

**Research Article**

## **THE EFFECT OF TEACHERS' BELIEFS ON THEIR INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES: REGARDING TEACHING READING STRATEGIES**

**Abolfath Rouhani Mehr<sup>1</sup>, Seyyed Ali Kazemi<sup>2</sup> and \*Arezoo Omidvari<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of ELT, Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Yasuj, Iran

<sup>2</sup>Department of ELT, Yasuj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Yasuj, Iran

\*Author for Correspondence

### **ABSTRACT**

This study aims, first, to look for those kinds of beliefs that EFL high school teachers hold about reading strategies, then, to find out the effects of teachers' beliefs on their instructional (classroom) practices: regarding teaching reading strategies in EFL setting. The questionnaire is devised by Chuo 2008 and it is based on Likert scales, containing three parts: The importance of reading theories and strategies in reading comprehension, the necessity of reading theories and strategies in teaching practices, and the actual employment of reading theories and strategies in classrooms. 20 EFL high school teachers from different schools participated in this study. The results showed that the teachers emphasized on cognitive strategy, metacognitive strategy, and linguistic knowledge. The data also provided strong evidence that reading theories and strategies in three domains: The importance of reading theories and strategies in reading comprehension, the necessity of reading theories and strategies in teaching practices, and the actual employment of reading theories and strategies in practical classrooms), were correlated with each other and affected teaching in the classroom.

**Keywords:** *Teachers' Beliefs, Instructional Practices, Reading, and Reading Strategies*

### **INTRODUCTION**

It is observed that some of EFL teachers are not aware of their skills and weaknesses in teaching process in order to make such teachers more effective we should help them to address how to improve their practices and become more effective teachers. In fact most EFL teachers in Iran high schools have access to valid theories in teaching reading to students but they don't use such valid theories in practice, this may affect learning process and result in incompleteness in acquisition. However, a good deal of discussion of the relationship between teachers' beliefs and teachers' practices has centered on the higher teacher education. Little attention has been paid at the secondary education level. Regardless of the importance of understanding teachers' beliefs, little research has focused on foreign language reading in education in Iran. EFL teachers come into the class with lots of information they had learned before from other instructors among universities or institutes, and start teaching regardless of those theories and beliefs that they have in their brain box about the subject they are going to teach and this problem absolutely affects learning process. Teachers are not aware of the effects of such beliefs and theories on their teaching practices in the classroom. In addition the ability to teach a subject does not solely depend on what you have learned but on how to put in practices your beliefs and theories as well. Teaching is not merely exposing what you learned before. In fact teachers should take into consideration the importance of their classroom beliefs and theories in teaching and the effectiveness of such beliefs in their real practices in class. In the EFL setting of Iran, reading is somehow ignored in high schools because Iranians high schools students are not expected to read textbooks for different subjects written in English. In order to help them access knowledge and skills, reading instruction on the high school level has become a key factor in cultivating students' achievement. Based on these concerns, the present study tried to investigate the effects of teachers' beliefs on their classroom practices regarding teaching reading strategies to determine whether EFL teachers' beliefs can consciously affect teaching process. There have been a lot of researches, indicating that teachers' beliefs have affected their understanding and ideas that actually in turn affect their classroom activities. Classroom practices have been affected by teachers' beliefs, understanding of teaching materials and learning as well as Harste and Burke (1977) stated, theoretical

## **Research Article**

beliefs of teaching and learning are the cause of making decision about classroom instruction. The goal of teachers, procedures, classroom interaction patterns, materials, students, and the educational place they work in have been affected by these beliefs that teachers bring to the class. In the same way, Richards and Rodgers (2001) announced that, teachers have assumptions in terms of language and language learning and stated that if theoretical aspect is a major determinant of how teachers act during language instruction, then teacher educators can affect classroom practices by ensuring that teachers improve theoretical aspects that is ‘ ‘ reflective of current and pertinent research in the field’’, (Cummins *et al.*, 2004).

However, beliefs also affect training. Studies computing the effect of teacher education on teacher cognition have reported that the anticipated transfer from course input to practice is highly affected by teacher’s old experiences and beliefs (Cabaroğlu and Roberts, 2000; Freeman, 1993; Sendan and Roberts, 1998). That’s why teachers reply and elaborate innovations, in the way which are in relating to their existing beliefs’ practices. Hence, ignoring teachers’ prior experience or knowledge is similarly to hinder the assimilation of the new ideas and practices that teachers are appreciated to adopt. This issue help them to respond on their existing beliefs and behaviors could help them became more effective and help them to be ready to modify their knowledge and work in consistent way which their developing – opinion and research-bases standards. Teachers’ beliefs are necessary component of English acquisition. Teachers’ theories and beliefs represent a rich store of knowledge that can actually cause to make decision about their world and respond to it. Teachers’ beliefs are of different kinds same as personal, professional, instructional, and those which are related to classroom practices, by such beliefs teachers can make decision about what will happen in his/her future life. As Johnson, 1994 stated, such beliefs put teachers in the way they make decision about their future life and their work in the classroom situation. Teachers’ beliefs are related to their values, views of learners, attitudes towards learning and understanding of teacher roles in teaching practices. Hence, being aware of teachers’ beliefs improving both professional preparation and teaching effectiveness (Nespor, 1987).

However, lots of discussions have centered on finding relationship between teachers’ beliefs and teacher practices and these studies have focused on higher education, little attention has been paid to lower level in primary or secondary teacher education. Regardless of the importance of understanding teachers’ beliefs little research has focused on foreign language in Iran.

### **Research Questions and Hypotheses**

The research questions are:

1. Do EFL high school teachers hold any beliefs about reading strategies?
2. Do teachers’ beliefs affect their teaching practices about reading strategies?

### **The null hypotheses of the present study include:**

1. EFL high school teachers don’t hold any beliefs about reading strategies.
2. Teachers’ belief has no effect on their teaching practices about teaching reading strategies.

### **Review of Related Literature**

#### *Teachers’ Beliefs*

Mohamed (2006) stated that Teachers’ beliefs affect not only their teaching, but also filter new input, suggesting significant implications for the implementation of educational innovations and teacher development.

Judson (2006) found an inconsistency between teachers’ professed beliefs about instructional practice and their actual classroom practice. The relationship between teachers’ beliefs and their practices are in some instances far from straightforward.

Al-abdulkareem (2004) investigated Saudi science teachers’ beliefs about science and science teaching, and to determine how Saudi science teachers view pedagogical reform in science, and how do they view change in education. The sample was 329, consisting of 298 science teachers and 31 supervisors. The results showed that although Saudi science teachers presented inquiry – based views about science and teaching science, they do not practice these views in science classes. Chou (2008) conducted a study based on the assumption that teachers are highly influenced by their beliefs. He investigated the beliefs

### **Research Article**

about teaching reading among 42 university instructors. The degree of discrepancies or consistencies between teachers' beliefs and their practical teaching activities was explored. The findings showed that there were no significant differences between the participants' beliefs and their classroom practices.

Shun (2008) examined teachers' beliefs and their relations to instructional methods. 2139 full-time teachers from 40 primary schools in Singapore participated in this study. The results showed that there was not much variance in teachers' beliefs, and the use of instructional method.

Phillips (2009) investigated the beliefs and practices of a novice high school social studies teacher through her first and second years as a classroom teacher. Results of the study indicate that while her beliefs and goals changed little over time, her classroom practices changed and adapted to the school climate and to student needs. This study suggests that, despite the challenges that she encountered, this teacher practiced in ways that were consistent with her beliefs.

The purpose of Bisl *et al.*, (2009) study was to investigate teaching beliefs of social studies teachers in the basic cycle in New York and the extent of the classroom practice of those beliefs. Views of the sample teachers were surveyed about beliefs and constructive classroom practices. Results were compared with the results of individual and group interviews, as well as the observation method of the teachers teaching in the social studies classrooms by supervisors. The study found no proof of the relationship between teachers' beliefs and constructive classroom practices in the social studies through the observation process of teaching in the social studies classrooms. Harcarik (2009) investigates the relationship between fifth-grade teachers' social studies knowledge and beliefs and their relationship to classroom practices. Quantitative data were collected through beliefs and classroom practices survey and 60-item knowledge test covering several fields of knowledge. In order to provide a comprehensive picture of the fifth-grade teachers' knowledge, beliefs, and self-reported classroom practices relating to social studies. The findings of this study indicate that there is a relationship between teachers' beliefs and their self-reported classroom practices in the domains of resources, best practice, time, the and personal interest.

### **Instructional Practices**

Instructional practices are general principles, guidelines, and suggestions for good and effective teaching that are supported by research. It has been demonstrated that quality of instruction is fundamental to student learning. For instance, Wang *et al.*, (1993) showed that classroom management and classroom interactions had effects similar in size to students' cognitive competencies and their home environment. Likewise, when reviewing contemporary research on school effectiveness, Scheerens and Bosker (1997) concluded that characteristics of instruction have a greater effect on student achievement than those of the school environment. However, researchers agree that there is no single, well-defined best way of teaching. The effectiveness of classroom practice is domain-specific as well as goal-specific; it depends on the cultural context and professional traditions.

### **Reading and Reading Strategies**

Discovering the best methods and techniques for achieving fluent reading with adequate comprehension, and identifying what techniques or processes the learners choose to access, is the goal of research in reading strategies. Moreover, the effectiveness of teaching reading strategies has been the subject of over "500 studies in the last twenty five years" and what these studies have concluded is that "strategy instruction improves comprehension (Willingham, 2007).

Research into developing theories of second language reading process has been productive for the past two decades (Everson and Ke, 1997). Kamil (1986) reviews first language models which to varying degrees influence how the second language reading process is conceptualized. He claims that there have been three general orientations of reading models: bottom-up models (text-based, or skills models), top-down models (reader-based or holistic models), and interactive models (balanced models).

The bottom-up model is based on the assumption that "the reader begins the reading process by analyzing the text in small units," and "these units are built into progressively larger units until meaning can be extracted" (Kamil, 1986). As a result, the meaning of any text must be decoded by readers' processing incoming data in which grammatical skills, vocabulary development and syntax structures are highly emphasized.

**Research Article**

In contrast, in top-down processing, readers construct meaning by using general knowledge of the world or of particular text components to predict what comes next in the text. Researchers (i.e., Goodman, 1976) postulate that reading processes are initiated by making guesses about the meaning of the text. As the ongoing decoding process continues, readers decode the text to either verify or modify their guesses. For Goodman (1976), the reading process is a psycholinguist guessing game in which readers rely more on the structure and meaning of language rather than on the graphic information from text.

According to Birjandi *et al.*, (2006), reading is the most important skill of all for most students of English throughout the world, especially in the countries that foreign language learners have not the opportunity to interact with native speakers but have access to the written form of that language. Reading can be considered as a source of information, as pleasurable activity, and as means of extending one's knowledge of the language.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Methodology**

**Participants**

The population here contained young and experienced EFL teachers (with specialties like, TEFL, linguistics, English literature, and English translation) were teaching at high schools. They were selected based on accidental or availability sampling method of selecting participants. There were males, and their age ranged from 28 to 50 years old, and all taught English as foreign language for many years. Their experience was about 4 to 25 years. Vast majority were experienced teachers. There were 20 EFL teachers with different range of degree from B.A. to M.A.

**Table 1: Demographic Information of Participants**

Category	Level	Number	Percent
Gender	Male	20	100
	Female	0	0
Teaching Experience	Less than 2 years	0	0
	2 years less than 4	0	0
	4 years less than 6	2	10
	6 years less than 8	2	10
	8 years less than 10	7	35
	10 years or more	9	45
Degrees of Education	Bachelor	13	65
	Master	7	35
	Ph. D.	0	0
Specialty	TEFL	11	55
	Linguistic	3	15
	Literature	4	20
	Other	2	10
Native Language	Persian	20	100
	English	0	0
	Other	0	0
Approach	Bottom – Up	5	25
	Top – Down	3	15
	Interactive	7	35
	Other	5	25

N = 20

## **Research Article**

### **Instrumentation**

This study utilized the "Teaching Reading Strategies Questionnaire" devised by Chou 2008. It is a five-page questionnaire which includes both close and open-ended questions. The questionnaire adapted Likert Scales 1 to 5, in which 1 indicates the least important or the least agreement on a certain statement, while 5 refers to the most important or strongest agreement of the item. It consists of two parts. Part I: Reading Strategy and Part II: Individual Background. The first part includes three sections; A, B, and C. Section A investigates what teachers believe about the importance of reading strategies in reading comprehension. Section B investigates what teachers believe about the necessity of reading strategies in teaching practices, and Section C investigates the actual employment of reading strategies in teachers' reading classes. Each section contains 20 identical elements that are considered important factors in reading comprehension. The 20 items are classified into six categories of reading strategies. Items 1-3 refer to linguistic knowledge, such as studying vocabulary or grammar. Item 4 is about translation, namely translating English texts into L1. Items 5-8 are related to conceptually-driven basis, such as activating background knowledge or understanding the connections between paragraphs. Items 9-16 concern cognitive strategies, such as guessing, scanning or skimming. Items 17-18 are about metacognitive strategies, such as monitoring learners' reading comprehension. Finally, items 19 and 20 are categorized as aided strategies. Part II, Individual Background, sought some personal information about the respondents.

In addition, an open-ended question was used to provoke teachers' self-reported teaching approach and basic personal information was also included. Moreover class observation was used in order to find better results.

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

### **Analysis**

First, data was analyzed descriptively to understand the construct of teachers' beliefs about reading theories and strategies among high school teachers. Hence, inferential statistics (mean, SD, T-test, and MANOVA to find correlation) was utilized to clarify the effects of teachers' beliefs about reading theories, strategies, on their practices of course, it done by SPSS software version 21. It would be better to say that data in this study was analyzed base on mix method (qualitative and quantitative). Once the results of questionnaire and class observation were out, descriptive analysis of items started. Then inferential statistics of those items were clarified in order to find the effects of teachers' beliefs on their instructional practices.

The data in the present study was analyzed based on mix method. Using both qualitative and quantitative method in the study considered by researcher in a way that descriptive statistics first used to elaborate and then the inferential statistics used to analyze those data. Of course SPSS software tool version 21 was utilized to get the better and complete statistical information about the items in the questionnaire as follows:

- 1- Descriptive statistics: to know about the frequencies, means, and SDs of each items in teachers' beliefs about the importance, necessity, and actual employment of reading strategies in reading comprehension.
- 2- T-test (pair-sample t-test): were computed using the mean scores to compare teachers' beliefs about reading theories and strategies in reading comprehension between the six categories namely linguistic knowledge, translation, conceptually-driven basis, cognitive strategy, meta-cognitive strategy, and aided strategy.

**Research Article**

3- Spearman's rho was computed the correlation between the three parts A, B, and C (importance, necessity, and actual employment of reading strategies in reading comprehension) as well as the six categories of reading theories and strategies in reading comprehension. Furthermore, a MANOVA was conducted to identify any significant differences between independent variables and teachers' beliefs.

**NOISSUCSID DNA STLUSER**

**Results**

**Table 2: Mean, Standard Deviation for Each Item in the Teachers' Beliefs about the Importance of Reading Strategies in Reading Comprehension**

Items	Mean	SD
1. Vocabulary	3.8	.951
2. Grammar	2.35	.745
3. Reading aloud the text	3.05	1.191
4. Translating the text into Persian	2.30	1.031
5. Activating prior or background knowledge about the reading content	3.65	.875
6. Understanding the connection of each paragraph	3.85	.745
7. Understanding the types of the text	3.60	.940
8. Title	3.90	.968
9. Guessing the meaning of words	3.75	.910
10. Scanning	3.75	1.020
11. Skimming	3.75	1.164
12. Finding main idea	3.85	.745
13. Summarizing	3.85	.933
14. Outlining	3.85	.875
15. Retelling the text	3.85	.933
16. Predicting the main idea of the following paragraph	3.75	.910
17. Monitoring reading	3.85	.745
18. Asking question to check comprehension	3.90	.852
19. Using dictionaries	2.40	1.046
20. Using visual support	2.55	.945
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.84</b>	<b>.9262</b>

According to Table 2, the means of 15 out of 20 items (75% of the overall items) were in the high range (mean 3.0-4.0), while 3 items (15% of the overall items) fit the medium range (mean 2.34-3.0). The remaining 1 item (10% of the overall items) was placed in the low range (mean 2.0-2.35). The three most important teaching theories or strategies advocated by the teachers were “title” (Mean 3.90, SD.852), “asking question to check comprehension” (Mean 3.90, SD .852), and “Finding the main idea” (Mean 3.85, SD .745). In addition, the three least important strategies included “Translating the text into Persian”

**Research Article**

(Mean 2.30, SD .1.031), "Grammar" (Mean 2.35, SD .745), and "Using dictionary" (Mean 2.40, SD 1.046).

**Table 3: Mean, Standard Deviation for Each Item in the Teachers' Beliefs about the Necessity of Reading Strategies in Reading Comprehension**

Items	Mean	SD
1. Teaching vocabulary	3.00	.000
2. Teaching grammar		
3. Asking students to Read aloud the text	2.00	.000
4. Translating the text into Persian		
5. Activating prior or background knowledge about the reading content	3.00	.000
6. Teaching the connection of each paragraph	2.00	1.000
7. Teaching the types of the text		
8. Identifying title	3.00	.000
9. Teaching students how to guess the meaning of words		
10. Teaching students how to scan information	3.00	.000
11. Teaching students how to skim the passage	3.00	.000
12. Teaching students how to find main ideas		
13. Teaching students how to summarize	3.00	.000
14. Teaching students how to do outlining		
15. Asking students to retell the text	3.00	.000
16. Asking students to predict the main idea of the following paragraph	3.00	.000
17. Asking students to monitor reading comprehension constantly		
18. Asking question to check comprehension	4.05	.000
19. Teaching students how to use dictionaries		
20. Using visual support	4.00	.000
	3.00	.000
	3.00	.000
	3.00	.000
	3.00	.000
	3.00	.000
	3.00	.000
	4.05	.000
	2.00	1.050
	2.00	1.021
<b>Total</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>0.153</b>

The results showed that the means of 16 out of 20 items (80% of the overall items) were in the high range (mean 3.0-4.50), while 4 items (20% of the overall items) fit the medium range (mean 1.50-2.50). The three most important teaching theories or strategies advocated by the teachers were “Teaching students how to skim the passage” (Mean 4.05, SD.000), “Asking question to check comprehension” (Mean 4.05, SD .000), and “Teaching students how to find the main idea” (Mean 4.00, SD .000). In addition, the four least important strategies included “Translating the text into Persian” (Mean 2.000, SD 1.000), “Teaching

**Research Article**

grammar” (Mean 2.000, SD .000), “Teaching students how to use dictionary” (Mean 2.000, SD 1.050), and “Using visual support” (Mean 2.000, SD 1.021).

**Table 4: Mean, Standard Deviation for Each Item in the Teachers' Beliefs about the Actual Employment of Reading Strategies in Reading Comprehension**

Items	Mean	SD
1. Teaching vocabulary	3.00	1.020
2. Teaching grammar	2.00	1.020
3. Asking students to Read aloud the text	3.00	.000
4. Translating the text into Persian	3.00	.000
5. Activating prior or background knowledge about the reading content	1.00	.000
6. Teaching the connection of each paragraph	4.00	.000
7. Teaching the types of the text	4.00	.000
8. Identifying title	3.00	1.040
9. Teaching students how to guess the meaning of words	3.00	1.000
10. Teaching students how to scan information	4.00	1.020
11. Teaching students how to skim the passage	4.00	.000
12. Teaching students how to find main ideas	4.00	.000
13. Teaching students how to summarize	4.00	.000
14. Teaching students how to do outlining	4.00	.000
15. Asking students to retell the text	4.00	.000
16. Asking students to predict the main idea of the following paragraph	4.00	.000
17. Asking students to monitor reading comprehension constantly	4.00	1.000
18. Asking question to check comprehension	4.00	.000
19. Teaching students how to use dictionaries	4.00	.000
20. Using visual support	4.00	.000
	4.00	.000
	4.00	.000
	2.00	1.040
	2.00	.000
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.35</b>	<b>0.357</b>

The results showed that the means of 16 out of 20 items (80% of the overall items) were in the high range (mean 3.0-4.50), while 3 items (15% of the overall items) fit the medium range (mean 1.50-2.50). The three most important teaching theories or strategies advocated by the teachers were “Numbers from 4 to 18 in the above table” (Mean 3.00-4.00, SD 1.000-1.041). In addition, the four least important strategies included “Translating the text into Persian” (Mean 2.000, SD.000), “Teaching grammar” (Mean 2.000, SD 1.020), “Teaching students how to use dictionary” (Mean 2.000, SD 1.040), and “Using visual support” (Mean 2.000, SD.000).

The result showed in the three tables, there were some items that their means and SDs were near to each other whether at high range or in low. It indicated that participants constructed their beliefs differently among items they faced and it also showed participant's beliefs affected their way of answering to the questions. For example most of them showed their highest interest to answer the items that are related to their cognitive and metacognitive strategies and the lowest interest to the translation, linguistic, and aided



**Research Article**

strategies. Then on the basis of such results the first null hypothesis (EFL teachers don't hold any kind of beliefs about reading strategies) rejected.

**Table 5: Means, Standard deviations for Each Category**

Category	Mean	SD
Part A: Importance of Reading Strategies for Reading Comprehension		
Linguistics Knowledge		
Translation	3.06	.962
Conceptually-driven Basis	2.30	1.031
Cognitive Strategy	3.75	.882
Metacognitive Strategy	3.80	.936
Aided Strategy	3.87	.798
Overall	2.47	.995
Part B: Necessity of Theories/Strategies in Teaching		
Linguistics Knowledge		
Translation	2.66	.000
Conceptually-driven Basis	2.00	1.000
Cognitive Strategy	3.00	.000
Metacognitive Strategy	3.25	.000
Aided Strategy	3.52	.000
Overall	2.00	1.035
Part C: Actual Employment of Theories/Strategies		
Linguistics Knowledge		
Translation	2.67	1.020
Conceptually-driven Basis	1.00	.000
Cognitive Strategy	3.50	.510
Metacognitive Strategy	4.00	.225
Aided Strategy	4.00	.000
Overall	2.00	.520
	2.86	.379

In the present study means and standard deviations of six categories for the three parts, namely the importance of reading theories and strategies in reading comprehension, the necessity of reading theories and strategies in teaching practices, and actual employment of reading theories and strategies in classrooms are presented in table 5. The results showed that the metacognitive strategy category (Mean 3.87, SD. 0.798), was reported the most important category in reading comprehension while the translation category was the least important one (Mean 2.30, SD.1.031). In addition, the importance of reading strategies for reading comprehension (Overall mean 3.20, SD. 0.934) was considered rather the necessity of theories/strategies in teaching (Overall mean 2.74, SD. 0.340) and actual employment of theories /strategies (Overall mean 2.86, SD. 0.379). Then, the first null hypothesis of the study rejected.

In short the six categories' rank order for each part could be elicited from Table 5 as follows:

Part A: The importance of reading strategies for reading comprehension

1. Metacognitive Strategy
2. Cognitive Strategy
3. Conceptually-Driven Basis Strategy
4. Linguistic knowledge
5. Aided Strategy
6. Translation

Part B: Necessity of reading strategies in teaching practices

1. Metacognitive Strategy

**Research Article**

2. Cognitive Strategy
3. Conceptually-Driven Basis Strategy
4. Linguistic knowledge
5. Aided Strategy
6. Translation

Part C: Actual employment of reading strategies in reading classes

1. Cognitive Strategy
2. Metacognitive Strategy
3. Conceptually-Driven Basis Strategy
4. Linguistic knowledge
5. Aided Strategy
6. Translation

T-tests were computed using the mean scores to compare teachers’ beliefs about the importance of reading theories and strategies in reading comprehension between these six categories. An acceptable significance level was deemed to be  $p < .05$ .

Table 6 presents paired sample t-tests for mean differences between these six categories.

**Table 6: Significant Paired Sample T-tests for Category vs. Category**

Pairs	Category	Difference	df	t	Sig.(2-tailed) or p
Pair 1	Linguistic Knowledge – Translation	Linguistic Knowledge > Translation	19	10.000	.000
Pair 2	Linguistic Knowledge - Aided Strategy	Linguistic Knowledge > Aided Strategy	19	5.000	.000
Pair3	Conceptually-driven Basis – Translation	Conceptually-driven Basis > Aided Strategy	19	10.000	.000
Pair4	Conceptually-driven Basis - Aided Strategy	Conceptually-driven Basis > Aided Strategy	19	7.000	.000
Pair5	Cognitive Strategy - Conceptually-driven Basis	Cognitive Strategy > Conceptually-driven Basis	19	2.000	.042
Pair6	Conceptually-driven Basis – Cognitive Strategy	Cognitive Strategy = Metacognitive Strategy	19	1.000	.000
Pair7	Metacognitive Strategy – Cognitive Strategy – Translation	Cognitive Strategy > Translation	19	10.000	.000
Pair8	Cognitive Strategy - Aided Strategy	Cognitive Strategy > Aided Strategy	19	8.000	.000
Pair9	Metacognitive Strategy - Linguistic Knowledge	Metacognitive Strategy > Linguistic Knowledge	19	3.000	.005
Pair10	Metacognitive Strategy – Translation	Metacognitive Strategy > Translation	19	10.000	.000
Pair11	Metacognitive Strategy - Aided Strategy	Metacognitive Strategy > Aided Strategy	19	6.000	.000
Pair12	Conceptually-driven Basis - Linguistic Knowledge	Conceptually-driven Basis > Linguistic Knowledge	19	2.000	.010
Pair13	Cognitive Strategy- Linguistic Knowledge	Cognitive Strategy > Linguistic Knowledge	19	4.000	.000
Pair14	Metacognitive Strategy- Conceptually-driven Basis	Metacognitive Strategy > Conceptually-driven Basis	19	.000	.000
Pair15	Aided Strategy- Translation	Aided Strategy > Translation	19	1.000	.000

**Research Article**

From the analyses of paired sample t-tests, these participants believed linguistics knowledge was significantly more important than translation,  $t(19) = 10.000, p < .0001$  and aided strategy,  $t(19) = 5.00, p < .0001$ . Conceptually-driven basis was significantly more important than translation  $t(19) = 10.000, p < .0001$  and aided strategy,  $t(19) = 7.000, p < .0001$ . Cognitive strategy was significantly more important than translation,  $t(19) = 10.000, p < .0001$ , aided strategy,  $t(19) = 8.000, p < .0001$  and conceptually-driven basis,  $t(19) = 2.000, p = .042$ . Metacognitive strategy was significantly more important than translation,  $t(19) = 10.000, p < .0001$  and aided strategy,  $t(19) = 6.000, p < .0001$ . Finally, aided strategy was believed more important than translation,  $t(19) = 1.000, p < .0001$ . Participants also believed that they employed metacognitive, cognitive, and linguistic knowledge significantly more than conceptually-driven basis, aided strategy, and translation and reported that such categories affect their practices in the classroom. It concluded that when they used such beliefs they acted more effectively in the classrooms.

In summary, the rank orders for these six categories could be identified as:

cognitive strategy, metacognitive strategy, linguistics knowledge, conceptually-driven basis, aided strategy, and translation. In other words, the participants believed that cognitive strategy, metacognitive strategy, and linguistics knowledge were the most important strategies in reading comprehension. Cognitive strategy in turn is significantly more important than conceptually-driven basis. Finally, aided strategy and translation are the least important strategies in reading comprehension.

**Table 7: Correlations between the Three Parts of Reading Theories and Strategies**

	Importance	Necessity	Employment
Importance of Theories /Strategy	1.000*	.586	.643*
Necessity of Theories/Strategies in Teaching	.586*	1.000	.768
Actual Employment of Theories/Strategies	.643	.768	1.000

\*Correlations are significant at the .05 level (1-tailed).

Spearman’s rho was computed to investigate the correlation between the three parts as well as the six categories of reading theories and strategies. The data kept proof that the three parts(A, B, and C), the importance of reading strategies in reading comprehension, the necessity of reading strategies in teaching practices, and actual employment of reading strategies in practical classrooms, correlated with each other (see Table 4-6). The positive correlation indicated that the degree of importance of each part increased as its counterpart similarly did. Hence, as the results of tables 6 and 7 showed, the second null hypothesis rejected.

**Table 8: Correlation between the Categories of Reading Strategies**

Category	Ling A	Concept A	Cog A	Meta-cog A	Aided A
Ling B			--		
Ling C			--		
Concept B			--		
Concept C			--		
Cog B			.0627*		
Cog C			0.198*		
Meta-cog B			--		
Meta-cog C			--		
Aided B			--		
Aided C			--		*

\*Correlations are significant at the 0.05 and 0.01 level (1-tailed)

## **Research Article**

+A, B & C refer to Part A: the importance of reading theories and strategies in reading comprehension, Part B: the necessity of reading theories and strategies in teaching practices, and Part C: actual employment of reading theories and strategies in practical classrooms.

Furthermore, a MANOVA was conducted to identify any significant differences between independent variables and teachers' beliefs. Table 8 summarizes the MANOVA results, focusing on the significant level at .05.

### **Discussion, Conclusion and implications**

#### **Discussion**

There have been studies into the relationship between teachers' beliefs and their instructional practices. Different aspects of beliefs and practices have been investigated. Most of studies indicated that the results are in approval to the results of current study. They believed there were positive and strong relationship between teachers' beliefs and their instructional practices. Furthermore, researchers proved teachers' beliefs affect their practices in the classroom (Garden, 1996; Mohamed, 2006; Chou, 2008; Kuzborska, 2011).

Findings of the study are like the findings of Garden's (1996), Chou's (2008), Mohameds' (2006), and Kuzborska (2011) studies. Garden (1996) studied six secondary teachers of French and Spanish in the USA and found generally a consistent relationship between teachers' reported beliefs and their observed practices in reading instruction. Chou (2008) also concluded that there were no significant differences between the participants' beliefs and their use of each reading approach. Kuzborska (2011) concluded that, there was a relatively strong relationship between the teachers' beliefs and their classroom practices allows us to assert that this study supports the notion that English teachers teach in accordance with their theoretical beliefs and that differences in theoretical beliefs may result in differences in the nature of literacy instruction (Borg, 2003; Borg, 2006).

Mohamed (2006) stated that Teachers' beliefs affect not only their teaching, but also filter new input, suggesting significant implications for the implementation of educational innovations and teacher development.

The results of this study, however, are unlike the finding of Basturkmen *et al.*, (2004), and Khonamri and Salimis' (2010) study. They found evidence of incongruence between L2 teachers' stated beliefs and their classroom practices related to form-focused instruction.

#### **Conclusion**

The present study did the effects of teachers' beliefs on their instructional practices. The results indicated that the participants highly believed a wide range of reading strategies were important in reading comprehension. The items were ranged from the high level (75% of the overall items) to the medium level (15% of the overall items). Participants also rated the least item " translating to Persian".

Furthermore, EFL high school teachers believe that metacognitive strategies are the most important strategies in reading comprehension while linguistic category is the least important in reading comprehension. Moreover, metacognitive strategies position in the highest and translation falls in the lowest necessity of teaching in reading classes. These findings are consistent with Chou's findings. Chou (2008) concluded that EFL instructors believed that reading strategies are important in reading comprehension (Mean. 3.59, SD. 0.53) and it is necessary to teach reading strategies in reading classes (Mean. 3.64, SD. 0.53). The results had shown that the instructors emphasized linguistic knowledge, cognitive strategy, and metacognitive strategy category. The result also revealed that the relation between teachers' belief and practices is appropriate relationship. As it was shown in Table 7 there was a positive correlation between teachers' belief about the necessity of reading strategies in teaching practices and their self-reported actual employment of reading strategies or classroom practices. Moreover, there was significant correlation between teachers' beliefs about the importance of reading strategies and their self-reported classroom practices. In addition, participants found that most important teaching beliefs or strategies were all located among these three categories. For example "finding the main idea of the paragraph" belongs to cognitive strategy and "grammar and vocabulary" belong to linguistic knowledge. On the other hand, the strategies, "using visual support," and "using dictionaries" categorized as aided

## **Research Article**

strategy were ranged as least important elements in reading comprehension. To summarize, the focus on cognitive strategy, linguistics knowledge, and metacognitive strategy has delineated the construct of teachers' belief systems among those high schools teachers who participated in this study.

Moreover, the three parts of the beliefs systems (the importance of reading theories and strategies in reading comprehension, the necessity of reading theories and strategies in teaching practices, and actual employment of reading theories and strategies in practical classrooms), were strongly correlated with each other. Furthermore, the study also reveals that the six specific categories (linguistics knowledge, translation, conceptually-driven basis, cognitive strategy, metacognitive strategy and aided strategy) correspond with their counterparts within each of the three parts.

These finding indicated that the teachers' beliefs affect their teaching practices in the classroom. The results have resonated with the factor that the way the instructors practice teaching activities in their reading class depends, to a large extent, on their beliefs about learners, learning and theories (Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992).

The result showed no significant differences between the participants' self-reported effective approach (the bottom-up, top-down or interactive approach), and the beliefs about and the use of each category. A possible explanation for this result may be that the majority of the instructors (35%, 7 out of 20) claimed that they believed the interactive approach was the most effective approach in teaching reading. The high ratio seemed to be the major reason that caused the undifferentiated result.

## **Implications and Limitations**

### *Pedagogical Implications*

The finding of this study offers several pedagogical implications for teaching in EFL context. Some of these implications are presented below.

1. The finding of the current study helped educators to understand classroom facts and explore teachers' beliefs. Teachers can also be certain about the positive process of teaching. When a teacher has become aware of his educational (classroom) beliefs, he can act more appropriately and effectively in the classroom. Teachers understand when and how use knowledge or beliefs that are effective.
2. It has also implication for teacher educators, as it is necessary to figure out and realize how teachers practice in the classroom and how to develop the process to become a excellent teachers.
3. Raising teachers' consciousness about their beliefs about teaching reading and further encourages reflection on how teacher tacit knowledge shapes the way they understand and act upon information in the classroom.
4. It also helped teachers to become aware of their skills and weaknesses in the teaching process. Those teachers that have rich and effective information in terms of teaching and practices but didn't put them in practice can profit and present their beliefs into practice.
5. Finally it causes developing in situation for EFL teachers. Teachers who utilize beliefs and put them into practice can be improved and the educational community looked at him in light of capable and effective teacher.

### *Limitations of the Study*

The findings and implications of this should be viewed in the lights of its limitations:

1. The first limitation that should be mentioned in this study was due to participants in terms of their gender and the sample size. Researcher selected just male teachers in order to moving forward his study and it is not suitable procedure in selecting participants. Moreover the researcher selected 20 participants to try the study out and finding appropriate result. Frankly speaking, the results and findings cannot be generalized to all teachers.
2. Second, this study limited to low level context and the researcher moved forward the study in only one province and only one country. To achieve the applicable results the researcher must try out the study in different context to find better consequences.

### *Suggestion for Further Research*

### **Research Article**

1. Other form of beliefs related to one the researcher studied can be tested for their effects on teaching or other skills such as speaking, listening, and writing skill could be included in research process. Moreover sub-skills such as pronunciation, vocabulary and ... can be tested to find the effects.
2. This research was Gender-based study and the researcher just uses male teachers to run the study. It is need for somebody to go beyond gender-based and selects both male and female teachers to achieve better finding because male and female teachers have different thoughts and notions toward teaching so it is encouraged.
3. Another suggestion is to conduct studies specifically about proficient teachers or instructor at universities separately. Teachers in lower levels of English teaching should be treated differently than those in higher levels. The same strategies cannot have the same results for teachers. Proficient teachers are more knowledgeable than non-proficient teachers so the type of strategies they use are different and classroom beliefs may not be attractive for them. What are of their interest can become topics for further research.

### **REFERENCES**

- Al-Abdulkareem S (2004).** Investigating science teachers' beliefs about science and science teaching. *Struggles in Implementing Science Education, Reform in Saudi Arabia, Ph.D theses Submitted to West Virginia University.*
- Birjandi P, Mosallanejad P and Bagheridoust E (2006).** *Principles of Teaching Foreign Language* (Rahrovan Publication) 210.
- Bisland B, O'Connor E and Malow-Iroff M (2009).** Beliefs and Issues in Social Studies Instructional Practices: A Case Study of Alternatively Certified Elementary Teachers. Paper presented at the College and University Faculty Assembly of the National Council for the Social Studies, Atlanta, GA, November 11.
- Cabaroglu N and Roberts J (2000).** Development in student teachers' pre-existing beliefs during a 1-Year PGCE programme. *System* **28**(3) 387-402.
- Chou YC (2008).** Exploring the reflection of teachers' beliefs about reading theories, strategies on their classroom practices. *Feng Chia Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* **16** 183-216.
- Cummins CL, Cheek EH and Lindsey DJ (2004).** The Relationship between Teachers' Literacy Beliefs and their Instructional Practices: A Brief Review of the Literature for Teacher Educators. *E-Journal of Teaching & Learning in Diverse Settings* **1**(2) 175-188.
- Everson ME and Ke C (1997).** An Inquiry into the Reading Strategies of Intermediate and Advanced Learners of Chinese as a Foreign Language. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association* **32** 1-20.
- Freeman D (1993).** Renaming experience/reconstructing practice: Developing new understandings of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education* **9**(5/6) 485-497.
- Haertel and Warburg HJ (1993).** Toward a Knowledge Base for School Learning. *Review of Educational Research* **63**(3) 249 -294.
- Harcarik M (2009).** Fifth-Grade Teachers' Social Studies Knowledge and Beliefs and their Relationship to Classroom Practices. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. The University of Florida, USA.
- Harste JC and Burke CL (1977).** A new hypothesis for reading teacher research: Both the teaching and learning of reading is theoretically based. In: *Reading: Theory, Research and Practice*, edited by Pearson PD (S.C.: National Reading Conference) Clemson 32-40.
- Kamil ML (1986).** Reading in the Native Language. In: *Listening, Reading, and Writing: Analysis and Application*, edited by Wing BH (VT: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages) Middlebury 71-91.
- Khonamri F and Salimi M (2010).** The interplay between EFL high school teachers' beliefs and their instructional practices regarding reading strategies. *No vitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)* **4**(1) 96-107.

### Research Article

**Kuzborska I (2011).** Links between teachers' beliefs and practices and research on reading. *University of Essex United Kingdom* **23**(1) 102–128.

**Mohamed N (2006).** An exploratory study of the interplay between the teachers' beliefs, instructional practices, and professional development. *Doctor of Philosophy in Language Teaching and Learning, the University of Auckland* 250-570.

**Nespor J (1987).** The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* **19** 317-328.

**Pajares MF (1992).** Teachers beliefs and pedagogical research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Pedagogical Research* **62**(3) 307-332.

**Phillips M (2009).** Beginning teacher beliefs and wise practices: A case study of a high school social studies teacher. Ph.D dissertation, University of Florida.

**Richards JC and Rodgers T (2001).** *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

**Scheerens J and Bosker RJ (1997).** *The Foundations of Educational Effectiveness*, Pergamon, Oxford.

**Sendan F and Roberts J (1998).** Orhan: A case study in the development of a student teacher's personal theories. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice* **4** 229–244.

**Shun L (2008).** Teacher Beliefs and their implications for enhancing instructional practices. *Center for Research in Pedagogy and Practice*, Singapore.

**Willingham TD (2007).** The usefulness of brief instruction in reading comprehension.

## Appendices

### Appendix A: Teaching English Reading Questionnaire

#### (English Version)

##### Directions:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to investigate your beliefs about reading theories and strategies/skills in reading comprehension. There are no right or wrong answers to the statements in the questionnaire. All the answers will be kept confidential and no identity will be disclosed.

This questionnaire consists of two parts.

Part One contains Sections A, B and C. There are 20 items in each section:

**Section A:** investigating what you believe about the importance of reading theories/strategies for reading comprehension.

**Section B:** investigating what you believe about the necessity of reading theories/strategies in teaching practice

**Section C:** investigating actual employment of reading theories/strategies in your reading classroom

Part Two includes 6 questions related to your background information.

#### Part I: Reading Theory/Strategy

##### Section A:

The Importance of Reading Theories/Strategies for Reading Comprehension

How do you rate the importance of the following items according to their role in reading comprehension? Please check the degree of importance of each item for reading comprehension.

1-Not important

2-Less important

3-Somewhat important

4-Very important

5-Extremely important

**Research Article**

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Vocabulary	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Grammar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Reading aloud the text	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Translating the text into Persian	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Prior knowledge or background knowledge about the reading content	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Understanding the connections of each paragraph	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Understanding the types of the text	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Title	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Guessing the meaning of words	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Scanning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Skimming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Finding main idea	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Summarizing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Outlining	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Retelling the text	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Predicting the main idea of the following paragraph	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. Monitoring reading comprehension constantly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. Asking questions to check comprehension	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. Using dictionaries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. Using visual support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Section B:**

The Necessity of Reading Theories/Strategies in Teaching Practices

How do you rate the importance of the following items that should be taught in the reading classes in order to increase students’ reading comprehension? Please check the degree of importance of each item in teaching reading classes.

- 1-Not important
- 2-Less important
- 3-Somewhat important
- 4-Very important
- 5-Extremely important

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Teaching Vocabulary	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Teaching Grammar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Asking students to read the text aloud	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Translating the text into Persian	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Activating prior knowledge or background knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Teaching the connections of each paragraph	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Teaching the types of the text	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Identifying title	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Teaching students how to guess the meaning of words	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Teaching students how to scan information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Teaching students how to skim the passage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Teaching students how to find main idea	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Teaching students how to summarize	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Teaching students how to do outlining	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Asking students to retell the text	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Asking students to predict the main idea of the following paragraph	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. Asking students to monitor reading comprehension constantly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. Asking questions to check comprehension	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. Teaching students how to Using dictionaries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. Using visual support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Section C:**

Actual Employment of Reading Theories/Strategies in Your Reading Classroom

How often do you employ the following activities in your reading classes? Please check the frequency of each item used in your reading classes.



**Research Article**

- 1 Never or Almost Never (i.e., you never or almost never employ this activity in your reading classes)
- 2 Seldom (i.e., if you teach 10 units, you employ this activity in about 2 to 3 units)
- 3 Sometimes (i.e., if you teach 10 units, you employ this activity in about 5 units)
- 4 Usually (i.e., if you teach 10 units, you employ this activity in about 7 to 8 units)
- 5 Always or Almost Always (i.e., you almost always employ this activity in each unit)

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Teaching Vocabulary	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Teaching Grammar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Asking students to read the text aloud	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Translating the text into Persian	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Activating prior knowledge or background knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Teaching the connections of each paragraph	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Teaching the types of the text	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Identifying title	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Teaching students how to guess the meaning of words	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Teaching students how to scan information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Teaching students how to skim the passage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Teaching students how to find main idea	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Teaching students how to summarize	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Teaching students how to do outlining	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Asking students to retell the text	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Asking students to predict the main idea of the following paragraph	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. Asking students to monitor reading comprehension constantly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. Asking questions to check comprehension	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. Teaching students how to Using dictionaries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. Using visual support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Part II: Individual Background**

The questions below are about your personal background. Please answer the following questions or check the proper answers.

1. Gender:  Male  Female
2. Years of Teaching:
  - less than 2 years  2 years - less than 4 years
  - 4 years - less than 6 years.  6 years - less than 8 years
  - 8 years - less than 10 years.  10 or more years
3. Degree of Education:  Bachelor  Master
4. Specialty:
  - TEFL  Linguistics  Literature  Curriculum Design
  - Educational Administration  Other
5. Your Native Language:  Persian  English  Other
6. The most effective reading approach:
  - Bottom-Up (readers begin the reading process by analyzing the text in small units, and these units are built into progressively larger units until meaning can be extracted)
  - Top-Down (readers construct meaning by using general knowledge of the world or of particular text components to predict what comes next in the text)
  - Interactive (interactive models disconfirm the linear order of reading processes from the previous two approaches and postulates reading processes can be in both directions)
  - Other

## **Research Article**

### **Appendix B**

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

T= teacher                      SS= students

#### **LESSON 4**

- A pre-reading activity: T invites SS to discuss ideas about earthquakes before discussing a text entitled “earthquakes and how to survive them” (before you read, lesson 4).
  - o What is the purpose of this activity? Why do you ask SS to discuss ideas about earthquakes first?
- Reading aloud in class:
  - o Why do you ask SS to read the text aloud in class?
- Correction of oral reading mistakes: S mispronounces the word character, T corrects the word.
  - o Why do you correct S’s pronunciation? Do you usually try to correct mispronounced words? Why?
- Paragraph discussion and the clarification of unknown words after reading the paragraph:
  - o Why do you ask SS to retell the text paragraph by paragraph?
  - o Unknown words: why do you ask SS to clarify the meanings of the unknown words after reading each paragraph? In this case, did SS have to read the text in advance at home? Did they have to find out the meanings of these new words before coming to a lesson?
    - Translation of words: ‘T: or "entirely" كاملا "damage" "صدمه" "predict" "پيش بينى
  - o Why do you ask SS to provide the Persian translation of the English words or sentences?