices students made to write different assignments show that the focal students were agentive in which readings to do and extracts to use in their writing.

Moreover, five of the focal students (Sally, Carol, Coco, Kate, and Mai) voluntarily re-read texts after class meetings in order to deepen their understanding of content by reviewing the main ideas and key concepts discussed during class. They reported re-reading either because they had not been sure about what to focus on when reading before class or to fill in gaps in their knowledge of the content. For example, Sally explained the importance of re-reading after class:

Everything I learn here is new and I don't know what to focus before class. So I just try to find the key words in reading assignments before class. ... Post-class reading is very important to understand what the readings talk about. ... After the class I understand some ideas and then I go back to read the assignment. I don't read specifically of course, I just read a little bit or only read important sentence that teacher discusses and writes in the classroom. (Interview, December 1, 2018)

Sally's re-reading after class focused on what was covered during class, in order to "understand what the readings talk about." The syllabus or the instructor did not require the students to read after class. However, most of the focal students felt it was important to re-read some text in the assigned readings after class to reinforce their understanding.

Similarly, Carol wanted to build her background knowledge by re-reading the assigned readings. She explained her awareness of the gap between her undergraduate and graduate disciplinary knowledge:

I always think of my major. My undergraduate major is translation. I have a gap, [a] knowledge gap—there's so much knowledge about language acquisition I don't know. So, I want to fix the gap; so, I want to read more and learn more before and after class. (Interview, September 17, 2018)

Carol emphasized reading before class and re-reading after class as key strategies for building disciplinary knowledge. Similarly, in Singh (2015), EAL graduate students re-read texts two and three times to better understand the content. In Plakans' (2009) study, six graduate students in a U.S. university re-read certain words while trying to understand the texts. The only study that found that some students re-reading after class to make better sense of the texts is Hirano (2015), a strategy was suggested by the participants' instructor rather than being self-generated. However, in my study, most participants self-generated this strategy to deepen their content knowledge that would help in completing written assignments. As Coco put it:

Yesterday, we had to read about the sociocultural view of language, identity and agency. I did the reading before class. I took notes about the reading, but it was not easy to understand all about these new theories. The class discussions helped me understand what these theories mean. ... In class I also took notes about these theories. After class

[Class 3], I read them again to better understand them and because I wanted to write about them in my first reading journal. (Interview, September 19, 2018)

Coco could use her class notes she took before and during class to write her first reading journal (see the Syllabus for reading journal requirements in Appendix). Like other students, however, she decided to re-read some text about the new theories to better understand and write about them. Like reading with partners before class, re-reading texts after class becomes a purposeful strategy that can be more important in one situation than in another. Without a recommendation from the instructor, the focal students exhibited creative agency through developing new reading strategies that achieved their goals including participating in classroom discussions and completing written assignments.

In effect, these novel strategies helped the focal students to participate in classroom discussions (reading to speak), complete their written assignments (reading to write), and improve meaning making (reading to learn). Overall, these strategies yielded success for the focal students in the graduate course, as they all passed with grades of A, substantiating the role of student agency in reading and learning. The focal students may transfer these strategies to other contexts that have similar expectations to the graduate course under study. Indeed, these strategies have become part of accumulation of knowledge (e.g., capital) (Bourdieu, 1984) that can be transferred from one field to another (Curry, 2007).

CONCLUSION

This study has presented novel reading strategies that the participating students found useful in their making meaning process. Indeed, students found reading with partners before class and re-reading texts after class to be useful strategies, which contributed to their engagement in class and success in the graduate course. These novel strategies are generated by the focal participants, and thus show students as creative agents within the social structure of the graduate course. To exert agency, students recognized the course requirements mediated by the instructor, engaged in individual purposive practices, and ultimately achieved their goals. That is, students are agentive in their reading (van Pletzen, 2006) in that they can exert control in multiple ways and understand the consequences of their actions.

Findings of this study may be useful for faculty members to broaden their understanding of the academic English experiences of international EAL students in English-speaking universities. It is important for faculty members to be aware of some reading issues that EAL students may experience including the amount of reading they must do. Instructors and researchers should speak openly about the value of academic reading, as the instructor of the graduate course in this study did in the first-class meeting. Instructors can verbally refer to reading expectations and strategies when they introduce the syllabus in class and may include effective reading strategies in their syllabi.

Because this course focused on theories of second language acquisition, the assigned readings may have been more challenging than are readings in other courses. Thus, future studies of the reading practices of EAL students could investigate their experiences of academic reading in more concrete and practice-based courses as well as in other types of theoretically oriented courses. To explore diverse reading practices, future research could involve students from a broader range of cultural and linguistic backgrounds. The inclusion of students using English as

their first language in such a study could also lend a useful comparative dimension to future research.

APPENDIX

The Syllabus (adapted)

Second Language Acquisition and Bilingualism

Fall 2018

Tuesdays 7:35 PM-10:15 PM @ Room 141

Instructor: Sandra

*Office hours by appointment

Course Description

This course provides an introduction and overview to research on second language acquisition and bilingualism. We will examine major theories of bilingualism and second language acquisition (SLA) as well as the developmental stages and individual differences among language learners.

Course Objectives

- *To develop an understanding of the factors that affect second language acquisition*
- To become familiar with current thought in second and foreign language pedagogy, cross-cultural issues in language education, and how second/foreign language classrooms operate
- To become a critical consumer of research and instructional ideas, and to be able to independently evaluate and apply ideas from research and practice them in your own classroom.

Required text:

Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding second language acquisition*. London: Hodder & Stoughton. ISBN: 978-0-340-90559-3

Other course readings available to download/print on Blackboard.

Recommended text (we will NOT use this book in class, but it will be helpful for you):

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned* (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Course requirements

This course is a graduate seminar. In addition to the timely completion of assignments, class attendance, preparation, and participation are essential to the course and will constitute **15%** of your grade. Missing **more than two classes** and/or being consistently late to class will result in a reduction of these points. Students who foresee unavoidable conflicts should discuss these with the instructor prior to their occurrence to minimize or avoid penalties. Listed below are all of the course requirements and relative percentages in terms of the total grade:

- Class attendance, preparation, and participation **15%**
- Reading journals **10%**
- Leading discussions of an assigned article **20%**
- Interview of bilingual adult **20%**

- Final paper: Literature Review on a SLA topic **35%**

2

GRADING

The following grading scheme is used for this course:

A: 95-100; **A-:** 90-94; **B+:** 87-89; **B:** 84-86; **B-:** 81-83; **C:** 71-80; **E:** ≤70

For all assignments, if your grade is lower than 95% of possible points for a particular assignment, you have the option to revise your assignment up to two weeks after getting it back (final assignment revisions are not guaranteed and will be negotiated individually).

Late assignments will receive a **20% point deduction** for each day late, unless an extension is arranged and granted **before** the due date.

Writing counts! All written assignments should be typed, double-spaced, with page numbers, your name, course number, my name, a title **and** an indication of the assignment (e.g., *Bilingual Speaker Interview*). Longer assignments should include a cover page with this information on it. Please **spell check and proofread** your work and follow **APA Style Manual format**:

see American Psychological Association (APA) Publication Manual:

<http://www.apastyle.org/apa-style-help.aspx>

Purdue OWL has great APA formatting resources:

<https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>

Also take advantage of the Graduate School's Writing Support Services free workshops and consulting services.

ASSIGNMENTS

Reading journals (10%): Brief (1 double-spaced page) commentary about the readings for five classes, submitted via Blackboard (BB). Please **do not merely summarize the readings**; use this journal as a critical synthesis task—what issues, topics, questions arise? You can use the journal to relate issues in the readings to other things you have read, your own experiences and views.

[Important] You will submit a total of 5 journals for the semester. A reading journal is not expected for a class in which you lead discussion of a reading.

Leading a discussion of reading (20%): A link to an online sign-up sheet will be available on the day of the first class for each student to select an article on which to **lead a class discussion**. (Articles for discussion leading are **highlighted in yellow** in course calendar.) These presentations will include planning and conducting two types of activities: 1) a **brief summary** of the article, including discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the article, how the article relates to the other readings for that evening, and what additional information and questions the article might raise, and, 2) an **activity that engages the class** in processing or applying information from the reading. This second part might, for example, include questions for further discussion between partners or in small groups followed by whole group sharing. You are encouraged to use handouts, technology, and/or other visual supports for this assignment.

3

Interview of bilingual speaker (20%: Due 10/16): You will conduct an in-depth interview with an adult second language learner of your choice and then write up the contents of the interview as a narrative. Please find an interviewee who is from a different cultural background than yourself so that you may learn from another perspective. (Detailed instructions available in BB)

Final Research Paper (35%: Due 12/11): To further your learning for this course, you will select a topic of interest within the field of second language acquisition and bilingualism to research and write about in a final paper. Interim assignments include submitting an annotated bibliography of a selected number of your sources, outline of the paper, one-page proposal, and participating in a peer review of drafts. (Interim assignments and detailed instructions available in BB)

CLASSROOM COMMUNITY

The Graduate School of Education and Human Development is dedicated to fostering a learning community that represents and builds on the rich diversity of human experiences, backgrounds, cultures, histories, ideas, and ways of living. Consistent with our dedication to education that can transform lives and make the world more just and humane, we recruit, support and learn with and from students, staff, and faculty from the broadest spectrum of human diversity. Likewise, we seek the same through our interactions with the broader local and global community. See the statements on diversity from the Graduate School and University's websites.

It is expected that class meetings are supportive environments. A fundamental part of class work is committing ourselves to fostering an inclusive, anti-oppressive environment where each person takes responsibility for her/his language, actions and interactions. In this course, an anti-oppressive environment means that we work against language, actions, interactions and ideologies that hurt people, whether intentionally or unintentionally. It is important that we listen to each other about how our words and actions are affecting one another and that we talk about a class moment in which something may feel hurtful. The instructor views these skills as essential to good teaching and not simply professional courtesies. This course is an opportunity to practice these social justice skills in our social interactions and academic work.

Actions deemed by the instructor as detrimental to the development of a supportive environment will be addressed first by a meeting between the instructor and student(s) at the earliest convenience of all parties. If these actions continue after the meeting and are deemed disruptive to the social or academic progress of the class, the instructor may seek additional meetings with the individual, which may involve other parties as needed to resolve the situation. Continued detrimental actions may result in consequences for a student's academic standing.

Academic Honesty

It is expected that all work turned in for this course will be original and not submitted to other courses without the permission of both instructors. Preparing original work includes submitting work expressly created for the assignments of the course and properly citing sources even when

text is paraphrased. Additional information about the university's academic honesty policy can be found at the University's website, or by contacting the Associate Dean's office. Suspected cases of academic dishonesty will be investigated and penalties will result if work is deemed to be plagiarized (including self-plagiarism).

Please note: The instructor may make changes to the syllabus as the course proceeds. If changes are necessary, they will be announced in class and in Blackboard.

COURSE CALENDAR FALL 2018

Date	Topics	Assignments due for class
9/4	Class 1: Introduction to course Reading Assignments	Sign-up for discussion leading (BB-after class)
	Readings (Total of 1): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ortega: Ch. 1 Introduction (PDF attached in BB) 	
9/11	Class 2: Social contexts of bilingualism Gender and bilingualism Language attitudes and code switching	Identify bilingual respondent for interview (BB-before the class) Post a one paragraph (3-4 sentences) description of a (tentative) person you plan to interview Journal entry (BB)
	Readings (Total of 4): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ortega: Ch. 4 The linguistic environment (PDF attached in BB) ▪ Chernela, J. M. (2004). The politics of language acquisition: Language learning as social modeling in the northwest Amazon. <i>Women and Language</i>, 27(1), 13-21. ▪ Nilep, C. (2006). "Code switching" in sociocultural linguistics. <i>Colorado Research in Linguistics</i>, 19, 1-22. ▪ Pavlenko, A. (2001) Bilingualism, gender, and ideology. <i>International Journal of Bilingualism</i>, 5(2), 117-151. 	
9/18	Class 3: Second language learning Cross-linguistic influences Sociocultural and Contextual factors Identity & Agency	Journal entry (BB)
	Readings (Total of 3): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ortega: Ch. 3 Crosslinguistic influences ▪ Swain, M. & Deters, P. (2007). "New" mainstream SLA theory: Expanded and enriched. <i>Modern Language Journal</i>, 91(5), 820-836. Discussion leader: _____ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jones, R. (2001). A consciousness-raising approach to the teaching of conversational storytelling skills. <i>ELT Journal</i>, 55(2), 155-63. 	

	<i>Discussion leader:</i> _____	
9/25	<p><i>Class 4:</i> Multicompetence Communities of Practice in Language Education Myths of language learning/teaching</p> <p>In-class activity: Mind map activity In-class: Topic proposal</p>	<p>Research Paper Topic due (BB – after class) Prepare brief introduction of your (tentative) research paper topic (3-5 sentences).</p> <p>Post your in-class mind map activity (BB-after class)</p> <p>Journal entry (BB)</p>
	<p><i>Readings (Total of 4):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ball, D. L., Thames, M. H., & Phelps, G. (2008). Content knowledge for teaching: What makes it special? <i>Journal of Teacher Education</i>, 59(5), 389-407. ▪ Fraga-Cañadas, C. P. (2011). Building communities of practice for foreign language teachers. <i>The Modern Language Journal</i>, 95(2), 296-300. ▪ Wong Fillmore, L. & Snow, C. (2000). What teachers need to know about language. ERIC Clearinghouse on Language and Linguistics Special Report. ▪ Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. <i>TESOL Quarterly</i> 33(2), 185-209. <p>Discussion leader: _____</p>	
10/2	<p><i>Class 5:</i> Age Development of learner language Output hypothesis</p> <p><i>Eileen Daly-Boas from Library visits (Subject to change)</i></p>	<p>Journal entry (BB)</p>
	<p><i>Readings (Total of 3):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ortega: Ch. 2 Age ▪ Ortega: Ch. 6 Development of learner language ▪ Swain, M. (2005). <i>The output hypothesis: Theory and research</i>. In E. Hinkel (ed.), <i>Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning</i> (pp. 471-484). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 	

10/9	<p><i>Class 6:</i> Affect Individual Differences</p> <p>In-class activity: Peer review In-class activity: Annotated bibliography</p>	<p>Bilingual Speaker Interview Draft for peer review (Print only) (Please bring 2 copies to class)</p> <p>Post your in-class annotated bibliography activity (BB-after class)</p> <p>Journal entry (BB)</p>
<p><i>Readings (Total of 4):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ortega: Ch. 9 Affect and other individual differences ▪ Wong Fillmore, L. (1979). Individual differences in second language acquisition. In L. Wong Fillmore et al. (Eds.), <i>Individual differences in language ability and language behavior</i>. NY: Academic Press. ▪ Dörnyei, Z. (2009). Individual differences: Interplay of learner characteristics and learning environment. <i>Language Learning</i>, 59(S1), 230-248. Discussion leader: _____ ▪ Beebe, L. M. (1983). Risk-taking and the language learner. In H. W. Seliger & M. H. Long (Eds.), <i>Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition</i> (pp. 39-66). Rowley, MA: Newbury House. Discussion leader: _____ 		
10/16	<p><i>Class 7:</i> Foreign language aptitude</p> <p><i>Peer review of Bilingual Speaker Interview</i></p>	<p>Bilingual Interview Paper Due (BB+Print) Print/bring it to class</p> <p>Journal entry (BB)</p>
<p><i>Readings (Total of 4):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ortega Ch. 7 Foreign language aptitude ▪ Hakuta, K., Y. Butler, & D. Witt (2000). How long does it take English learners to attain proficiency. The University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute Policy Report. http://repositories.cdlib.org/lmri/pr/hakuta ▪ <i>Rossell, C. H. (2000). Different questions, different answers: A critique of the Hakuta, Butler, and Witt report "how long does it take English learners to attain proficiency?"</i> Read Perspectives, 3, 134-154. ▪ Olmedo, I. (2003). Language mediation among emergent bilingual children. <i>Linguistics and Education</i> 14(2), 143–162. Discussion leader: _____ 		
10/23	<i>Class 8:</i>	Proposal Peer review (Print only)

	Classroom language learning: BICS & CALP Code Switching in the classroom Academic language/vocabulary Attention to error/feedback	Print/bring 1 copy to class Journal entry (BB)
	<p><i>Readings (Total of 3):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cummins, J. (1984). Wanted: A theoretical framework for relating language proficiency to academic achievement among bilingual students. In C. Rivera (Ed.) <i>Language proficiency and academic achievement</i> (pp. 1-19). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters. ▪ Liebscher, G. & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2005). Learner code-switching in the content-based foreign language classroom. <i>Modern Language Journal</i>, 89, 234-247. <p>Discussion leader: _____</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lyster, R., & Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. <i>Studies in Second Language Acquisition</i>, 28(2), 269-300. <p>Discussion leader: _____</p>	
10/30	<i>Class 9:</i> Social context of language learning Culture and second language learning	Proposal Submission (BB + Print) Print/bring 1 copy to class Journal entry (BB)
11/6	<p><i>Class 10:</i> Bilingual education</p> <p>Journal entry (BB)</p> <p><i>Readings (Total of 4):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Norton, B. (2000). Investment, acculturation, and language loss. In S. McKay & S. L. C. Wong (Eds.). <i>New immigrants in the United States: Readings for second language educators</i> (pp. 443-461). New York: Cambridge University Press. ▪ García, O. (2009). <i>Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective</i>. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell ▪ Freeman, R.D. (1998). Societal discourses surrounding bilingual education in the United States: A historical perspective, in <i>Bilingual education and social change</i>. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters. 	

	<p>Discussion leader: _____</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cummins, J. (2000). Beyond adversarial discourse: Searching for common ground in the education of bilingual students. In C. J. Ovando & P. McLaren (Eds.), <i>The politics of multiculturalism and bilingual education</i>. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill. <p>Discussion leader: _____</p>	
11/13	<p>Class 11: Biliteracy Second language reading & writing</p> <p>In-class activity: Final paper outlines</p>	<p>Post your in-class outline activity (BB-after class)</p> <p>Journal entry (BB)</p>
	<p><i>Readings (Total of 2):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cheung, A. & Slavin, R.E. (2005). Effective reading programs for English language learners and other language-minority students. <i>Bilingual Research Journal</i>, 29(2), 241-267. ▪ Rubinstein-Ávila, E. (2007). From the Dominican Republic to Drew High: What counts as literacy for Yanira Lara? <i>Reading Research Quarterly</i>, 42(4), 568-589. <p>Discussion leader: _____</p>	
11/20	<p>Class 12: Motivation (2000)</p>	<p>Journal entry (BB) *Last chance to submit 5 journals</p>
	<p><i>Readings (Total of 3):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ortega Ch. 8 Motivation ▪ Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1994). Motivation, self-confidence, and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. <i>Language Learning</i>, 44(3), 417-448. ▪ Oxford, R. & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. <i>Modern Language Journal</i>, 78(1), 12-28. <p>Discussion leader: _____</p>	
11/27	<p>Class 13: <i>Peer review/Q&A session on Final research paper</i></p> <p>In-class activity: Peer review</p> <p>NO READING</p>	<p>Research Paper Draft (Print only) (Please bring 2 copies to class)</p>

12/4	<p><i>Class 14:</i> Last Class Meeting</p> <p>In-class activity: 3 min. Research Paper Presentations Course evaluations</p>	<p>Research Paper Presentations (In-class) Prepare a 3-minute presentation</p> <p>Final Research Paper Submission Due (BB only) 12/11 (Tue) 11:59 PM Submit via BB</p>
------	--	--

Other Readings of Interest:

- Bae, J. (2007). Development of English skills need not suffer as a result of immersion: Grades 1 and 2 writing assessment in a Korean/English two-way immersion program. *Language Learning*, 57(2), 299-332.
- Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, Y., and Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System* 36(3): 353-371.
- Ferris, D. R. (2004). The grammar correction debate in L2 writing: where are we, and what do we go from here? (And what do we do in the meantime?) *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13:49-62.
- Kagan, S. (1985). Co-op Co-op: A flexible cooperative learning technique. In R. Slavin et al. (Eds.), *Learning to cooperate, cooperating to learn*. NY: Plenum Press.
- Pulido, D. (2007). The relationship between text comprehension and second language incidental vocabulary acquisition: A matter of topic familiarity. *Language Learning*, 57(1), 155-199.
- Ravitch, D. & Macedo, D. (1997). Should bilingual education programs be abandoned? In J.W. Noll (Ed.), *Taking sides: Clashing views on controversial educational issues*. Guilford, CT: Dushkin/McGraw-Hill.

REFERENCES

- Altalouli, M. (2020). More surefire ways to increase the breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge: A response to Shoba Bandi-Rao's "nontraditional students' insight into vocabulary learning in the ESL classroom." *NYS TESOL Journal*, 5(1), 32-33.
- Altalouli, M. (2021). Agency and accountability in the academic reading of international graduate students using English as an additional language. *Journal of International Students*, 11(4), 932-949.
- Altalouli, M., & Curry, M.J. (2023). Integrating awareness of academic reading into teaching writing in an additional language. In H. Mohebbi & Y. Wang (Eds.), *Insights into teaching and learning writing: A practical guide for early career teachers* (pp. 19-32). Castledown.
- Bell, J. (2011). Reading matters: Framing and metacognition with Thai postgraduate students. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 11(2), 102-115.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction. A social critique of the judgement of taste* (R. Nice, Trans). Harvard University Press.
- Collins, J. (1993). Determination and contradiction: An appreciation and critique of the work of Pierre Bourdieu on language and education. In C. Calhoun, E. LiPuma, & M. Postone (Eds.), *Bourdieu: Critical perspectives* (pp. 116–138). University of Chicago Press.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Curry, M.J., He, F., Li, W., Zhang, T., Zuo, Y., Altalouli, M., & Ayeshe, J. (2021). *An A-W of academic literacy: Key concepts and practices for graduate students*. University of Michigan Press.
- Curry, M. J. (2007). A "head start and credit": Analyzing cultural capital on the basic writing/ESOL classroom. In J. Albright & A. Luke (Eds.), *Pierre Bourdieu and literacy education* (pp. 279-298). Routledge.
- Dearden, J., & Macaro, E. (2016). Higher education teachers' attitudes towards English medium instruction: A three-country comparison. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6(3), 455-486.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. Sage.
- Educational Testing Service. (2022a). Comparing scores. ETS TOEFL. <https://www.ets.org/toefl/score-users/scores-admissions/compare>
- Educational Testing Service. (2022b). Understanding your TOEFL iBT scores. <https://www.ets.org/toefl/test-takers/ibt/scores/understanding/>
- Flowerdew, J. (2016). English for specific academic purposes (ESAP) writing. *Writing & Pedagogy*, 8(1), 1-4.
- Green, R. (2022). Reading-to-write. In K. Manarin (Ed.), *Reading across the disciplines* (pp. 123-142). Indiana University Press.
- Griffiths, N. & Davil, Y. C. (2022). Embedding scaffolded reading practices into the first-year university science curriculum. In K. Manarin (Ed.), *Reading across the disciplines* (pp. 143-163). Indiana University Press.
- Hirano, E. (2015). 'I read, I don't understand': Refugees coping with academic reading. *ELT Journal*, 69(2), 178-187.
- Hirvela, A. (2016). *Connecting reading and writing in second language writing instruction* (2nd ed.). University of Michigan Press.

- Hsu, C. F., & Huang, I. (2017). Are international students quiet in class? The influence of teacher confirmation on classroom apprehension and willingness to talk in class. *Journal of International Students*, 7(1), 38-52.
- Karakoç, A. I., Ruegg, R., & Gu, P. (2022). Beyond comprehension: Reading requirements in first-year undergraduate courses. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 55, 101071.
- Kuzborska, I. (2015). Perspective taking in second language academic reading: A longitudinal study of international students' reading practices. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 20, 149-161.
- Lea, M. R., & Street, B.V. (2006). The “academic literacies” model: Theory and applications. *Theory Into Practice*, 45(4), 368-377.
- Lillis, T. M., & Scott, M. (2007). Defining academic literacies research: Issues of epistemology, ideology and strategy. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 5-32.
- Liu, J. (2015). Reading transition in Chinese international students: Through the lens of activity system theory. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 17, 1-11.
- Lu, Y., & Hsu, C-F. (2008). Willingness to communicate in intercultural interactions between Chinese and Americans. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 37, 75-88.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2016). *Designing qualitative research* (6th ed.). Sage.
- McMinn, M. R., Tabor, A., Trihub, B. L., Taylor, L., & Dominguez, A. W. (2009). Reading in graduate school: A survey of doctoral students in clinical psychology. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 3(4), 233-240.
- Plakans, L. (2009). The role of reading strategies in integrated L2 writing tasks. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 8(4), 252-266.
- Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage.
- Singh, M. K. M. (2015). A qualitative perspective of academic reading practices and overcoming strategies used among international graduate students in Malaysia. *Malaysian Journal of Languages and Linguistics*, 4(1), 55-74.
- Stoller, F. L., Anderson, N. J., Grabe, W., & Komiyama, R. (2013). Instructional enhancements to improve students' reading abilities. *English Teaching Forum*, 51(1), 2-11. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1014068.pdf>
- van Pletzen, E. (2006). A body of reading: making ‘visible’ the reading experiences of first-year medical students. In Thesen, L. & van Pletzen, E. (Eds.), *Academic literacy and the language of change* (pp. 104-129). Continuum.

Mahmoud Altalouli teaches graduate-level TESOL courses at State University of New York (SUNY) Brockport. His research interests include reading-writing connection and multilingual students' literacy development. He is a co-author of *An A-W of academic literacy: Key concepts and practices for graduate students* (2021).
Email: maltalouli@brockport.edu