University
of Stavanger

The Faculty of Arts and Education

MASTER THESIS

Study program: MLIMAS - Literacy studies - Master's Degree Programme	Spring term, 2020 Open
Author: Anastasia Amosenkova	…………………………………… (signatur author)

Supervisor: Dina Lialikhova

Title on master thesis: A comparative study of Norwegian and Russian EFL teachers' approaches to teaching English literacy at upper secondary school.

Word of reference: grammar-translation method, communicative approach, genre-pedagogical approach, English in Norway, English in Russia	Pages: 97 + attachment/other: 33 Stavanger, 11th May/2020 　　　　　　date/year

Acknowledgments

First and foremost I wish to thank my supervisor Dina Lialikhova for giving me the opportunity to work on this thesis and her patience and help during the process. I have been motivated by her thoroughness and engagement with the topic. I would also like to thank six teachers who have participated in this project and managed to find their time for interviews in spite of their busy schedules. A special thank to my mother, my father and my sister who provided me with enormous motivation, when I was going through all the complications connected to writing. Finally, I would like to thank my groupmates Olena Yurchenko and Nour Bakkar who were always ready to help and support me throughout the year.

Table of contents

3

Abstract

This study explores the ways Russian and Norwegian upper secondary EFL teachers approach teaching English language literacy. The main aim of the thesis is to investigate differences and similarities between teaching approaches applied to EFL literacy in upper secondary schools of Norway and Russia. The main research question is: 'To what extent do approaches to teaching English language literacy at the upper secondary level in the Norwegian context differ from the Russian context?"

This field of research is young in both Norway and Russia, as there were presented no studies related to the same topic and context. Furthermore, the researcher, based on her own teaching experiences in the two contexts, have noticed that processes of globalisation have influenced the countries differently and a role of the English language is not the same. From this, it may seem that teaching literacy skills, which are among the most important, have been influenced, and revealing the tendencies of teaching them in different contexts can be the cornerstone of further research on the efficiency of applied approaches.

The present research is a qualitative study based on semi-structured in-depth interviews carried out among six EFL teachers working in upper secondary school, three in each context. The findings revealed that there could be traced both similarities and differences between the approaches to teaching EFL literacy in two different contexts. On the one hand, the Norwegian participants applied communicative process-oriented approach to teaching EFL writing, while the Russian participants tended to use the product-oriented grammar-translation method. The genre-pedagogical approach was common for both contexts.

The practice of teaching EFL reading was aimed at the development of intensive reading skills, work with different types of texts and involving pre-, while- and post-reading activities with implicit vocabulary learning. EFL literacy within the exam preparation was treated differently in Norway and Russia. While the Russian EFL teachers found significant teaching all the EFL literacy elements, the Norwegian participants had various opinions concerning the importance of developing reading or writing skills during the preparatory sessions. They demonstrate freedom to choose whether they put effort into writing or focus more on reading.

Despite the above-mentioned differences, both in Norway and Russia there were positive attitudes towards the implementation of digital tools into the EFL educational process, literacy teaching in particular. In addition to it, the interviews revealed that the projector was the most available educational tool in both contexts.

The results of this study imply that there still exist differences in teaching English literacy in the two countries with unsimilar relations and attitudes towards the English language. This study is among few comparative studies about teaching practice in Norway and Russia. It contributes to the field of linguistics and is the unique work, which provides an in-depth overview of the way upper secondary teachers approach teaching EFL literacy in different countries, particularly: Norway and Russia. This thesis can be a basis for further ideas and studies, for instance, a research in the ways Norwegian and Russian teachers approach teaching EFL oral skills. This master thesis cannot be claimed as the absolutely solid axiom. Readers can both agree and disagree with its results, but in spite of that, this thesis is a move towards studying and comparing English language teaching approaches in Norway and Russia.

1 Introduction

1.1 The present study: topic and aims

This thesis investigates practices of teaching English language literacy at upper secondary schools in the Norwegian and Russian contexts. This is a qualitative study, which is based on in-depth interviews with 6 English language teachers. The interviews focused on the following main topics: teachers' background, teaching reading skills, teaching writing skills and teaching literacy during the exam preparation.

In this study, the definition of literacy is the cornerstone that determines the scope of the research. McMillan, Oxford and Collins online dictionaries (accessed 05 May 2020) define literacy as the *'ability to read and write'*. Holbrook (1961:22) mentioned literacy as 'the practical aims' of the language. In his opinion, it was significant to use the English language practically, enrich knowledge with the cultural inheritage and feel the 'pleasure of the organised word in writing' (Holbrook 1961:23). The importance of the English language literacy in the modern world can be explained by the active processes of globalization. According to the research report by Cambridge Assessment, literacy nowadays is not the combination of static skills, but rather the actional use of them (Cambridge Assessment 2013).

The main aim of this research is to investigate possible differences and similarities between the approaches to teach English literacy in Norwegian and Russian upper secondary schools. To do so, six upper secondary teachers, namely three from Norway and three from Russia were interviewed.

1.2 Background

English as a lingua franca is rapidly expanding education systems all over the world. Being a native or a non-native language speaker can be a criterion for evaluating the chance to get the position as a teacher of English a foreign language (Clark and Paran 2007).

Both Norway and Russia have long history of teaching English as the foreign language. This tendency came to Russia after World War II and replaced French and German. At the beginning of 21st century there was a shift from teaching the structure of the language to its

use within the process of communication (Ter-Minasova 2005). Moreover, nowadays English as the foreign language has become compulsory in Russia and the only difference is the grade students start learning it: either 1st or 5th[1]. It is noticeable that teaching foreign languages at state primary and secondary schools is under the governmental control. Thus, study programs and materials have state standard requirements, so that teachers can only enrich the studying process with something more student-oriented if it is approved by school principals. Traditionally, EFL teaching was teacher-oriented. That means complications with a focus on individuality (Ter-Minasova 2005). Besides the traditional grammar-translation approach, which was not practically oriented, the audio-visual approach was introduced. In between many methods were developed, which varied from purposes the English language would be used for (Galskova 2003).

In the Norwegian context, English plays a role of a lingua franca, due to the globalisation processes and increasing number of multilingual and multicultural classrooms. For Norwegian students, English means something more than just a foreign language. In comparison with modern Russian students, the English language for Norwegians is the language they use on a daily basis, both children and adults (Brevik & Rindal 2019). Besides classrooms there is a great impact of mass media and travel experiences that give English a status of lingua franca. According to the Norwegian curriculum, English is an actual necessity for the multilingual and multicultural Norwegian society, the main reason for such dynamics is the open borders for the EU and citizens of some other countries, who move to Norway. Because the Russian Federation have mostly closed borders, classrooms of the state secondary schools, except for private ones, which have their own regulations, cannot be called multilingual. The students are either Russian citizens or immigrants from the post-Soviet countries. Furthermore, in the case of Norwegian schools, teaching is oriented towards class and a single learner (Burns and Richards 2012). In case of the Russian context, the education system also has undergone changes from teacher-oriented to student-oriented approaches (Ter-Minasova 2005).

1.3 Research questions and expectations

---

[1] http://www.minobr.orb.ru

The aim of this research is to investigate to what extent approaches to teaching English language literacy at upper secondary school differ in Norwegian and Russian contexts. The study addresses the following main research question:

To what extent do approaches to teaching English language literacy at the upper secondary level in the Norwegian context differ from the Russian context?

The subquestions are as follows:

1. How do the Norwegian upper secondary school teachers approach teaching EFL reading skills?

2. How do the Norwegian upper secondary school teachers approach teaching EFL writing skills?

3. How do the Russian upper secondary school teachers approach teaching EFL reading skills?

4. How do the Russian upper secondary school teachers approach teaching EFL writing skills?

5. How do teachers in Norwegian and Russian contexts approach teaching EFL reading and writing skills during the final exam preparation?

6. To what extent do teachers in Norwegian and Russian contexts apply IT technologies during EFL literacy teaching?

Based on the overview of previous research and linguistic works presented in Chapter 3, the researcher expects that the process of teaching English language literacy is carried out differently in the two contexts. By analyzing the Norwegian teachers' interviews the researcher expects to obtain results that confirm the expectations.

However, the researcher is curious about whether the data obtained within the Russian context will also corroborate the Norwegian results. Furthermore, the researcher wants to investigate whether the teachers focus on teaching literacy only during the regular lesson planning stage, or this is also significant during preparations for the final English language exams. In addition to it, it will be interesting to find out how they include teaching EFL literacy skills into the exam preparation process.

Concerning the use of IT technologies in the English language classroom, from the personal experience as an English language teacher, the researcher wants to study to what extent they reinforce the process of teaching English language literacy. Due to the fact that the

researcher comes originally from Russia and is familiar with the process of teaching EFL there, it is highly expected that the Norwegian teachers are more active at applying IT technologies to the process of teaching English literacy.

1.4 Outline of the thesis

Following this chapter, Chapter two addresses the background information that defines the status of a teacher and a student in the EFL classroom. Furthermore, it discusses more profoundly the role of the English language in Norway and Russia, and presents literature regarding approaches and methods of teaching foreign languages and English in particular. Additionally, it presents an overview of previous research on approaches to teaching English literacy at Norwegian upper secondary schools. Chapter three explains the method used in this research, participants and the process of data collection. Chapter four demonstrates findings from the teachers' interviews. In Chapter five, the results are analysed and discussed based on the information provided in Chapter two. The final Chapter six presents the conclusion.

2 Literature review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents an overview of previous research and theoretical background relevant to the present study. The main focus is on teaching the English language, but some elements bear overall significance for foreign languages in general. That is why the abbreviation FL (foreign language) is used additionally to the EFL (English as a foreign language).

The points presented in this chapter are connected not only to approaches to teaching the foreign language literacy in particular, but also provide information concerning the status of the English language in Norway and Russia, and, what is more, define the idea of teaching through the teacher-learner interconnection.

2.2 Teachers and learners

2.2.1 EFL teacher role and education

The shift from teacher-centered education towards learner-centered has created changes in education syllabi, which of course included the English language as well (Ahmed 2013; Gespass & Paris 2001, Barman 2013). It means that students with own plans, expectations, and, what is more important, capacities took the control over lesson planning and teaching approaches. Before there was an assessment result that represented positive or negative development of a student, and nowadays it is reinforced by student's response to the teaching process that has become the heart of a lesson. Nevertheless, there are some researchers who disagree with this theory and find it ineffective. For example, O'Neill (1991) does not find it sufficient to let students be totally responsible for the knowledge acquisition when a teacher plays a role of a helper and a resource provider who gets involved into a studying process only if it is needed. In fact, it is still questioned whether something is wrong with the old teacher-focused tradition and which approach, learner- or teacher-based, is more beneficial. With respect to both of them, Harmer (2004) points out their positive sides and takes into account the fact that there are cases when only student- or teacher-fronted education process

was discovered to be complicated. He suggests the option of combining both approaches, and, depending on the circumstances, there can be a teacher as a leader, instructor and controller of the whole class, while students from time to time get the chance to solve some tasks on their own or interact in pairs and groups (Harmer 2004:56-57).

Depending on activities, teachers' roles are changing as well. The learner-centered approach describes a teacher as facilitator that also can be called for tutor, resource and prompter. The main purpose of this role is to help students acquire the knowledge and be a helpful bridge between learning materials and learners (Harmer 2004:58). Harmer illustrates in his work several other roles any teachers have depending on the activity students have during an education process: controller, organiser, assessor, prompter, participant, resource and observer. Referring to Harmer (2004:63), it is significant to be able to switch between different roles and pay attention to how correctly they are performed.

Concerning second language learning, teachers perform same roles as in other subjects. In spite of that, education and learning provided to a foreign language teacher is different from teachers of other kinds.

Current practices in teacher education are focused on creating the right type of the language input that in practice will have impact on a student. At the beginning of describing the important points of EFL teacher education, it is necessary to explain the meaning of the term 'input' that is going to be mentioned a lot of times in the ongoing research.

The so-called input is a complex system that includes the content itself and ways of its creating, introducing to a learner, the impact it has and outcomes it creates. The educational input is the cornerstone of the FL education and a basis of 'the tripartite system' that answers the question about what is going to be taught, how and what effect it will cause (Freeman 2001:75-76).

According to Freeman (2001), there happened dramatic changes between learning how to teach the teacher of foreign languages and other subjects. 'This, in a broad sense, teacher education has depended largely on training strategies to teach people how to do the work of teaching', (Freeman 2001:79) that is what he claims highlighting the fact that the successful methods of teaching the students in the FL classroom directly depend on successful outcome from teacher education. An effective FL tutor always knows how to deliver content in the right way to receive the planned outcome.

2.2.2 FL learner

This paper is focused on teaching the students at the upper secondary level in Norway and Russia. In both countries, the upper secondary students are of age 16-18 or 19, which means that they still belong to the group of adolescents or teenagers, which are described by Ur (1996:286) as the best foreign language learners.

Nevertheless, compared to adults and young children, adolescents seem to be less motivated in their studies, even though they already manage to keep discipline and do the tasks the teacher asks them, many teenagers still do not demonstrate enough interest when it concerns success in studies, especially language learning (Harmer 200:39).

There can be a number of reasons why lower and upper secondary students lose motivation. One of the most significant is that at that age teenagers search for establishment of their own identity and seek approval amongst friends and classmates rather than teachers.

However, it is important to pay attention to the positive side of this age group. Teenagers are persons with a great ability to work with loads of information, especially if they get genuinely interested in something. In either case, an FL teacher should be able to provoke students' interest and engagement in the education process. Adolescents have more flexible education capacity than adult learners and are capable of finding both direct and abstract solutions for the educational issues (Harmer 2001:38-39).

Teaching teenagers, according to Legutke (2012), is inevitably connected with the out-of-school exposure to English. (113) Modern adolescents have unlimited access to media, Internet and intercultural experience from travelling and exchange studies. Legutke (2012:113) highlights that there is a big problem of neglecting this exposure in the EFL classroom: '...the classroom needs to be redefined as an arena where these different contexts for language exposure and language use are linked in a meaningful way'.

Legutke (2012) claims that the EFL lessons should be structured in a special way to satisfy the teenagers' needs. Teachers should be up to date with the ongoing trends of the adolescent's culture and try to implement the elements of it into the education process, that together with the correct use of teaching methods will cause the positive development (Legutke 2012:114-116).

2.3 Using technology in FL teaching

Concerning the importance of the IT technologies in the FL classroom, there have been conducted a large number of studies, which proved the positive influence of the IT on development of both oral and literacy skills. Kasapoglu-Akyol (2010), Alqahtani Mofareh (2019), Şahin-Kizi (2011) and other researchers (Agbatogun 2006, Warschauer and Meskill 2000, Wang 2005, Xiaoqiong and Xianxing 2008).

underlined that the use of the IT technologies benefited in the EFL classroom and demonstrated the development towards the positive learning outcomes. Their studies presented both teachers' and students opinions about the use of the technological tools, even though at some point technologies were not widespread. Both sides agreed that smart devices, applications, audio-visual elements, and other computer materials used not only inside, but also outside the English language classroom brought the ultimate changes into the old-fashioned routine work by solving such issues as the lack of communication and practice, low efficacy of the teaching process and inability to be integrated into a new culture.

Technology used in a classroom includes physical objects such as the television, the music player, the computer, the tablet and the video-projector with the whiteboard. In addition to it, schools use different software to manage the learning process and tools and application that fits both the education process itself and also has managing or controlling functions: e-mail, chats, social networks profiles and groups, videoconferences, Internet access and different documents and projects creators, for example: PowerPoint, Microsoft Word, Chrome.

Levy (2012) has divided technologies into several groups based on teaching different language skills. In terms of the current research it is important to present IT technologies used for teaching vocabulary, writing, reading and grammar.

Vocabulary learning in the classroom is reinforced by software type of dictionaries and language corpora. In easier cases there can be texts or presentations including hyperlinks, connecting a reader to the word definition (Levy 2012:281).

Teaching writing skills can be even more effective with a variety of programs used for creating written texts. These applications have a number of good features helping a writer to increase the quality and save time. Furthermore, modern text processors are multifunctional and include editing using audio- and video-files, with the help of which a writer can create

different projects. However, this is mostly for formal writing practice; informal writing is developed via chats, blogs, journals, online diaries and social networks, if it is included in a studying process. Nowadays, the most part of this software, such as Microsoft Office package for instance, offers options of auto correction of grammar and vocabulary that can positively influence creating the written products of better quality (Levy 2012:281-282).

Modern IT technologies used for reading are quite similar to those applied in vocabulary teaching process, but at the same time have a broader spectrum of applications and options they provide. For example, the website called Linguascope offers different materials and variety of activities aimed at developing reading skills. In general IT technologies of this kind can vary from electronic dictionaries, training software till textual and contextual annotations (Levy 2012:282).

The grammar-based software has undergone development from the software for the common use, such as Hot Potatoes, which offered several tutorial activities combining work with grammar and vocabulary. Since then teachers started creating their private application aimed at some definite group of learners. One more difference is that modern grammar-based software is better 'embedded in a communicative context' (Levy 2012:283).

To summarize, the IT elements can be successfully integrated into the studying process and make it beneficial. The main problem is the correct and appropriate integration of them into education, so that a teacher should evaluate the possible pros and cons of the technologies and decide whether it is suitable for the contemporary context of the EFL lesson.

2.4 Teaching English as a foreign language

2.4.1 Grammar

Ur (2012) and Newby (2012) have focused their studies on the development of the EFL teacher's knowledge in terms of teaching grammar. It is claimed that grammar knowledge takes the first place in the English language proficiency. The main reason is that before introducing English as a foreign language, students at schools had been taught dead languages, Ancient Greek and Latin, which had a strict grammatical structure. Thus, the tendency of teaching these languages has become a base for the development of the grammar-translation

method (Ur 2012:83).

Ur questions the fact that even after introducing other teaching approaches, for example communicative, the grammar translation method is still leading and plays a central role in EFL classrooms. Moreover, she pays attention that the grammar-translation method is prominent among both EFL teachers and researchers (Ur 2012:83).

The use of this approach is regulated by norm defining the 'correct' grammar, which influences how a teacher assesses the work of students and in which way they develop their EFL grammar proficiency. Ur (2012) and Maley (2009) claim that the 'acceptable' grammar is 'the conventional correct form of standard grammar' (Ur 2012:84) and teachers should focus on teaching the standardised language whilst preparing students to the fact that within intercultural communication in real life there exist a lot of other language variations (Maley 2009:195).

Grammar teaching can be either explicit or implicit. In her research, Ur (2012:84) underlines that the most popular tendency is teaching the EFL explicitly following the traditional presentation-practice-production pattern. Nevertheless, it is argued that this way of teaching is ineffective based on the fact that students get dependent on the exercises and strategies presented during lessons and still produce unacceptable grammatical forms. If teachers want students to be correct at spontaneous producing, they have to apply implicit communicative strategies when students are ready to absorb new grammar rules, but not just follow the studying plan.

Richards and Rodgers (2015) claim that the communicative approach is prioritized and widespread in the Western countries, including Norway. Additionally, in her study, Ur describes, firstly, the task-based instruction focused on 'communication-based tasks only'. (2012:85) Secondly, she talks about drilling or audiolingualism. Compared to all above described methods, this one implies only memorising without any clear discussions of grammar rules (2012:86).

It has been widely discussed which approach is more effective for English language instruction: grammar-translation or communicative one. Some studies (Dekeyser 2003; Ellis 2002; Norris and Ortega 2001) claim that instead of focusing on only one approach, it is more effective to apply bits of explicitly taught grammar on the implicit meaning-focused approach, thus the methodology is based on communicative tasks with temporary attention to the

grammatical correctness (Ur 2012:87).

Consequently, Ur (2012) underlines three more methods that include both focus on grammatical correctness and meaning. Focus on form involves temporary discussing and practicing grammatical constructions. It presupposes focus on rules only in case of need. The whole studying process is based only on communicative tasks but when, for instance, there comes up an issue with some grammatical structure, a teacher spontaneously decides whether students need to work on the grammatical feature. This inclusion is not encountered in the lesson planning and arises only if it is appropriate to the flow of an EFL lesson. (87) To the contrary consciousness- raising method does not involve practice and is based on students' readiness for studying a grammar rule. A teacher does not focus on grammar constructions within communicative tasks until students 'notice them in comprehensive input' (88).

Along with PPP there has been created the skill-based learning method. Technically they are very similar and include three main steps: presentation - practice - production. But the difference lies in the focus on the meaning of a text learners work with. The pure PPP tasks look illogical and have no correlation with the real live communicative situations. For example, students learn how to fill in the gaps or put a verb in the correct form. As it is claimed such tasks do not create any complications for students and they will successfully fulfil them as long as their focus is only on grammar and they have nothing to do with meaning of a sentence. Skill-based learning method is an elaborated option of PPP that has undergone the switch from grammar-translation to the communicative approach. The main aim of the skill-based learning is to devote the attention to the meaning of a sentence including grammatical tasks. But this method can be applied only if students are ready for it.

However, Ur (2012) relies on work by Spada and Lightbown (1999), who claimed that grammatical tasks are above the students' level, but practice accelerates the acquisition process. She underlines that, in any case there are still some learners that due to the dramatic lack of readiness cannot acquire the target grammar rules, but in spite of this teachers should not diminish the effectiveness of practice (Ur 2012:88-90).

Consequently, Ur (2012) analyzed how error correction helped to promote grammar acquisition among learners. Implying research by Krashen (1999), Truscott (1996, 1999), Lyster et al (1999), Long and Robinson (1998), she questions what impact error correction has on the students' grammatical development. On the one hand, it is claimed that it succeeds to

have a positive result on improvement only if a learner is interested in paying attention and correcting the errors made, or even worse, when students get distress or embarrassed. On the other hand, this idea was argued and replaced by the conclusion that error correction played a significant role in both oral and written speech accuracy development (Ur 2012:90). Ur's investigation (2012) was followed by the work of Lei Zhu (2017), who analysed the students' and teachers' attitude towards error correction in the EFL classroom. According to her, different strategies of error correction could be beneficial not only for teaching reading, but also vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation (Lei Zhu 2017:71).

All things considered the shift from explicit to implicit teaching methods has not excluded the process of teaching and correction of grammar. Above there have been described and discussed the most popular methods, but then it is still questioned which of them are more or less effective (Ur 2012:91).

It is found that when a learner knows the number of significant grammatical rules together with relevant vocabulary, he can produce correct sentences and build meaningful texts. But there is difference between written and spoken grammar and when a student absorbs the oral English language from the surroundings outside the school, differences between correctness of the grammar can be noticed and oral grammar can influence the written rules. According to Harmer (2004), during the oral informal conversation in English it is normal to meet unpredicted interruptions or jokes and attention is mostly paid to the content of what is being said but not the grammar, so that sometimes different grammar rules are omitted during the informal conversation. The grammar of oral speech and the grammar of written speech are two different constructions that have own principles of functioning (Harmer 2004:14).

2.4.2 Vocabulary

Vocabulary acquisition and use is a significant element of the development of EFL literacy skills. Compared to L1 the L2 vocabulary learning process is mostly implicit. The main aim of some linguistic studies is to prove whether implicit learning is more effective than explicit or vise versa and what are the most effective strategies of teaching the EFL vocabulary. Carter and Nunan (2001) analyzed four different hypotheses about implicit-explicit vocabulary learning.

The first hypothesis was developed by Krashen (1988, 1989) and his second language acquisition theory. It is based on the idea of a strong implicit-learning, which presupposes that the most part of the EL vocabulary is learned unconsciously. This theory embraced not only vocabulary acquisition, but the whole language acquisition in general.

The second hypothesis is weak implicit-learning that is opposite to the first one and claims that words are not learned unconsciously and there is some kind of conscious processes responsible for acquisition. This hypothesis was supported by Schmidt (1990) and his theory of language awareness.

The weak explicit-learning hypothesis was presented by Sternberg (1987). It holds that students process loads of information themselves and use different strategies to extract the meaning of a word relying on its context. Carter and Nunan (2001) also highlight that words presented without any context are learnt with less success than those used in a text or conversation.

The strong explicit-learning hypothesis supports metacognitive strategies that have direct influence on the successful vocabulary learning process. Cognitive processes depend on correct monitoring and planning, that also has been claimed by Craik and Lockhart (1972). According to this hypothesis, the meaning of the word can be acquired only within the strict processing including and correct context (comprehensive input) should be reinforced by effective learning strategies (Carter and Nunan 2001:44).

The history of development of these four hypotheses shows that the last one, strong explicit-learning, has been actively pushed forward and discussed in different research. It is the only hypothesis that highlights the importance of successful development of metacognitive strategies.

Carter and Nunan (2011) pay attention to the fact that there exists another way of viewing the weak-strong explicit-implicit learning. Furthermore, different strategies belong to different levels of the language knowledge. For example, upper secondary school students will not, probably, find methods of graphological shapes and word patterns useful, and will majorly find referential strategies beneficial. When a learner has an aim to study the surface form of a word, explicit learning is an effective option, but if there is a need to study the inner shape: semantic, structure and use in a discourse,- man should rely on implicit learning (Carter and Nunan 2011:45).

Harmer (2004:16) defines vocabulary as the language corpora. The most significant part of the vocabulary is word meaning, that is followed by two complicated points. The first one is that one word can have several sometimes absolutely different meanings presented by same or different parts of speech. "The point is that the same collection of sounds and letters can have many different meanings". (Harmer 2004:18) This polysemy can be resolved only if a learner sees words in a context that defines their connotations. Krashen (1998) defines vocabulary as mental lexicon of an individual that consists of words and expressions used for building and understanding sentences.

Based on works by Cummins (1999) and Herrel (2004), Mukoroli (2011) has presented four different types of vocabulary that is taught during EFL lessons: reading vocabulary that embraces words the reader recognizes in text; writing vocabulary that a student employs when creating a piece of writing; listening vocabulary that is recognized while listening to the English speech; and speaking vocabulary that is used in speech. A learner who experiences issues with the vocabulary development is less capable to comprehend or produce text depending on the skill in which there is the lack of lexical knowledge (Mukoroli 2011:7-8).

Knowledge about a word includes not only awareness of the way it is written, pronounced and translated from English to the mother-tongue. A language learner has to be aware of this spectre of features: 'literal meaning, connotations,...derivations, collocations, frequency,...the sort of syntactic constructions into which it enters, the morphological options it offers, and a rich variety of semantic associates such as synonyms, antonyms, homonyms'. (Mukoroli 2011:13) In other words, a learner needs to be aware of the whole word structure to use it correctly while both receiving or producing textual constructions.

Mukoroli (2011) implied the research by Herrel (2004) and analyzed the main steps included into the process of vocabulary learning.The first step is to acquire the syntactic pattern of the word used in a definite sentence.

The second step becomes available when learners meet other syntactic patterns similar to the first one. During this step they meet destabilization of the initial construction. This means that one can use the new lexicon as an opportunity to define the additional information presented in the second sentence and choose from the two constructions the most appropriate one (Mukoroli 2011:16).

In his research, Mukoroli (2011) analyzes and presents several the most effective ways

of teaching the English vocabulary. He starts the discussion with introducing the method of learning the lexical chunks. Compared to single words lexical chunks present the vocabulary in use. It means that, firstly, a student already gets known to a pre-prepared word construction that can be recognized during the receiving or used for producing information. To look at this another way, lexical chunks can be associated with a communication ritual, in other words with 'typical functional language use' (2011:22). Any chunk itself after being memorized and used can be divided into the constituent words.

Next, a method of teaching collocations is presented. In comparison to word chunks, collocations are not the phrases "to-go" that do not need any extra processing, but rather the words that frequently co-occur with the actual learned word. Moreover, students learn to see the semantic differences between synonyms that in fact cannot replace the word from a collocation. For example, man can say 'a small talk, not 'a little talk', but 'a little puppy'. This way learners are taught to define the semantic differences of words with the same meaning, which is also called 'the semantic area of a word' (Mukoroli 2011:23).

The third method mentioned is incidental vocabulary acquisition (IVA) (Mukoroli 2011:24-25). The main point of it lies in exposing the same word in different meanings during different communicative activities, such as speaking or reading. The learner gets known to a word under extra input of different contexts. The most effective ways to practice IVA are group work, presentations, watching English speaking TV-shows or extensive reading.

Teaching word family is one more method practiced. Teaching the FL vocabulary can be based on acquisition the whole semantic field with the interrelations between words. Words can be grouped based on various criteria. The simplest example is a semantic field of vehicles: car, bus, lorry, train, motorbike.

The fourth method is aimed not at acquisition of new lexical items but at memorising the already studied ones. In this case, Mukoroli (2011) clashes together two processes of learning words: incidental, that already has been presented, and intentional. The difference between them is the totally unpredictable vocabulary percepted in the first case and intentional work on a lexical item in the second. A student is more likely to memorise a word or a word combination by practicing it. In order to create the right input a teacher needs to pay attention to the context familiar to learners (Mukoroli 2011:26).

Mukoroli (2011) presented some more methods applied for teaching vocabulary, that

can be used in a system: 'eliciting, contextualization, labeling, personalisation, identifying productive pre- and post-fixes, association, semantic mapping, character trait vocabulary chart, learning vocabulary via analogy, reading and storytelling, story innovation, categorizing, vocabulary finder, tic-tac-toe, scrambled format, bilingual dictionaries' (27-32).

There are several challenges for vocabulary teaching existing in the EFL classroom. To begin with, the vocabulary of the ELLs is restricted compared, for example, to their mother-tongue. As long as EFL classroom is one of their main sources of the vocabulary, the number of lessons is strictly fixed so it can happen that a teacher does not have the amount of time they need to develop the wished positive tendencies. One of possible solutions is to organise homework that also includes methods of indirect EFL instruction: home reading or computer games.

One more obstacle is the lack of topic vocabulary needed to understand a text. Some teachers experience a problem when there is a lack of pre-text tasks when students meet the new words. But on the contrary extensive reading is a necessary component to develop sufficient vocabulary. These two elements complement each other, and a teacher should focus a learning process on acquiring the relevant vocabulary right from a text.

The last but not least point discussed was the lack of students' awareness about the breadth and depth of vocabulary. Mukoroli (2011) underlined that it is significant to develop the lexical competence of a learner, teach him how a word and its derivatives should be used, in which registers and circumstances.

Mukoroli has made a general conclusion concerning challenges teachers meet when they teach the vocabulary in EFL classroom is the insufficient level of the students and lexical poverty so that they cannot comprehend and produce lexically enriched and correct texts. The only solution for that is to provide them with sufficient comprehensive input and output (Mukoroli 2011:41-42).

2.4.3 Writing skills

Producing a piece of writing is known to be the most complicated task in language, especially for non-native speakers. Writing is "a complex cognitive process", that according to White and Arndt (1991), discussed by Nunan (1999) requires 'sustained intellectual effort over a

considerable period of time' (Nunan 1999:274).

There have been developed two controversial approaches towards writing pedagogy: product and process. The first one is focused on the final result, a text written perfectly. Regarding big pieces of work that have to be produced by a learner in an FL classroom this is nearly impossible. In order to satisfy the requirement of perfection a student has to copy or transform a model or an example that is presented by a teacher or in a textbook. Nunan calls it 'reproductive language work' (1999:272). He also underlines that in the case of such tasks, the focus is on a word or sentence but not the whole text. Words create sentences that build up a text, which is a part of discourse. Such a teaching approach is called bottom-up. Opposite to product writing is process writing. Teaching focus is shifted from the text particles, words and sentences, to the whole piece of writing or 'learning by doing' (Nunan 1999). The most significant idea lies in the focus on different stages of producing the piece of writing that gets feedback and corrected before final revising.

Nunan compares the bottom-up approach with the physical process of building, when learners create a whole entity (a text) with perfectly correct "blocks". To put it differently, process writing or the top-down approach demonstrates how a learner builds up texts of different quality that are 'shattered' into pieces and get feedback whether the product requires further correction before the finished draft (1999:274).

2.4.4 Genre-pedagogical approach in writing.

Horverak (2016) focused her study on the genre-pedagogical approach within argumentative writing. In the first place she introduced the reader into the historical development of the English writing instruction. Hoverak was not the only researcher who studied the genre-pedagogical approach. Hyland (2007, 2003) and Beittel (2002) discussed the idea of genre-based pedagogy a while before, but nevertheless defined this approach as beneficial and perspective.

Nowadays, in Norway there is an increased focus on writing skills and, according to the researcher, there has been a shift from the grammar-translation method to the communicative and audio-visual methods, which are effective but mostly focus on oral speech. Her idea to try out the genre-pedagogical approach was based on the requirements to use the

written English language in communicative situations (Hoverak 2016:98-99).

Horverak has investigated different aspects of the EFL writing instruction in Norwegian upper secondary school. She has analyzed data on both a local and national level, made a classroom observation, conducted the interviews and collected teaching materials (102).

The research has been conveyed at different phases. Phase 1 was devoted to teachers' experiences and perceptions of the effectiveness of teaching instructions used for developing the writing skills. Horverak correlated the data from interviews with the results from the classroom observations and studied the teaching materials used for the lessons. The main genre teachers were focused on was the argumentative essay and during the preparatory process students received a practical template of a text they could use as an example. The main purpose of that was to show the structure of an essay learners would have to work on getting prepared for the final exam. Nevertheless, there have arisen different opinions about details of writing instruction. Some teachers preferred to deconstruct the templates and demonstrate small pieces that had to be included in a correct essay. Others had an opinion that too detailed instruction could demotivate students by destroying their creativity, thus they only presented the basic structure of an essay. The teachers interviewed have underlined that the main complications were connected to the structure of argumentative essays, working with sources and adjusting the language to the genre (Hoverak 2016:107-108).

Phase 2 aimed at collecting data from the students' perceptions of the genre-pedagogical writing instruction. The results showed that the majority of learners was uncertain about the genre they had to write in, could not tell the difference between argumentative and narrative writing and how to choose the right formality of the language.

The experiment has resulted in that students have significantly improved their writing skills, which has been noticeable in the pre- and post-test. The genre pedagogical approach is effective for argumentative writing and learners develop 'all three main categories of structure, language and content' (Hoverak 2016:110).

2.4.5 Reading skills

Concerning reading skills at upper secondary level, it was hard to predict what type of teaching

approaches are mostly used. Moreover, it is clear that at upper secondary level students already have developed the necessary reading skills because the English language is compulsory at lower secondary level. Later in the interview it will be discussed that learners at upper secondary level still have different levels of reading skills not only between different EFL classrooms but also within same studying group. Especially if there is a majority of such students, teachers can adjust the studying process to the average level of the EFL classroom. Wiland (2000) presents two opposite reading strategies. The first one is called the bottom-up model, which consists of decoding letters, words and sentences in order to create meaning of a text. In the English language there are 26 letters representing over 40 sounds. The bottom-up model is also represented as the sound-symbol correspondences and is very effective on the beginner stage when students learn the English alphabet. Practising only this approach at the higher levels leads to mechanical reading without understanding the meaning of a whole text (Nunan 1999:252). Even if the sequence of the bottom-up approach is logical this strategy supports the 'purely structuralist point of view' (Wiland 2000:189-190).

Wiland (2000) gives an example of studying the Alan Lightman's Einstein's Dream by upper secondary school students. The first thing to be noticed is the absence of any technical obstacles. By the obstacles she meant vocabulary and syntax of the studied passage. Wiland believes that for 18-19 years old students who read the text with the bottom-up strategy, it is supposed to be clear and straightforward. According to her research, students were struggling with extractive the meaning from the passage (Wiland 2000:190).

The text from the example cannot be studied only with the structuralist reading strategy, because even the meaning of words and sentences is clear, the main obstacle is to get the right meaning of the whole text. 'The psycholinguistic view combined with cognitive learning theories' implies an idea that a reading finds a reader (Wiland 2000:190). In other words, this is called a top-down approach. The main purpose of it is to correlate the past experiences and knowledge of a learner with reconstruction of the text meaning instead of decoding words and sentences. This approach includes different pre-reading cognitive tasks aimed at helping to convey the text meaning to the learners.

Nunan (1999) conducted research on the process of acquisition of reading skills. He noted that the process of reading at any levels involved a constant switch between the top-down and bottom-up approaches. To prove his theory, he conveyed a short experiment that

included a passage written in an unknown language (New Guinean Tok Pisin) that was followed by several questions about its content. After that Nunan presented a transcribed conversation between two individuals who did not know the language but nevertheless tried to get the meaning of the passage. It became clear from their conversation that they used both bottom-up and top-down approaches in order to extract the content from the passage. The individuals used their knowledge about the grammatical and lexical structure of English to define the structure of the unknown language. They also implied some knowledge about Tok Pisin and the contact between Australia and Japan. Accordingly, the participants agreed not to struggle with complicated parts but move on further and then come back 'when they get a sense of what comes after' (Nunan 1999:254-255).

Discussing the process of the development of the reading skills Nunan (1999:251) presented four different types of reading.

1. The first type was called receptive reading . This meant the automatic understanding of a rapidly read text.

2. The second type was reflective reading. Compared to receptive one, readers did not only extracted the meaning but also reflected on it.

3. The third strategy was skim reading. This type was close to the receptive reading but it was more superficial and aimed at general understanding of the text content.

4. Scanning is the last type of reading strategy used within the teaching process. Process of scanning consists of the rapid skimming of the text and skipping some parts in order to find some specific information, for example, an answer to the question.

Nunan (1999) analyzed the model of Directed Activities Related to Text (DART), created by Davies and Green (1984) and Davies (1985), and presented the main features any "good" reading task should obtain:

1. use of authentic or challenging texts;

2. rhetorical or topical framework for processing and analyzing the text;

3. oral reading followed by silent reading and rereading;

4. students interact with text and with each other;

5. question answering followed by indirect analysis of the text;

6. transfer of information from the text to a visual representation;

7. students made hypotheses explicitly;

8.   students were evaluated by students;

9.   discussions about interpretations of a text;

10.   students asked questions about what they did not know about a text;

11.   teacher as informant;

12.   critical reading of a text'(Davies 1995:144).

The features presented are significant for this study, because they defined teaching methods used by EFL teachers in Norway.

2.4.6 Developing reading comprehension in Norwegian upper secondary school

Brevik (2015) investigated the practices of teaching EFL reading skills in Norwegian upper secondary school. After the educational reform in 2006, schools were required to teach students writing, as it has been mentioned in the above presented research, and reading skills on the regular basis. But even though teachers were reporting on the successful work with reading skills, there was still little information about whether they were actually teaching reading and comprehension or that was just the well worked-out process that was impeccable only technically with zero understanding the meaning (Brevik 2015: 208).

The main focus of Brevik's research was on analyzing the reading instruction and defining the main strategies used for developing reading comprehension. She took into account both general and vocational programmes (Brevik 2015:207).

The research was based on a mixed methods approach. Brevik (2015) conducted interviews with students and EFL teachers at upper secondary level, collected teachers' narratives, gathered information via classroom observation and from reading tests (211).

The main finding was that reading comprehension instruction was not excluded from the EFL classroom at the upper secondary level. Brevik emphasized the shift from the 'Nike mode of reading,' when students read the text without comprehension and just to answer the task, to the 'Sherlock Holmes' mode, when the main point was not to find an answer but to solve a puzzle whether tasks also took some time to think about. There were some differences between the teachers' attitudes towards reading comprehension strategies in general and vocational programmes. Teachers in vocational programmes were more responsible for development of the reading comprehension skills. What is more, the students noticed that they

started comprehending texts automatically, even when they were not asked to. On the contrary, teachers in general programs demonstrated less interest in settling the reading-comprehension skills in the learners' minds and the strategies were used only if there was a demand for them (Brevik 2015:215-217).

2.5 English in Russia

2.5.1 The status of the language

Ustinova (2005) conducted research concerning the status of the English language in Russia at the beginning of the 21st century. The paper analyzed spheres where the language has already expanded, its functions and users.

To begin with, she introduced English as the language that did not play a role as a means of communication in the country. It was regarded only as a foreign language, the area of its usage and number of users were restricted. The majority of the spheres where English was required were connected to international commerce, studying abroad and collaboration of the Russian universities with the international ones, tourism, and science (Ustinova 2005:239).

Ustinova implied the term of "the Russian English" or "Russianized English", because, as she claimed, there was no "pure" form of the language existing. The attempts to teach the standard language were made at specialized upper secondary schools and universities. Building on from the idea about the development of the EFL classroom it was significant to notice that this paper was written 15 years ago and nowadays the standardized English language has become an important subject at secondary and sometimes primary schools in Russia. This fact was implied by the Russian Ministry of Education and Science in its official papers.[2]

The documents give an overview over the most fluent users of the English language. They mostly live in big cities that are popular among foreign tourists or study at universities hosting the international events. The Internet and media have also influenced the increasing level of the language proficiency (Ustinova 2005:242).

In terms of education, English in Russia plays an instrumental function. Ustinova

---

[2] http://docs.cntd.ru/document/901782389 - this website contains official documentation of the Russian Ministry of Education and Science.

highlighted that teaching the EFL was taken seriously pursuing the potential aims to develop workforce that could satisfy the international standards. She presented an example of increasing export of natural resources to the Western countries that needed a language for work (Ustinova 2005:244). The consequence is that the English language become a compulsory part of school curriculum, essential for 'well rounded education' (Ustinova 2005:245). The main purpose of teaching EFL at the school level is to master the core language competence in reading, listening and comprehension, writing and speaking. Nowadays the English language has become compulsory subject at Russian secondary schools, this information if officially provided on the website of the Russian Ministry of Education and Science (accessed 04 May 2020).

2.5.2 EFL teaching in Russia

The work by Ter-Minasova (2005) investigates the idea of traditions and innovations in EFL teaching in Russia. The researcher has described changes in three traditional features characterising the Russian EFL classroom

The first feature is called 'depth, thoroughness, perfectionism (Ter-Minasova 2005:447). Since the Soviet times there has been A traditional way of thinking 'Soviet means excellent'. This feature defined the purpose to learn the EFL perfectly during the education process. The main focus was on the classical authors and authentic texts. Students could be scaffolded by the tasks that are way above their level of language, whilst all EFL teachers learned to apply the methods regarded as a classical norm. Both learners and teachers were forced to do their best teaching and studying both literacy and oral skills not taking into account practical needs of students. The negative side of teaching each and every point lied in the fact that students learned everything but nothing, especially if learners prioritised other subjects over the English language (Ter-Minasova 2005:447). By contrast there were changes that led to international communications with the English-speaking world which resulted on shifting the focus from absolute perfection towards the actual cross-cultural needs (Ter-Minasova 2005:452).

The second feature was called changing from teacher to student-orientation. It could be described by changing from EFL for aristocracy to EFL for masses as a compulsory subject at

secondary school. Curriculum before was unified and textbooks used were mostly same from school to school and city to city. As it has been mentioned above, no one took into account real needs and capacities of students and EFL teaching was mostly teacher-oriented also because of the large number of students (over 20 million) and vast amount of information to be taught (Ter-Minasova 2005:448). Russian writers were, nevertheless, to that issue and cooperated with English ones to create books that could be used pragmatically and satisfy both students' and teachers' needs (Ter-Minasova 2005:453).

The third feature was theoretical foundations. The absence of direct communication at the beginning of the 20th century led to the strong theoretical roots of teaching the EFL. Concerning vocabulary and grammar of foreign languages education in Russia relied mostly on theoretical background (Ter-Minasova 2005:451). Over time this feature underwent some changes in terms of pragmatic orientation of studies in addition to theoretical (Ter-Minasova 2005:453).

To sum up, the main features of the modern EFL teaching in Russia, it can be claimed that those principles had an influence on the methods used for teaching English literacy skills. First of all, as long as the theoretical background received the clear pragmatic motivation and there was no longer teacher-oriented education process, one could consider that depending on the students' capacities there can be applied different methods. Secondly, Russian EFL teachers have freedom to choose studying materials so it is expected that the research will show this variety.

2.6 English in Norway

2.6.1 The status of the language

Aalborg (2010) carried out research concerning the status of the English language in Norway. The aim of her study was to find out how globalization and modern technologies influenced the spread of English in the non-English speaking country. It was hypothesized that English was no longer just a foreign language, but could be distinguished from other foreign languages and attained a special status.

The research comprised 107 secondary students of the age 15-16. They had to respond

to the questionnaire and the data collected demonstrated the importance of the English language in their lives.

Concerning participation in natural communication, there were 80% of the participants that claimed that they used English words and expressions in their everyday Norwegian talks. Moreover, 82% agreed that the English language helped them to contact people when they travelled abroad. The participants considered the media as a good input of oral speech, so living in Norway they learned how to speak and understand English (Aalborg 2010:88).

When Norwegian students had English lessons since early childhood, it became much easier compared to other foreign languages they study. According to the research of Aalborg, only 60% of students agree that they mostly learned the English language at school, other could not agree with that mentioning that there also existed other sources. For example, variety of interactions outside the school provide them with different language skills (Aalborg 2010:89-90).

Aalborg also analyzed the mass media input as 'a supplement to classroom teaching' (91). She defined two main sources: music as the spoken input and Internet as the written input.

The influence of Internet and mass media showed that they also were channels to practice communicative skills. The results of Aalborg's research presented that 106 participants use social networks and 100 use online chats (2010:93).

On the whole Aalborg found positive attitude of the Norwegians secondary students towards learning English. Her study has proved the work of Bonnet (2004) who presents the students this way:

'The Norwegian pupils have a positive attitude towards English, and they are motivated to learn it. Their motivations are the following, to communicate abroad, to understand English TV, films and song lyrics better, and to make better use of computers and the Internet' (Bonnet 2004:146). The researcher analyzed all the data collected and came up to the conclusion that English was no longer just a typical foreign language for the Norwegian students. Moreover, for some of them it could be called as a second language. Aalborg (2010) concluded that it was hard to define the status of the language, but she defined that English occupied its special niche between second and foreign languages (98).

2.6.2 Studying the English language in Norway

Reading was described as a process when information from a text and students' knowledge meet and create some meaning. The new models used in the Norwegian EFL teaching program is constant swinging between bottom-up and top-down approaches. Grabe (2009) and some other earlier researchers (Koda 2005, 2007; Cummins 2000) have developed the hypothesis of interdependence. This hypothesis claims that the reading process on the L1 is same for the L2 and moreover, when it comes to L2 texts, a learner activates both L1 and L2 knowledge.

Furthermore, Bernhard (2005:308) has presented a compensatory model for reading in L2 with the help of L1 knowledge. According to her work, the quality of reading also depends on the 'unexplained variance', that includes content, motivation, interest and reading strategies. In fact, there are some limits defining to which extent the transition of knowledge about Norwegian can influence the reading process in English. Hellekjær has mentioned a term of the linguistic threshold. It can be described as the 'the more demanding the task is, the higher the linguistic threshold (Alderson 2000:39). The main academic purpose of the linguistic threshold is to overcome it in order to perform better as an EFL reader (Hellekjær 2012:155).

Notably during the period of time from 2002 till 2011 there have been some changes in the EFL reading process at upper secondary school in Norway. Hellekjær (2012:167) defines these changes as the process of rising importance of EFL reading practice together with the raising number of reading materials used towards the active use of computers during lessons.

Norway is expanding the international communication and English as lingua franca is important both inside and outside the EFL classroom. Business and politics spreading far away from Norway require the high level of the English writing and reading awareness. The Norwegian education program has made English a compulsory subject at school, from primary to upper secondary stages. Though there are no strict requirements to have English at the university level, for example, when a degree is taken in Norwegian and is not connected to English teaching or Linguistics, the base of articles and researches students are going to come across is much richer in English than Norwegian.

Russia also follows the modern tendencies and the English language education has got a new focus on developing the citizen with the satisfying communicative competence and

especially high levels of literacy skills.

The acquisition of literacy skills includes not only learning rules about how to produce or percept written texts. It is a process that also includes teaching grammar and vocabulary, and depends on such factors as teacher education and students' age, and has connection with modern technologies.

3 Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the research methods used in the present study. This research is qualitative and data collection was fulfilled via interviews based on convenience sampling.

Section 3.2 describes the research project and participants. In Section 3.3, the description of the qualitative research and its pros and cons are provided. Subsection 3.3.1 includes the description of interviews as the research method, and an in-depth presentation of the interviews in this study in particular. In Section 3.4, aspects, such as reliability and validity are presented. Lastly, Section 3.5 addresses ethical considerations of this study.

3.2 Research project and participants

The research participants were 6 English language teachers. In order to answer the main research question and subquestions, the participants belonged to 2 different groups based on the country they taught in, particularly Norway and Russia.

The sampling was defined by the age of pupils the participants taught English to. This research was conducted at upper secondary school. It means that in Norway, upper secondary school lasts for three years and is called videregående skole or VG1-VG3, the age of students varies from 16 till 19. The researcher did not focus on only one age group due to two reasons. The first reason was that on the one hand subjects who agreed to take part in the interviews taught different age groups and different levels of upper secondary school, and in comparison to ones teaching at elementary and lower secondary levels were more willing to take part in the interview. The main challenge was to recruit unfamiliar teachers, so that all the participants were either the researcher's current or former groupmates. On the other hand, such a selection gives a more broad overview over the main tendencies in English writing and reading practices in Norwegian upper secondary school, compared to studying the case of a single teacher or two teachers who teach the same age groups. Thus, the project is based on convenience sampling (Lavrakas 2008). Convenience sampling involves dealing with participants who are willing to take part in a research project (Dornyei 2007).

The Russian education system implies upper secondary school as 10th and 11th forms, and students are 15-18 years old. Compared to the Norwegian education system, there are

some differences, because school education in Russia lasts 11 years, while in Norway it takes 13 years. The researcher did not have the possibility to travel to Russia in order to talk to the teachers personally, so invitations to participate were sent out via e-mail. Participants that got interested in this research project are also teachers at different grades of upper secondary school, so that both Norwegian and Russian groups were teachers at the same level of schooling. The researcher had expectations that participants from each context would have similar tendencies in teaching English language literacy. In spite of that it was expected that participants within same context (Norwegian or Russian) would have some disagreements inbetween, that could be explained by a lot of different factors, starting from backgrounds and education, finishing with the classes of different abilities. Nevertheless, both common tendencies and differences were planned to be noted and analyzed.

Concerning the way of interviewing, there were some differences. All the Norwegian participants lived in close proximity to the researcher so that there did not happen any obstacles regarding interviewing them in person. Each interview was a face-to-face talk following the interview guide, but if the interviewer noticed that some information should be cleared up, the interviewees got additional questions. Two participants agreed to take part in the interviews in English, while the third participant preferred to do it in Norwegian. For that teacher, the interview guide was translated from English and the conversation was transcribed in Norwegian.

The researcher had planned to travel to Russia with a purpose to personally interview the teachers, but it was not possible because of the tight schedule of the participants, who could not give interviews within the short period of time, so that it was agreed to use Skype as the social network that allows to make free phone and videocalls abroad. This change did not influence the structure of the interview and the process went the same way as with the participants in Norway.

Despite the fact that interviews with the Russians were conducted via Skype there happened no obstacles. Moreover, the teachers were able to answer all the questions from the interview guide and cleared up some points in addition to that. Because all Russian participants got their education in Russia, they found it more convenient to give interviews in Russian. So the interview guide was translated from English into Russian, and the interviews were recorded and transcribed in Russian as well.

3.3 Qualitative research

In order to answer the main research question, qualitative research was employed (Fraenkel and Wallen 2003:430-432; Johnson and Christensen 2011:33-37). Thus, the researcher's focus was on an in-depth investigation. In total, six interviews were conducted and analyzed.

Qualitative research in education has both advantages and disadvantages. On the one hand, qualitative research gives an opportunity for the thick description of a single participant and allows to collect and analyse information in detail. Moreover, compared to quantitative methods, qualitative research is not restricted by numbers only and is more flexible when it concerns sampling, therefore it is possible to work with fewer participants. In qualitative research, the questions can be easily adapted to the context. In this study, it was most appropriate to employ the interview guide in order to get relevant data (Rahman 2016).

On the other hand, if qualitative research embraces a small number of participants it is hard to claim whether the information represents the actual state of affairs in a group or groups they represent. In addition to it, it is claimed that participants can be selected in order to meet the researcher's expectations. It can also be complicated if an interviewee is not able to answer one or several research questions due to own reasons. In such case the significant insight can be missed and the picture is not presented completely.[3] These disadvantages were taken into account while conducting the study.

This research can be described as a comparative qualitative study based on interviews in two different contexts. The main task is to compare the teaching principles of Norwegian and Russian EFL education at upper secondary school. This includes an in-depth study of each interview: presenting and analysing their results, defining and comparing the major features in methodology of teaching the English language.

The study is based on comparison of two education systems: Norwegian and Russian at the upper secondary level. As above, from each side there were interviewed only three teachers. The qualitative analysis of methods of teaching the English language in Norwegian and Russian classrooms is possible in case data provided by the participants is sufficient enough. The main purpose of this approach according to Johnson and Christensen (2012:48-49) is to focus on the detailed investigation of a phenomenon, which is in this study teaching methods. This research includes different cases that equally describe Norwegian and Russian methods of teaching in English language classrooms. Analyzing the data that can

---

[3] The information has been provided by the Web-Site Poppulo. https://www.poppulot.com

point out the main features of the interviewed groups, their similarities and differences is the main focus of this research.

3.3.1 Interview

In order to answer the main research question and investigate differences and similarities of teaching methods, the data was collected through interviews (Cohen, Manion and Morrison 2011:409-411).

The use of interviews can be justified as the most beneficial in terms of this study. First of all, besides interviews there are different types of instruments for collecting data: questionnaires, observation, and tests. But they cannot be effective enough for this research. Information that was collected, concerns teaching experience and can be expressed verbally in a form of dialogue to avoid misunderstanding. Moreover, during an interview there is always a chance to elaborate on the question for participants thus they can give valid answers. Questionnaires are mostly aimed at providing quantitative data, which is contrary to the scope of this research. This style of data collection can include both close and open questions but the latter can bring up complications to the further analysis, because participants freely write answers on own terms in the "offline" regime, which means that they cannot consult a person who is responsible for research to develop the points and data can be insufficient or invalid (Cohen, Manion & Morrison 2011:378-383). Tests are even less suitable to this study, as long as there is no aim to evaluate, diagnose or measure results. Furthermore, tests are constructed in a different way and contain only close questions and participants cannot provide any extra data that is required by this research (Cohen, Manion and Morrison 2011:476-477). Method of observation would be a suitable supplement to this case study, but it was influenced by the distance of the second research group that is located in Russia, that made it impossible to attend English language lessons there.

Secondly, the interview, according to Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011), is a flexible mechanism that enables multi-sensory channels: verbal, non-verbal, spoken and heard. This definition implies that an interview is a conversation between two or persons, where at least one of them is an interviewer and a second one is a participant. Talking about the multi-sensory channels described by Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011) it is logical to conclude that these channels also deliver different types of data, besides the verbal that can be transcribed. The non-verbal channels can on the one hand help to provide with sufficient

information during an interview, and on the other - distract an interviewer so that a person will misunderstand the data provided. At the same time, in case of this research, the non-verbal information can be significant as long as it is possible to control the flow of the interview. For example, whenever participants non-verbally demonstrate discomfort or hesitation it should be a direct signal for an interviewer that it can influence the quality of the information provided, that in some cases can be a good signal to change the flow of an interview. Thus, the interview guide of this research consists of questions that do not confront any ethical principles and moreover the participants have been introduced to the topic of thesis and content of the guide, so that while giving their agreement to take part in the interview the teachers were aware of what topics they would be asked about: research focus was on the methods of teaching the English language in Norwegian and Russian schools (Cohen, Manion & Morrison 2011:409-443).

The participants were interviewed in two different ways. Those who were available for meeting personally were talked to face-to-face, others were interviewed via social networks: Skype. Hanna (2012) defined that compared to face-to-face interviews, the ones using internet technologies are beneficial for both researchers and interviewees. The former ones have an opportunity to 'stay at the level of the text' (Hanna 2012:240). According to Holt (2010), a researcher is not influenced by extratextual factors so the data collected will not include any contextual information, for example, participants' insecurity caused by physical interaction. Furthermore, Hanna (2012) also has studied that interviewees try to avoid potential inconveniences surrounding face-face-to face interviews.

In terms of this work there was developed a pattern of preparing the participants for the upcoming interview. After introducing the project to volunteers and obtaining their consent concerning their participation in this research, they got the opportunity to choose the way they would like the interview to be conducted. The Russian group initially interacted via internet technologies and it was agreed to use Skype as the main research medium.

For this research there have been conducted six semi-structured interviews, which let the interviewer vary the sequence of questions generally make them more flexible (Fylan 2005). The main aim of the research was the focus on methods of teaching the literacy skills, so that a dialogue has been based on the interview guide separated in three different blocks with the set of question. The first block is introductory and arranges the settings for the main part. It includes questions concerning the participants' education and teaching experience of. In terms of this interview it has been interesting not only to know what type of education the

teachers have, but also to what extent their own experience of studying the English language could have influenced their choice of teaching methods.

The final question in this block concerns number of pupils of the upper secondary level, that have to be taught simultaneously

Depending on the size of a target group and in terms of restricted amount of time, there can be variations of teaching methods that are effective for each case.

Summing up, the purpose of the first block is to find out whether there are any external factors that influence the choice of teaching English literacy skills, and how these interconnections vary depending on the country.

The second or main block has two parts: part "A" asks to talk about developing reading skills, part "B" - about English writing instruction. Each of the consists of six identical questions. The researcher asks a participant to describe a process of planning the lesson with focus on literacy skills. When an interviewee is giving an answer he or she can be asked extra questions.

For example: 'Is teacher the only person who takes responsibility for lesson planning, or should the plan satisfy the prescribed standards?'

Answering this question, participant is supposed to clear up the circumstances that 'force' him or her to make a choice for the lesson structure and amount of time used for developing literacy skills. The next questions are focused on the methods and choice of materials. The researcher was aware of the fact that the Russian education program compared to the Norwegian one, strictly requires the use of studying literature and expected to see difference between teaching methods depending on how 'free' the teachers are in terms of available vastness of choice.

The last two questions of part 'A' and 'B' develop the idea of pupils' success or unsuccess. Bergquist, Litner and Sumpter (2006) discussed a hypothesis that students at the upper secondary level depend on 'individual's memory images and familiar routines', that makes them good problem-solvers (1). Since only teachers have been interviewed, the data collected was very subjective, but nevertheless that could possibly influence the choice of methods of teaching English language literacy whether teachers give sufficient information.

Finally, the third block compares preparation processes to English language exams and the main tendencies of using literacy skills during the preparatory sessions. This part includes questions similar to ones in the main part.

3.4 Reliability and validity

According to Dörnnyei (2007:50), reliability shows whether the research procedures produce consistent trustworthy results. According to Basit (2010), the qualitative study is 'unique and particular to a setting'(69-70). In order to be secure that a qualitative study is reliable, the entire research process has to be 'scrupulous, honest, and precise, and has addressed their research questions' (Basit 2010:70). Moreover, the same study conducted by different researchers can provide with different outcomes and is still count as reliable. Reliability for this research is implied by the researcher's precise and responsible collecting and handling the data material.

Concerning research validity, Dörnnyei (2007:53) has defined six main threats to it. Each of these threats and their influence on the research will be briefly described in the following. In addition to it there will be discussed ways to minimize them for getting more valid research.

The first threat is the participants' dropout or attrition. Dörnnyei (2007) describes it as a serious concern. In terms of this research it is obligatory to have the same number of upper secondary school English language teachers as representants from both Norwegian and Russian sides. There was a high risk of the so-called differential dropout where subject leaving a definite group creates disproportionality. Searching for participants for this study was inconvenient, because of tight schedule of the teachers and in case they were not familiar to the researcher, they were skeptical about taking part in the interview. Thus, it was planned to schedule interviews in a short time from one to two weeks after discussing it with the volunteers, as long as they had the good overview over their future plans. Furthermore, the researcher has decided to interview as many participants as possible and in case of dropout there had already been contacts with other potential research subjects .

The second threat is called the Hawthorne effect. It is described as influence the research process on the participants' performance. If they know that they are being studied, they will act differently and be presented both as more and less effective, depending on how they personally react to the fact of being studied. In comparison to the method of observation when participants use a language spontaneously, this case study is not under such a big risk, as long as teachers' performances have not been estimated. Anyways, the impact of the Hawthorne effect on this research has been minimised by agreeing with teachers about that all the interviews would be anonymous and would not include any questions related to their

professional competence and effectiveness.

The third threat is practice effect. It means that the more participant repeats doing same tasks and answering same questions, the better the quality of data provided is. One can consider that teachers who took part in this research could have already taken part in some interview that was very similar, but risk of this is very low. Moreover, the most part of the participants answered negative after being asked about whether they had been interviewed for the educational research before.

The fourth threat maturation can be applied only to longitudinal studies that require experiments with same subjects during their developmental processes. Thus there was no risk for this research.

The fifth threat is participant desire to meet expectations or social desirability bias. This was one of the main threats to this research. The Russian participants informed that they would like to get information about the topic of the interview and examples of the some main questions. The reason for that was lack of experience from defining specific teaching method in theory. The social desirability bias was the ability of the participant to anticipate what type of question the researcher expected from them, they could start overreporting about positive sides of studying programs and chose to describe theoretically most effective methods, but not those that are actually applied in practice. To minimize this threat same as in case of the Hawthorne effect, the researcher has introduced the participants' rights and ethical terms of the research, to make them feel secure that this research is aimed on studying main tendencies of teaching English literacy, but not the professional effectiveness of the participants.

The last common threat is history. Dörnnyei (2007:54) claims that data collected from the research is influenced by unanticipated events that happen when the study is in progress. Concerning this threat the interviewer was not under a big risk to collect invalid data. The maximal length of the interviews was forty-five minutes and such threat is more common for longitudinal studies.

One more challenge was the personal attitudes of the participants to the interviewer. Both familiar and unfamiliar persons took part in this research, and the interviewer got a challenge to develop the best way of interaction that would be beneficial for this research. Asking extra questions to clear up answers if a participant was confused about information he or she wanted to provide with, was the best option to avoid the threat to validity of the research.

The last eighth threat was the process of translating data from the Norwegian or

Russian language to English. The interviewer could not convey the interview only in English, because pedagogical education in Russia is taught in the mother-tongue and the participants have informed that they would provide more sufficient information about teaching process if they use their native language. Some Norwegian participants have also preferred to give answers in their mother-tongue for the same reason. The data collected had to be translated as precisely as possible and besides own knowledge the researcher used external sources of information, such as dictionaries and pedagogical literature written in English.

3.5 Research ethics

This research contains information about personal work experience of the subjects and all the terms have been discussed and agreed between the researcher and participants.

It was required to register with the Norwegian Centre for Research Data (NSD) because the data collected via interview contains sensitive information that could identify the participants. 'NSD's core value is that research data is a collective good that should be shared.' [4] The application process included several steps:

Step 1: the interviewer presented the detailed information about the planned research and uploaded it on the NSD's web-page.

Step 2: the information was preliminarily reviewed and the researcher received the message about some corrections.

Step 3: the elaborated information went through the final check and was approved. After receiving the electronic approval, the researcher started with the interviews.

The study was conducted only after having obtained the NSD approval. Regarding the Russian context it was not required to receive any approval from the Russian centre for research data. Thus, the interviewer followed the Norwegian requirements while conducting the interview with the Russian participants and handling the data.

Moreover, all the information was recorded, stored and processed on the researcher's personal computer, which was registered with NSD as well. (Johnson & Christensen 2012:377) During all the interviews the data was collected with the voice recorder and stored on the pin-code protected memory stick.

Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) discuss the ethical practice of research, so that there was an opportunity to evaluate whether this study met ethical principles.

---

[4] https://nsd.no/nsd/english/index.html

To begin with, this study does not confront any physical and psychological concerns (Fraenkel & Wallen 2003:56-57). Teachers interviewed during the conducted research were asked to answer questions relevant to their experience. Neither in Norway nor in Russia there is any legal prohibition to share information concerning their profession.

Secondly, the research data is completely confidential. Relying on the interview guide there are no questions that can in any way disclose the person interviewed to the third parties. Participants were not asked about their name, age and place of work. The main criteria was to interview English language teachers in Norway and Russia that taught at upper secondary school. So that in this research their names were replaced by codenames: "Teacher 1", "Teacher 2", "Teacher 3" - for the three teachers who work at Norwegian upper secondary schools; and "Teacher 4", "Teacher 5" and "Teacher 6" - for the interviewees with the teaching experience from Russia (Fraenkel & Wallen 2003:58-59).

The third point discussed by Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) was possible harm to the interviewed groups. In terms of this case study neither teachers nor their students fall under any negative influence and are at zero risk. Interviews with teachers is an acceptable practice in Norwegian and Russian schools (Fraenkel and Wallen 2003:57-58).

Fourthly, in terms of deception the interview guide has been planned in a way that teachers were not supposed to express their own subjective opinion (Fraenkel & Wallen 2003:59-60). The only point they have to clear up based on own viewpoints was to evaluate whether the studying plan and materials used while teaching writing skill are satisfactory. One has to take into account that there still can be some level of deception that depends on the not quite naturalistic situation of an interview when the participants are asked to talk about teaching processes to a person that does not take part in the described educational process. Deception can work two opposite ways. The first one is when a participant being asked the questions he or she has not been prepared to provides with invalid information; the second one is an attempt to give an impression of a more qualified professional and talk about methods the person actually do not use in terms of the teaching process but definitely are more suitable for it. The problem of deception in this research could not be avoided, so that there has been created a plan to inform the participants beforehand about points they will have to answer, anonymity of the data collected during the interview does not force them to embellish their personal success as teachers and lie about methods used. It has also been important to underline that this case study is not focused on evaluating how effective methods of teaching are, but what actually these methods include and what expectations are set.

The participants have been interviewed in two different ways. Those who were available for meeting personally have been talked to face-to-face, others were interviewed via Skype. According to Holt (2010), while taking an interview at the distance a researcher is not influenced by extratextual factors so the data collected will not include any contextual information, for example, participants' insecurity caused by physical interaction. Furthermore, Hanna (2012) also has studied that interviewees try to avoid potential inconveniences surrounding face-face-to face interviews. Starting with issues caused by travelling long distances and busy schedule and finishing with psychological inconveniences and alienating research objects, these complications can nowadays be reduced by conducting interviews via different research media

4 Results

4.1 Introduction

Results presented in this chapter are the data collected from six in-depth teacher interviews. The interviews primarily focused on methods of teaching English language literacy skills in upper secondary school in Norway and Russia. This section, namely Section 4.1, explains the structure of Chapter 4. Section 4.2 and Section 4.3 present the results obtained in the Norwegian and Russian contexts respectively.

Sections 4.2 and 4.3 have been divided into several subsections, and each of them contains both results about methods of teaching English reading and writing skills in upper secondary school and participants' backgrounds, including their own experiences of learning English literacy at upper secondary school, education and professional experience.

Subsections 4.2.X.1 and 4.3.X.1 include results about the teachers' education, their background connected to the acquisition of English language literacy skills at upper secondary school and their work experience.

Subsections 4.2.X.2 and 4.3.X.2 present results about teaching English reading at the upper secondary level. All the teachers have been interviewed about materials they use for teaching reading skills. The main question concerned methods of teaching reading, and whether there are any complications that need extra attention and improvement, as well as noticeable positive tendencies. The participants explained possible reasons for students' success and failures.

In Subsections 4.2.X.3 and 4.3.X.3, the data about teaching English writing skills at the upper secondary level is presented. The type and number of the questions are the same as in the previous part devoted to the reading skills.

Finally, the last subsections 4.2.X.4 and 4.3.X.4 include the results from the questions about students' preparations for the English language exams at the upper secondary level with the main focus on literacy skills.

In addition, teachers were willing to give feedback according to the number of students in the studying group and probable complications and benefits. Some of them have also talked about studying materials they use and their effectiveness for the education process.

4.2 Participants in the Norwegian context

4.2.1 Teacher 1

4.2.1.1 Educational background and teaching experience

Teacher 1 worked at an upper secondary school and taught the general English course. The teacher's professional experience as an English language teacher was eight years. It is noticeable that the work experience of this teacher was not restricted to the upper secondary level only, but included all levels of schooling.

Education of this teacher was completed in Norway. The teacher's bachelor's degree in English, not based on teaching practice, was reinforced by a one-year study in History and later on - PPU, Practical Pedagogical Education in the English language and History.

Regarding his own experience of acquiring English literacy, the participant could not tell much, because of the amount of time that passed since he had finished school. The English language had been taught on the vocational basis. The interviewee had some English during the first and second years of the upper secondary school. As long as the vocational study was based on communication, the main aim of the English lessons was the development of oral skills. Students were listening to "hørespill på Engelsk" (radio drama) and had some history in the lessons.

The number of students at the upper secondary level the participant taught was 30 in one class. The teacher was responsible for planning the lessons according to the Norwegian governmental standards:

> 'Når det gjelder undervisningsprosessen, kan man velge selv. Vi har grovplanen med forskjellige tema vi må dekke opp i løpet av studieåret. Det er helt opp til meg når og hvordan jeg kommer til å gjør det.'
> 'When it concerns education process, it is free to choose yourself. So we had the main plan for a year with different topics we should cover during the year. That was totally up to me what time and in which way I am going to do it.' (2020, translated by Anastasia Amosenkova)

The main aim of the teaching process was to satisfy the requirements provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Education, Utdanningsdirektoratet. Teacher 1 taught English five hours a week.

4.2.1.2 Reading skills

Teacher 1 tried to use all four types of reading: receptive, reflective, skimming and scanning. This teacher underlined that types of reading vary every time and there is no strict pattern, so that everything depended on text type and tasks given in a book. As long as this participant paid a lot of attention to work with different text types, there was also a variety of interaction between the students. Teacher 1 worked both with long and short texts, that had influence on time used for reading and working with tasks. Even though big stories and novels were more time-consuming, it was beneficial from the point of view of this participant, because it was possible to organize different types of work: individual, in pairs or groups.

Despite the variety of genres, the participants find it significant to connect all types of texts to pre-, while- and post-reading activities. The main task that started the reading process was to scan a text and search some specific information or quickly read-through to create the picture of what that text was about. When students worked with novels the pre-reading activities were to guess what texts were about and define their theme. While-reading activities were focused on work with contents and characters, for example, describing protagonists and antagonists of the story. Post-reading activities included critical analyses of texts.

Even though students were supposed to know the vocabulary used within the topics without extra preparation, Teacher 1 used some handing outs with both authentic texts and translations from Norwegian into English. Such papers could include difficult elements that were unfamiliar to the students or not clear in some contexts. Thus, the participant added one more pre-reading activity to provide the class with sufficient vocabulary.

The interviewee had an idea of even combination of articles and novels from the given syllabus and other reading materials that the teacher found suitable for the topic. Teacher 1 agreed that teaching reading and writing skills should be interconnected and even more, in that case the connection is reinforced by use of whiteboard where the students could see the text while the teacher was reading it aloud and

at the same time the highlighted elements significant for essays were paid attention to.

The participant implied students were rather good readers with decent pronunciation, but the question was how fast they could read. Teacher 1 underlined that individual reading in classroom created complications, because some students could fulfill reading tasks much earlier than others. Text analysis was the most complicated part for the students, which required reflective reading. Moreover, they were not that successful at understanding the elaborated language of novels. Teacher 1 explained the main reason for such complications as differences between the English language and vocabulary in particular students used in their daily life and absolutely different topics given at school, thus they did not have enough words to understand texts, analyze and reflect on them correctly.

4.2.1.3 Writing skills

It has already been mentioned that very little attention was paid to the development of writing skills in Teacher 1's classroom. The participant made handing-outs with examples of correct essays and main constructions that have to be used. Due to the limited amount of time students got an opportunity to write a good introduction with the help of a teacher, but rest was left as homework.

Vocabulary and grammar were not taught separately from the essay-writing process. According to the participant, after finishing the 10th grade all students were expected to have satisfactory grammar and vocabulary level. Anyways, if the teacher noticed some common tendency, the students would go through the most classic fails, but only as addition to the main lesson planning. Teacher 1 said that writing sessions were mostly focused on correcting the teenage "language" and turning it into more "adult" academical that satisfied the given standard. For example, the most common mistake was using "kids" instead of "children" and "buy" instead of "purchase".

Concerning teaching grammar, the participant was trying to organize the lessons in a way that the most significant and complicated grammar rules were refreshed, firstly, in the beginning of the study year. Secondly, the most common grammatical mistakes made during tests, were collected and discussed at the lesson after. During this grammar session Teacher 1 preferred to use blackboard to demonstrate mistakes and correction in the most convenient way and involve all the student in the education process.

In addition to the whiteboard, the interviewee also used ITs Learning software that is generally used at the majority of Norwegian schools and is built up in a way of external drive to give and deliver tasks, have control over grades and upload files and presentations. Teacher 1 told about the lack of time that could be paid to using more IT elements and in-depth studying of grammar and vocabulary.

The most general failures students made, were, firstly, as it has already been mentioned, the use of the everyday language instead of academical, and direct translation from Norwegian to English, which is not suitable for writing essays.

The participant struggled to name any good points that describe students' writing. Furthermore, because teacher was not fond of the most popular social networks, it was hard to claim whether the written language of the students and their success at learning literacy was influenced by their addiction to it. Also, the question devoted to positive tendencies in this sphere has not been described clearly. The main reason for that could be lack of time used for teaching writing, thus students were not capable to perform impeccably.

This interviewee claimed that the amount of time devoted to the development of literacy skills varied and one academic hour at least once a week would focus on teaching reading. At the same time this teacher paid attention to that on the one hand students practiced their writing skills every lesson, if it was connected to memorizing of written elements related to the topic. On the other hand, Teacher 1 is honest about little time given to practicing essay writing. The participant could not say accurately, how long it took, but underlined that it was obligatory to write at least the introductory part.

4.2.1.4 Exam preparation

In Norwegian upper secondary school students have to take the final English language exam in the last year. It is compulsory only for the learners who are randomly picked up for the exam.

Teacher 1 received all information about the exam 48 hours before the date and, what is more, the participant claimed that the Norwegian education system provided them with extra hours to prepare the learners for it.

The teacher preferred to start preparation before the exam date was announced and students were picked up. In April the whole class started working on the previous exam

papers that included both questions and answers, as the examples. The preparation process follows these steps:

1.   the teacher handed out exam papers from the previous years;

2.   the students could study both questions and answers;

3.   the teacher asked the students to give their own answers;

4.   the answers were handed in and checked by the teacher;

5.   the teacher discussed common mistakes with the students: both personally and with the whole class.

24 hours before the final exam, when students get information about who will finally take it, is the preparation day. Teacher 1 met the students early in the morning and they went through all the tasks and text that the Ministry of Education had provided them with before the exam.

In fact, the teacher did not focus specifically on developing the literacy skills, but nevertheless involved mastering writing. In general, all the preparatory work was aimed at revising the given topics.

4.2.2 Teacher 2

4.2.2.1 Educational background and teaching experience

Teacher 2 worked at upper secondary school with focus on vocational studies. The teacher's professional experience as an English language teacher was fourteen years and compared to Teacher 1, this participant taught only at the upper secondary level.

Concerning education, Teacher 2 had the international bachelor's degree, which included one year exchange study in the United States, and the participant had 2,5 years of the English studies out of 4 in total. The interviewee also finished his master's degree at school management at the Norwegian Business School BI. The participant's own experience from studying literacy skills at upper secondary school was related to reading a lot of literary texts of different sizes, both novels and short stories, which were reinforced by watching movies relevant to the topic and helping with understanding of texts; and writing essays. The way the teacher described experience of developing English reading and writing skills at the upper secondary level as "drill" with the very strong perception-production pattern and a drop of reflection. Teacher 2 has specified that there

was no focus on acquiring different genres but only belles-lettres. Concerning writing skills and grammar development students were drilling specific grammar rules and that was planned from before: 'This lesson, this month we are going to work with nouns...or adverbs...or adjectives. We just had a grammar book and did exercises every week based on grammar-translation method'.

During the academic year when the interview was conducted, the participant taught classes consisting of 10 students. Teacher 2 also told that in the beginning they had more than that number of students, but students dropped out and classes were getting smaller. The participant is teaching students aged 16 to 19, but there are some of the age of 24 who come from other countries.

Lesson planning needs to fulfill the government standards and within the school walls the English language teachers have divided topics that will be suitable for the first year of the upper secondary school (VG1) and for the second (VG2). All the topics were still mostly focused on studying the English speaking countries:

'So we have divided, if VG1 are studying other English speaking cultures like the United States, Canada, Great Britain, the United Kingdom and Ireland; and next in VG2 they do like Nigeria, South Africa, Australia and India…'

Concerning the teacher's responsibility for lesson planning, this interviewee did not have to agree with anyone about the lesson structure, but teachers within the English language group talked to each other and cooperated to present their suggestions and find better solutions.

The teacher also introduced the researcher to the diagnostic tests all the students had to take at the beginning of the study year. This test is compulsory and provided by the Norwegian Ministry of Education. Moreover, Teacher 2 had own diagnostic test in the form of a personal letter from the students in order to evaluate the language level and provide with the satisfactory input during the lessons.

Finally, this teacher pointed out that school focused on vocational courses could have students with more widespread level of the English language, for example, if there was a talk about the third world countries where people did not learn the language or had it only for few years. In comparison with the previous participant this teacher spent on teaching literacy approximately 1,5 academic hours a week.

4.2.2.2 Reading skills

Methods of teaching reading skills presented in this subchapter are various. It is important to notice that in this teacher's English language classroom there were students of various levels and the teacher tried to satisfy all the needs. The participant said that it was beneficial to have a smaller class of 10-15 students because it helped to pay attention to all of them during the lesson. The most preferable model of interaction between classmates was groupwork. If Teacher 1 performed reading aloud while students were listening and then gave tasks to read one by one, Teacher 2 decided to involve all the students in the reading process straight away, so they could read taking turns or in small groups. Moreover, this participant found it beneficial, as it provided opportunities to give small corrections immediately. Choice of texts of this participant was similar to Teacher 1, who preferred to use fiction as well as fact articles. Besides using materials given in the textbook the interviewee also used texts from additional sources. The main focus was on short stories.

Tasks used while working with the text were very similar for both teachers. But it is the first participant who was talking about the importance of correct translation and pronunciation. This language classroom used all for types of reading. But Teacher 2 did not imply a lot of pre-reading tasks and finds while- and post-reading activities satisfying enough. Besides that, the interviewee found the tasks based on reflective reading the most important and practiced them a lot.

This teacher found it necessary for the education process to make PowerPoint presentations . Not all classrooms were provided with the whiteboard and different other IT surveillances, but this teacher tried to make the best out of what they actually had.

The most satisfying tendencies that were underlined by this participant were that students were good at reading in terms of fluency and pronunciation and were apparently much more successful at reading than writing. This interviewee also named watching movies, playing computer games and Internet-surfing as the probable cornerstone of that. 'And they have like specific words that I don't know', claimed Teacher 2.

Complications connected with the in-depth and reflective reading were similar for this and the previous participant. The teacher agreed that this issue could be caused by the active use of social networks. This interviewee works at school with the high level of minority students, namely 35%, which can bring up specific complications into the reading

process, such as cultural and language differences cause misunderstanding of the text idea.

4.2.2.3 Writing skills

Teacher 2 talked about an active use of IT resources during the education process. At the beginning of a new study year all the students were asked to demonstrate their writing abilities and knowledge of grammar and vocabulary. This is a test work that helps a teacher to evaluate the average level and adjust the teaching process. For that matter, there is an active use of electronic mail, thus the students send an official letter concerning their student life. It helped them to create a real-life situation of an official conversation and they could demonstrate their abilities as long as this task was adjusted to their experience. Oppositely, the first participant was mostly implying academic standards and requirements hat had to be satisfied, but very unfamiliar to students.

This teacher combines reading and writing sessions, as for example, before reading a new material, students had to work with the vocabulary, read it, translate and write down.

Initially the grammar level of the upper secondary students was rather low and Teacher 2 was honest about seeing no point in spending much time on learning grammar during the last years, if the students did not manage to learn it at the secondary level. This teacher agreed with the first participant about that students were supposed to know the basic grammar rules and apply them on satisfactory level. Anyways, grammar is significant for teaching writing and cannot be completely abandoned. As it has been told, this school had first of all a lot of minority students, and secondly, students that were getting very low grades at the secondary school, and definitely needed extra help. Despite own experience of learning English writing based on drilling, this teacher gave up this method shortly after starting the teaching practice. The main grammar work was connected with face-to-face talk with students and writing down the rules, so they can take a look at them and revise.

During the lesson writing sessions were based on learning how to write correct essays. Handing outs include both work with correct spelling of words and writing in a context; and patterns important for essays, such as introduction, main body and conclusion.

Same as Teacher 1, this one could not mark any points students are good at. That also can be explained by both lack of time and their low language proficiency. The only thing Teacher 2 underlined is students' hard work and will to get to the point.

This teacher is open about the attitude towards the influence of social networks, particularly Instagram, and computer games on the students' written language use. In spite of the moment when these sources can significantly enrich students' vocabulary, wrong grammar and spelling seen and repeated constantly starts seeming as correct. Furthermore, the students were struggling with reflective writing and creating long texts.

4.2.2.4 Exam preparation

The participant underlined that it was common for Norwegian education system that students were picked up for the final English language exam and got all the relevant information 48 hours before the day 'X'.

Teacher 2 thought that the content was the most important element in the exam, that is why the attention was paid to practicing necessary vocabulary and text structures. The students would have to write a reflective essay and it meant that all the handing outs with the significant elements must be revised.

The preparation process was based on correlation between reading the text and watching movies related to the topic, thus the students enriched their knowledge with more relatable content.

Compared to Teacher 1, this interviewee did not spend time for additional preparation during semester but took 8 hours before the exam. What is more, Teacher 2 did not work with the previous exam papers, because the questions could vary, and the most important element was vocabulary and ability of the students to express themselves first orally, during the preparation and then in written, during the exam.

4.2.3 Teacher 3

4.2.3.1 Educational background and teaching experience

Teacher 3 worked at upper secondary school with focus on vocational studies. Compared to the first two teachers, this one did not have a long experience of teaching the English language and had been working only at the upper secondary level for two years. Furthermore, if the previous two participants had already finished their degrees, Teacher 3 had a position of an adjunct, which means that the education was not completed.

The interviewee's experience from learning literacy skills at the upper secondary level was described as 'boring'. Same as Teacher 2, Teacher 3 was talking about pure drilling. Moreover, the participant could not recall a lot of learning of the literacy skills, but there majorly was present the development of the oral skill, based on learning different topics. This is very similar to the experience of the Teacher 1, who had much longer experience and finished upper secondary school earlier but claimed that there was few focus on literacy skills. In addition to it the teacher has expected from students to know the required grammar rules and vocabulary, that was why they were not taught.

This participant had a similar number of students in the English language classroom as the Teachers 2: 15, and also prefered, same as the previous participants, to strictly follow the education standards concerning topics and skills that had to be taught and developed. At the same time this interviewee pointed out that there was no need to make an agreement with other English language teachers working at the same school, which also meant that lesson planning was responsibility of this participant.

Teacher 3 agreed with Teacher 2 concerning the amount of time spent on teaching reading and writing. It took 1,5-2 academic hours a week and a participant tried to include both skills in every teaching session.

4.2.3.2 Reading skills

Teacher 3 did not make the students to work a lot with the pre-, while- and post-reading tasks. The reading process usually took a whole hour and was followed by a group project based on a text students had just worked with. During this reading session the students took turns in reading aloud one-by-one.

This participant mentioned the use of both top-down (text related) and bottom-up (knowledge-related) tasks. For example, finding answers in texts or true-false questions combined with reflexive reading, that could be presented in a project. One of the pre-reading tasks was quick reading-through the text and discussion what the text was about.

Compared to classes of the first two teachers, this class was struggling a lot with intonation and pronunciation.

Generally, the overall information collected from this interviewee was very similar to the one of the second teacher. Students also worked a lot with the unfamiliar words and

constructions while reading the text, but since they probably did not have such a low level of the language, they did not struggle with reflective reading.

4.2.3.3 Writing skills

The main focus of the writing process lay on essays. Students were taught to work with two different essay types: reflective and descriptive. The participant tried to connect teaching with the real-life situations, so students were mostly aware of the point they talk about in the given topic.

Teacher 3 agreed with Teacher 2 in terms of face-to-face discussions of written mistakes, both orally and with the help of making notes. The most effort was put into learning essay-writing and there was little time devoted to teaching grammar and vocabulary separately. Nevertheless, in case some grammatical mistakes seemed to be very common, the participant decided to take a whole hour devoted to discussing of those failures and practical work on them. Teacher 3 worked out the pattern of introducing grammar rules to the learners:

1. showing a sentence containing a mistake;

2. asking what type of mistake it was and if someone were aware of the rule;

3. discussing the rule;

4. students were asked to make up correct sentences.

This participant had similar way of teaching vocabulary as Teachers 1 and 2 by defining around 15 significant words from the topic that had to be learned both orally and in writing.

Furthermore, Teacher 3 did not bring any new information concerning handing out that were used to teach writing: the major part included examples of the correct essay pattern.

Description of the success and failures of the students given by this participant was very shallow. According to the teacher's opinion, students just 'follow the flow' and one of the most common mistakes was translation from the Norwegian language into English that created the incorrect way of writing.

4.2.3.4 Exam preparation

Teacher 3 spent 4 hours on preparing selected students for the English language exam. The learners had two compulsory hours and after that they could go home and continue preparation on their own.

This participant combined the topics given by the Ministry of Education and exam papers from the previous years as the main materials. During this four-hours session the focus lay on the content of the topics given: vocabulary. The students and teacher worked on it in a way of discussion and the learners d for themselves whether they needed to write something down.

In accordance with the first interviewee, this teacher started some preparations beforehand to make the students generally ready for the exam. Teacher 3 paid attention to both answering the questions from the previous years and active development of the grammar awareness. The students had to write an essay, the participant checked all of them and defined the main mistakes, which were discussed with them face-to-face.

The last option for exam preparation was called 'Studieverksted'. If the students thought they were not capable to pass the exam, they could apply for those sessions and work with one teacher for several months. The participant has never had any experience from the 'Studieverksted' so that could not describe the teaching process there.

4.2.4 Summary

Firstly, all the interviewed teachers were educated pedagogues who had at least a bachelor's degree, giving competence in teaching English. Nevertheless, one Norwegian (Teacher 1) initially had a bachelor's degree in linguistics and studied pedagogics as an additional course. Moreover, Teacher 3 was still studying at the university. The teachers gave similar responses regarding their own experiences of studying literacy at upper secondary school. They were talking about drilling the grammar rules and little attention to developing literacy skills.

Secondly, all of the participants presented were of different amount of work experience and worked in different types of schools. In addition to it, one Norwegian teacher (Teacher 1) besides working at the upper secondary level also had experience from primary and lower secondary level. All the interviewees, except Teacher 2, worked with the students of the age group 16-18, while the second participant was dealing with older individuals who had moved to Norway and attended the upper secondary school because of

the insufficient English language level.

Thirdly, the participants focused their teaching aims at satisfying the education standards and prepare student for the final exams. Teaching literacy skills was mostly based on following the given syllabus, preparing additional handing-out and using IT surveillances. Teacher 1 and 3 were talking only about making presentations in front the whole class, but Teacher 2 also found it useful to apply modern methods of Internet communication within the education process; and only Teacher 2 ignored the use of syllabus and makes handing out based on it. The participants preferred to teach reading while working with both long and short texts, adapted and authentic. There was no agreement about what type they preferred more, because every participant found one specific text type more beneficial. Furthermore, they agreed that adopted texts presented in syllabus were related to the students' real life, so that they could get the correct meaning of a text. However, Teacher 1 thought that even if topics were familiar, there were still some complications, especially during post-reading discussions, because some learners did not face some problems personally. Two of three teachers used the whole specter of pre-, while- and post-reading tasks, while Teacher 2 ignored active pre-reading preparation. Nevertheless, all of them developed all four types of reading: scanning, skimming, reflective and receptive, and what is more, though that development of reflective elements were the most complicate for learner, and tried to put extra focus on it. Teacher 1 and 2 practiced activities in pairs and groups, but Teacher 3 prefered to work with the learners one-by-one.

Fourthly, teaching reading skills was based on learning how to write a reflective essay. All the participants in the Norwegian context agreed that it was necessary to develop the correct text structure and vocabulary. Two of them ignored active development of grammar skills as the learners should have already been prepared for it. At the same time Teacher 3 preferred to pay regular attention to the most common grammar mistakes in students' essays.

Finally, all the teachers had a similar system of exam preparation. Teachers 1 and 3 used old exam papers and starts preparing 1-2 month before the day X. Moreover, all three teachers spent some hours the day before exam to prepare the students. One more common thing was that the day before preparation did not include teaching literacy skills, but only repetition of the given topics. Nevertheless, Teacher 3 spent time on correcting grammar errors in the training essays, so the learners could pay more attention to it.

4.3 Participants in the Russian context

4.3.1 Teacher 4

4.3.1.1 Educational background and teaching experience

Teacher 4 got teaching experience from primary, lower secondary and upper secondary level, since in Russia, 1-11 grades can be located in same building. The participant worked at a secondary school with the in-depth study of social- economic disciplines.

Teacher 4 completed a bachelor's degree in pedagogics with the focus on foreign languages in 2017. Right after that the participant started the career as the English language teacher and at the date of interview had already been working for 2 years and 3 months. Concerning the upper secondary students, the participant was working with a relatively small group that consisted of eight students aged 16-17. Moreover, Teacher 2 gave positive feedback about this size of a study group:

'В этом году в моей группе по английскому языку только восемь учеников старшего звена. Это достаточно удобно, так как я могу организовать любой вид деятельности и уделить достаточно внимания всем ученикам. Более того, это положительно влияет на дисциплину в классе, потому что в более младших классах, где я преподаю английский язык, группы по 16 человек, и возникают определенные проблемы.'

'This year I only have eight students of the upper secondary level in the English language classroom. This is rather convenient, because I can organize any kind of work and give enough attention to all the students. Moreover, it influences positively the discipline in the classroom, because at the lower grade where I teach, there are groups of 16 students, that causes some problems' (2020, translated by Anastasia Amosenkova).

The teacher's own experience of studying the English language and particularly literacy at upper secondary level was described as a positive one. The participant did not study foreign languages at an advanced level, but belonged to the group of the strongest students the teacher was mostly focused on. Because Teacher 4 was interested in language

contests and taking the final language exam, during the lesson there were organised different types of work: in groups and pairs and were not only learning the language based on the study books, but also extra materials, such as exam papers and tasks from the university level. Writing and reading skills were mostly taught with the help of drilling grammar rules and vocabulary, writing reflective essays and reading the texts with typical pre- and after-texts tasks.

Curriculum was controlled by the interviewee together with other English language teachers working at the same school and has to satisfy the governmental requirements. All the topics given in the plan were strictly followed and could not be omitted or postponed for the next study year. At the same time this participant was the only person responsible for lesson planning.

Teacher 4 stated that introducing both reading and writing in every English lesson and teaching each skill took approximately 1 hour a week.

4.3.1.2 Reading skills

It has been said in the previous subsection that Teacher 4 was working at the upper secondary school where students did not learn foreign languages in-depth. Moreover, the English language was not actively involved into daily lives of the country's inhabitants that led to rather low literacy level of the students.

As the teachers said: '...а английский: они даже в одиннадцатом классе говорят: "Мне он не нужен, я не поеду за границу". '...and concerning English, even in the eleventh grade they say, I do not need it, I will not travel abroad' (2020, translated by Anastasia Amosenkova).

This teacher applied a strict pattern during the studying session including the main steps that were interconnected:

1. introduction, when students talked about a topic and defined it themselves;

2. main part: worked with new material or practicing the old one;

3. final, when teacher explained homework to students.

Teaching reading and writing skills was at the second and third steps. Main part was developed into several sections and reading took part in the beginning right after introduction, especially while introducing the new topic, and usually reinforced by listening and comprehension. After that there came a big text that majorly belonged to

fiction.

The most popular reading tasks used by Teacher 4 were, firstly, work with new vocabulary as the pre-reading activity. It included not only teaching correct meaning and translation but also offered rephrasing and equivalents the students also could apply later while developing writing. One more pre-reading task was to choose the correct title for a text. Secondly, while-reading activities included task aimed at putting the text part in the correct order and filling the gaps. Thirdly, after reading the students were asked to work with grammar and vocabulary – find correct forms in the text, find a character using given features and give oral or/and written translation.

In addition, the participant said that practicing reading was not limited by several sections in the books. The students also developed their skills while reading aloud different interviews, dialogues and single sentences before they did oral, listening and grammar tasks.

This interviewee tried to involve all four types of reading: receptive, reflective, scanning and skimming, depending on material the class works with. Short texts were mostly connected to in- depth understanding, long texts were focused on overall comprehension.

Texts that were used for teaching reading skills were both authentic by British and American writers and adopted, created by the Russian book authors.

Teacher 4 described a syllabus that must be used for teaching as the book extremely enriched with information and would be suitable for students with a high level of the English language, and students at that school found it very difficult. Otherwise the participant would like to spend much more time teaching reading. Nevertheless, Teacher 4 thought that the materials given in the syllabus were more than enough and there was no need for additional handing-outs. At the same time there were extra texts and tasks related to the topic, that the interviewee found on the Internet or in different syllabus but applied them very seldom.

It happened that the students while working with reading tasks tried to cheat and searched full text and their Russian versions instead of using own knowledge. One more complication related to pronunciation and intonation, that was explained by the fact that students relied on their mother tongue and there was very few attention paid to development of these skills at the secondary level. Rather low productivity in general concerned not only reading but studying the English language in general. The teacher

explained it as the lack of motivation, because students prioritized other subjects over the language and claimed that they did not need English in the future.

One positive moment mentioned is that the students liked reading and tried to do their best, even if some of them made mistakes.

Teacher 4 underlined that if the projector or whiteboard were available, the reading process was reinforced by showing movies following up with related movies for better comprehension of the idea of the written text.

4.3.1.3 Writing skills

Describing the process of teaching writing, the participant also said that planning was very full, and the students did not get as much time for writing as it should be. Attention paid to theory and practice varied from the genre man writes in. For example, on the one hand informal letters did not require much time and effort, because they were taught at the previous grades. On the other hand, descriptive writing was introduced only at the upper secondary level and the teacher focused on that a lot at the cost of time used for teaching other skills.

Concerning writing, the syllabus had tasks of different levels, that prepared students at the in-depth level: rules and main writing patterns were reinforced by tasks on development of different elements. These tasks were similar to the while-reading activities: fill the gaps, put in the correct order and so on. Teacher 4 agreed with the Norwegian participants about interdependence of teaching reading and writing. During the reading part the students worked with the topic vocabulary and its equivalents that was memorized and used for writing. In addition to that, the writing chapter involved even more enriched collections of different synonyms related to text genre, thus students got known to cliché and correct lexical elements.

The students' writings were supported by a "check-list" with the required elements and text features. This plan could be used for both writing a draft and correction of the final work.

In addition to textbook, the syllabus presupposed the use of workbook to work on grammar and vocabulary. Tasks were based on both complete texts and single sentences.

Teaching grammar separately from writing essays was mostly ignored by the teacher. The main grammar tasks were focused on finding the correct word form and

filling a gap in a text.

From the participant's point of view writing was more difficult for students than listening, speaking and reading. The students were not aware of grammar and vocabulary and, moreover, did not know how to use dictionary and grammar sources correctly. The major part of writing practice was given as homework and some students could cheat using external sources, such as Internet. Teacher 4 found it complicated to check and evaluate these works. The students were nevertheless successful with pre-writing tasks, where they must work on already created product.

4.3.1.4 Exam preparation

Teacher 4 claimed that all types of final control works written in Russian schools at the upper secondary level were very similar concerning topics and tasks. Even though this test checks both oral and written skills, the participant told that for some classes they needed to ignore the oral part because of the low English level of students and teacher were motivated to present better results to the Ministry of Education.

The participant put the main focus on grammar and vocabulary that the students had to revise. This final test also includes writing unofficial letter and reflective essay, but Teacher 4 underlined that the students got the profound practice during regular lessons, so preparation session involved only revision of those aspects.

Preparation started two weeks before the control test and during the lessons Teacher 4, first, introduced its structure and after that talked about different elements, paying the major attention to elements of the English writing skills.

Materials used for the preparation lessons included the main syllabus and handing outs. The participant made them using control works from the previous years and other sources such as Internet and related syllabus.

Teacher 4 underlined that the final state exam and the final control tests had the same structure. This interviewee also took part in preparing the students for the state exam. It was not compulsory, but learners who were interested in it got one extra hour every week and preparation could last for 1,5 – 2 years. In this case the participant also focused on teaching writing skills: unofficial letter and reflective essay. The teaching process was based on active practice to produce the correct pieces of text.

This participant had chosen to focus mostly on the writing skills while preparing

the students to the final control test and state exam, because these elements, from the teacher's point of view, contained the highest number of mistakes. Oppositely, fewer attention was paid to the reading tasks, as students manage to do them without many complications.

4.3.2 Teacher 5

4.3.2.1 Educational background and teaching experience

Teacher 5, similarly to the previous one, was teaching English in the secondary school that did not have the in-depth focus on the foreign languages. As an English language teacher this interviewee had been working for 3,5 year and had same education as the Teacher 4.

Teacher 5 agreed with the Teacher 4 concerning own experience of learning writing skills: practice was mostly aimed at writing essays that students were going to have at the final exam. Nevertheless, this participant argued with all the previous ones about developing reading skills. While they were majorly describing reading experience at the upper secondary level as the boring one and mostly based on drilling and blindly following the tasks from books, Teacher 5 mentioned some ways of working with text and vocabulary that were introduced in their classroom. The most noticeable from the participants point of view was translating the text and picking up the significant elements and dividing them into three groups depending on how familiar the students were with the meaning.

Teacher 5 was working with the group that consists of 15 students and was technically the only person responsible for lesson planning but compared to other participants lessons were still under control of the school headmaster and other management. It means that the participant was obliged to demonstrate them the in-depth lesson planning and if it were needed, the head teacher could attend the interviewee's lessons in order to evaluate how effective they were.

This participant used 1 hour a week to teach reading skill. Concerning English writing, that was hard for Teacher 5 to tell how many hours were actually spent on that, but claimed that from time to time it also could take up to 1 hour a week.

4.3.2.2 Reading skills

Teacher 5 agreed with the previous participant about introducing reading into every lesson and connecting it with development of other skills. The whole teaching process was strictly based on the syllabus planning.

Methods this interviewee based the teaching process on were work with text of different genres with pre-, while- and after-reading activities. Furthermore, this participant worked with a whole reading- writing system and did not separate these processes. For example, Teacher 5 could present a grammatical rule that was followed by a short text including that rule and after-reading task asking students to define it in the text. There were all four reading types applied. The most popular tasks were to find the correct variant relying on text information, fill in the gaps and translate from English into Russian. Pre-reading tasks were connected to finding the main idea and topic of the text.

The learners constantly worked not only with fiction and articles, but also read aloud dialogues and learned them by heart. Texts were both authentic and adopted. As long as this participant worked with the same syllabus as Teacher 4, they applied same methods of teaching reading skills.

Teacher 5 claimed that the students had a very low English language level that significantly slowed down the teaching process and there was no time for extra materials within the process of teaching reading.

On the one hand, the learners were good at reading in term of intonation and pronunciation. Furthermore, Teacher 5 noticed the positive tendency in developing the translational skills. The main tasks connected to skimming and scanning usually were done with success. The participant guessed that students had received good reading preparation at the previous level. Others, who were unprepared since secondary level, received extra help from the participant.

On the other hand, the teacher found it problematic to work with tasks that were involving several different skills, for example, if the students were asked to find the correct tense in the text as the after-reading activity. Due to the very low level of students' reading preparation, Teacher 5 had to omit the majority of reflective tasks connected with reading.

4.3.2.3 Writing skills

Teacher 5 was honest about paying few attention to the development of the EFL writing

skills. Anyways, the participant focused on different text genres and preferably on those that were included into the final language exam and control works: essays, formal and informal letters.

If there was some grammar rule described Teacher 5 tried to include the writing activity, when the learners created their own piece of writing based on that grammar rules and text following.

Sometimes, but very rarely this participant used extra grammar task from another reading book that was not included in the main syllabus. The grammar tasks were presented in each module and had few related tasks, mostly about putting a word in a correct form within a whole text.

The participant taught vocabulary more profoundly than grammar. The students learned the module vocabulary by heart and after that had to write down their own texts or sentences using the new words.

This teacher agreed with Teacher 2 in the idea of using e-mail as one of the IT surveillances for teaching writing. The task was to write an official letter using the requires structure, correct grammar and vocabulary. Difference between these two teachers is that the Russian participant used e-mail letters not as the introductory test to evaluate the language level, but as the control task. The participant also mentioned that it would be nice to have more possibilities to use IT technologies in classroom.

Teacher 5 as all other interviewees pointed out structure of letters and essays that includes such elements as introductory words and some necessary vocabulary.

The participant underlined that the learners were good at acquiring vocabulary and spelling it correctly for both unofficial and official writings.

The learners had very low level of the grammar knowledge, claims Teacher 5. They also struggled with reflective essays and reaching the main point in other pieces of writing.

4.3.2.4 Exam preparation

Teacher 5 told that the final control test included several elements of literacy: vocabulary, grammar, reading: both work with tasks after a text and reading aloud, and writing a reflective essay. Preparatory process included same steps and methods as Teacher 4 described.

The participant spent one extra lesson a week preparing the students for the state

exam. As long as the preparation did not take time during the planned lessons, Teacher 5 said that it was possible to work on every task. Preparation started several months before the test and the participant tried to apply as many study materials as possible. However, the teacher was sure that the main syllabus was not good enough for preparation and that is why made own handing-outs with rules and tasks while practicing on control works from the previous years.

Concerning the lesson planning, Teacher 5 tried to go step by step and did not have the strict limit of time that had to be spent on teaching the language skills, the participant found it hard to define the strict flow of preparatory lessons.

4.3.3 Teacher 6

4.3.3.1 Educational background and teaching experience

Teacher 6 worked at school with no in-depth focus on foreign languages. Nevertheless among all the interviewed teachers both from Norway and Russia this one had the least work experience of 1 year and 4 months.

It is also noticeable that this teacher initially did not have pedagogical education. The teacher's bachelor's degree was focused at foreign languages and gave the qualification of a linguist. To become a school teacher this participant has taken extra online degree aimed at providing with the necessary pedagogical skills.

Teacher 6 recalled own experience of acquiring literacy skills at the upper secondary level as the active preparation to exams as long as the majority of the class was planning to choose the English language for the finals. Apart from working with the papers from previous years student also had a grammar book called "Grammarway" that included only grammatical task for developing writing skills, while reading was based on the above mentioned handing outs and materials given in the compulsory syllabus. This interviewee also agreed with other participants who have described their experience as nothing more than plain drilling.

The number of students that Teacher 6 worked with was 18 and according to the participants' opinion this was quite a lot and smaller number would be more beneficial.

No had control over lesson planning, but sometimes more experienced teacher could visit the lessons and give some advice after. The main aim for Teacher 6 was to

satisfy the government education standard and provide students with the sufficient knowledge, so that they could successfully perform at the exams and control tests.

This teacher same as Teachers 2,3 and 4 spent two hours a week devoted to developing literacy skills, one hour equally for reading and writing.

4.3.3.2 Reading skills

Teacher 6 spent same amount of time on teaching reading skills as other participants but did not agree with them in terms of spending only little time from each lesson. Relying on the planning in syllabus, the students must spend the whole lesson studying reading.

Methods, used by this participant varied from text types, but same as Teachers 1,2,4 and 5 this participant also applied three main stages: pre-, while- and post-reading. Pre-reading tasks included work with texts scanning, introducing the author and discussing the possible idea of the text and its genre. While-reading tasks were aimed at not only at understanding the content and translation, but also at students' correct perception of the main meaning and purpose. Post-reading activities involved same tasks as described by Teacher 4 and reflection on the idea given in a text.

The students worked very often in pairs, evaluate each other's reading skills and even gave grades. In order to check the correctness and objectivity Teacher 6 also chose some students after them and asked them to read aloud.

The teaching process followed strictly topic planning in the syllabus. This interviewee used different book than Teachers 4 and 5 but anyways supported the idea that the syllabus was enriched enough to develop literacy skills. Compared to the teaching practice of the previous interviewee, this participant worked with more broaden variety of genres of both adopted and authentic texts. The latter included different magazines articles and scientific works as well as fiction. This teacher claimed that adopted texts were much easier to work with because they contained ideas and involved readers in situations familiar and popular among the age group of upper secondary students.

In comparison to the previous interviewee, Teacher 6 did not find work with long and short text equally beneficial:

'Если честно, я люблю работать с длинными текстами….появляется возможность дать много разных заданий, и ученики более заняты, работая с

ними.'

'Actually, I like to work with long texts that with short….it possible to make a lot of different tasks and the students are more occupied with working on them.' (2020, translated by Anastasia Amosenkova)

Teacher 6 defined positive tendencies in those types of reading when the students were not asked to work on the in-depth reading: skimming and scanning. Furthermore, this teacher was satisfied with student' ability to learn new words and described their vocabulary as enriched.

Receptive and reflective reading turned out to be the most complicated for the students. According to the participant, they seemed to be indifferent and that is why could not express themselves or even create any opinion about any described problem. The teacher mentioned as well, that the students were not motivated to put enough effort into learning the language and they seemed to be lazy and not hard working while doing homework but more productive under the pressure during lessons. In addition to it the participant agreed with the previous interviewee that the students had problems with intonation and pronunciation: said all the sounds in the Russian manner. After being asked about the possible reason for that Teacher 6 started talking about two possible reasons: firstly, wrong pronunciation of the students influence by TV and Internet or computer games, and secondly, the influence of the adopted English words and phrases. Moreover, students were not motivated to be more active in learning the language because they were sure it would not be useful for them in the future and they were not taking the final English language exam.

This teacher underlined that it was impossible to use IT technologies teaching EFL literacy, because classrooms were not equipped enough and teachers had the access only to one PC to work with.

4.3.3.3 Writing skills

Teacher 6 agreed with other participants about teaching writing every lesson, and said that not only specifically writing tasks aimed at creating essays or learning grammar and vocabulary were suitable for that, activities connected with other aspects of the English language also were beneficial: for example, working on reading and doing tasks in writing.

The students were working on different text genres, which made the writing process like the one described by Teacher 1. The main genres were an unofficial letter-response, official letters and reflective essays. Teacher 6 helped students to create memory-cards explaining the main rules and elements of written texts. Mostly, it included structure and some significant words that must be memorized. The positive thing, according to the interviewee, was that topics learners must write about were adopted to their age problematics.

Learning vocabulary had two steps: first one included learning translation; and second one was devoted to use of words in writing within sentences.

Grammar skills were addressed in the main textbook but no specific grammar rules were described, says the participant. In this case Teacher 6 made additional handing outs using different syllabus. The most popular tasks were connected to use of words in a correct form within a whole text. The idea of such texts depended on the topic but must be familiar to the students. The interviewee supported the idea of the Norwegian teachers about collecting the most common grammar mistakes were presented on a screen to be sure that the whole class revised rules simultaneously.

The good points about reading were, firstly work with unofficial letters, where students did not need to use the "adult" vocabulary, basic grammar and met an easy text structure. Moreover, there was no extra effort to make up own thoughts as long as a letter was based on answering clear task questions. Concerning other genres, the learners were good at organizing a well-structured text including all main elements.

Nevertheless, the students were not successful at writing official letters and reflective essays, because they were not used to applying the academic style instead of daily vocabulary and grammar presented in such types of texts is more complicated in comparison to unofficial letters. This teacher also underlined the most common problem described by all participants: students could not work on reflective writing in a proper way with the lack of suitable vocabulary and motivation. But compared to reading, the students seemed to be a little bit more productive in writing. The teacher guessed that not that strict requirements were the main reason.

4.3.3.4 Exam preparation

Teacher 6 told that not all upper secondary students were taking the final English state

exam, nevertheless, the final control work was compulsory for everyone. The participant said that this work included all the aspects that present in the exam and preparation process was actually similar.

It was up to the teacher to define how long time before the control work the students should start active preparation, but usually it happened a couple of weeks before. The control work included these literacy aspects: writing an essay and informal letter, reading a text and tasks focused only on lexical and grammatical knowledge.

The participant said that teachers were not informed about topics that are included in the control work, so it was pointless to use the lesson syllabus. Anyways, Teacher 6 tried to teach students how to do the basic tasks, so prints handing outs that included control works from the previous years.

The participant found it hard to say what the students should mostly focus at while preparing for the final control test, and underlined that classes had students with different level of language and their own opinion played a role to decide what could be highlighted or ignored during preparation.

The participant said that the school was responsible for making tasks given in the control test: both the English language teachers and other employees with relevant qualification. The school had come up to a decision about excluding essay from the control work and keeping only informal letter, so that this aspect of English literacy was not trained during the preparation. The reason for that was limited amount of time given during the test.

Teacher 6 said that results of the control test showed that the students performed much better in literacy aspects than oral. Mistakes were usually found in grammar.

Preparation for the final state exam in English started from the first year of the upper secondary school and lasted for two years. All students who were interested in taking this exam, had one extra lesson (45 minutes) every week. The main materials used were examples and exams from the previous years available on the Internet.

4.3.4 Summary

The Russian participants had very similar amount of work experience and education, all of them worked with students of different grades at schools that did not have in-depth learning of the English language. All of them have already finished university with the

degree in teaching the English language. They described own experience of acquiring English literacy as a process based on preparation for the final state exam. At the same time, one participants highlighted that their teacher was interested in working with more active and successful students. At school, Teacher 4 and 6 learned the language applying active drilling, but oppositely, the third participant described the English teacher as a person who was involving various teaching methods. Two interviewees from Russia worked with classes of 15-18 students but commented on it as rather high amount that was complicated to work with.

The next step was to present results from teaching English reading and writing skills. The participants had very structured lessons and lesson plan was based on the syllabus. Both individual and group work was used. They agreed that syllabus that should be used for the English lessons at the upper secondary level, was full of information and did not require much reinforcement from external sources.

All participants used four reading strategies: scanning, skimming, reflective receptive reading. They also involved pre-, while- and post-reading tasks while working with every text. The teachers focused on pronunciation, speed and clarity of reading, so made the students practice a lot with reading aloud. Participants defined that they applied both authentic and adopted texts of different length. Nevertheless, syllabus mostly included adopted ones with thematic familiar to teenagers. The teachers had different opinions about texts of what length are more beneficial to work with, but at the same time claimed that students had complications with reflection and getting the main idea.

The Russian teachers tried to combine teaching different language skills, so that writing never went separately from reading. The interviewees did not ignore grammar and vocabulary and said that the given syllabus had enough tasks to develop them. Teaching writing skills was focused on creating reflective essays and letters. For that purpose, all three teachers made handing outs including structures and main elements.

While interviewing teachers in the Russian context, the researcher did not collect much data concerning the IT surveillances used in classroom. The most common answer was that school did not provide them with enough whiteboards, projectors, screens and PCs. The teachers tried to use presentations whenever it was possible but not on the regular manner. What is more Teacher 6 also applied modern tools of online communication.

The final state exam preparation started long time before the date. Some teachers talked about 2 academic years' time, when the students had one hour a week to attend the

language class. The structure of the final exam and control test were given by the ministry of education, but teachers were allowed to make some changes in the latter in order to present the better grades. While preparing for both test and exam, the teachers used materials that contained tasks examples and focus was not on teaching reading and writing from the bottom, but revising the already studied elements and working on applying them in practice.

5 Discussion

5.1 Introduction

As the only research method, teacher interviews have provided the researcher with a significant amount of information concerning approaches to teaching English language literacy at the upper secondary level. The given findings are discussed in this chapter in connection with literature reviewed in Chapter 2. In addition to it, teaching English literacy during the preparation for the final language exams and control tests is also discussed in this chapter.

This chapter addresses the main research question: 'To what extent do the EFL teachers' approaches to teaching English language literacy at the upper secondary level in the Norwegian context differ from the Russian one?', and discusses six sub-questions. Thus, the discussion is divided into sections that are related to each sub-question. Firstly, Section 5.1 analyses and compares the amount of time the participants spend on teaching literacy skills in both contexts. Secondly, Section 5.3 addresses the question how the participants teach English literacy in the Norwegian context. This section includes four subsections, which discuss teaching reading skills, teaching writing, teaching literacy during the final exam preparation and use of IT technologies. Thirdly, Section 5.4 highlights the main tendencies in the Russian context and includes same sub-sections.

5.2 Time devoted to teaching English literacy in both contexts

This subsection analyses how the Norwegian and Russian participants include teaching literacy into their lesson planning.

To begin with, it is significant to state that the Norwegian participants stated that they had more freedom concerning planning their EFL lessons in comparison with the Russian participants. In the Norwegian context, it was allowed to follow the topics in the way a teacher or teachers (working in the same school) thought it was most appropriate and suitable for the level of the students. Moreover, the participants claimed that at the beginning of a study year students wrote tests that depicted the average level of the class, so that a teacher could adjust planning and strategies. In terms of the Russian context, the

teachers did not include this type of tests, but at the same time there definitely existed other ways of defining the level of the students, as long as the teachers were speaking about teenagers of different capacities. The Russian participants seemed to follow the lesson planning more strictly, when the topics were compulsory and could not change their places.

Furthermore, all participants were asked about how many hours of EFL they had during a study week and how much time they usually spent teaching reading and writing skills in particular.

Even though this is a qualitative study, the researcher finds more convenient to organise the information about teaching hours in a table (see Table 1).

Table 1: Including EFL literacy in the EFL lessons at upper secondary level in the Norwegian and Russian contexts

Teacher	EFL hours a week	Teaching EFL reading	Teaching EFL writing
Teacher 1	5	approx. 1 academic hour	not defined, very few according to teacher's opinion if it concerns essay writing; and every lesson if it concerns writing down words and notes
Teacher 2	3	1 academic hour	1 academic hour
Teacher 3	3	1 academic hour	1 academic hour
Teacher 4	3	1 academic hour	1 academic hour
Teacher 5	3	1 academic hour	max. 1 academic hour
Teacher 6	3	1 academic hour	1 academic hour

Before discussing the time spent on teaching EFL literacy in each context, it should be mentioned that neither in Norwegian nor in Russian schools teachers were responsible for how many EFL lessons they had per week. Teachers 1, 2 and 3, as well as Teachers 4, 5 and 6, are under the governmental control and the Ministry of Education regulates the number of academic hours. Teacher 1 worked at upper secondary school with general studies while other Norwegian participants taught at upper secondary schools with vocational studies, namely "yrkesfag". According to Udir, vocational studies have English

for 2 years and nearly twice as less for a single study year (84 hours in Vg1 and 56 hours in Vg2) as compared to general studies with EFL strictly planned by the Norwegian Ministry of Education only during the Vg1 (140 hours). [5]

In terms of the Russian education system, the participants did not teach at schools with the in-depth studying of the EFL, and according to the standards provided by the Russian Ministry of Education and Science, amount of EFL is 3 hours per week. [6]

Nevertheless, participants were responsible for lesson planning and decided how many hours they could spend on teaching literacy skills. Concerning the Russian context, it was more even: each teacher spent approximately 1 academic hour or 45 minutes on each literacy skill. So teaching writing, as well as reading, takes the third part of the whole week planning.

Norwegian participants agreed with the Russian ones concerning vocational studies and spent the same amount of time on literacy. Nonetheless, it was clear that Teacher 1, working with general studies, paid less attention to the development of literacy skills because of, as the participant claimed, "very few writing hours" and approximately 45 minutes reading with 5 academic hours of EFL a week.

5.3 Teaching English literacy in the Norwegian context

5.3.1 Reading skills

To begin with, all Norwegian participants paid attention to the process of vocabulary teaching, but only if it concerned unfamiliar lexical items. New words were presented as part of the pre-reading activity and were, firstly, presented without a context. Students were expected to refer a word to the text and define its inner shape in the given context. The teachers clearly supported the both explicit and implicit ways of teaching vocabulary, but that supported both Crack and Lockhart's (1975) and Schmidt's (1993) theory of language awareness (Carter and Nunan 2001:44). Teachers wanted the students to acquire new vocabulary items shaped in a list in order to, firstly, be ready to meet them in a text

---

[5] The information was provided by the official Web-Site of the Norwegian Ministry of Education, Udir. https://www.udir.no
[6] The information was provided by the official Web-Site of the Russian Ministry of Education and Science, Minobr.http://www.minobr.orb.ru

and, secondly, that was actually more related to teaching writing, to learn words and collocations by heart and apply them in essays. Setting up clear purposes the teachers developed a strategy of intentional learning, which was presented in Schmidt's work. Moreover, he underlined that in controlled studies the process of intentional learning, when the purpose and instruction were clearly presented to students, was much more effective than incidental learning (Schmidt 1993:208).

While teaching vocabulary, the Norwegian teachers followed the idea of Krashen (1998), which was later supported by Harmer (2004), namely that the most complicated about teaching the language corpora was that one word or expression could have several meanings. So the main strategy of teaching vocabulary was working with words within a text. Moreover, participants also introduced the students to unfamiliar or complicated elements before they started reading. Moreover, in line with suggestions by Cummins (1999) and Herrel (2004), all the participants worked on reading vocabulary, as their students were exposed to the new words and phrases they were going to or had already come across while reading a text. Working on that part of reading instruction, the Norwegian teachers followed the idea by Mukoroli (2011:7-8) and prevented the possible problems with reading comprehension.

Despite the active work on vocabulary, the teachers mostly focused only on word connotations instead of having an in-depth introduction to the whole spectre of features, including the semantic associates, which were presented by Mukoroli (2011:13). In addition to it, students at the upper secondary level were expected to be aware of the main lexical constructions, thus the teachers did not find it necessary to focus on the whole word structure.

Mukoroli (2011:27-32) presented many methods of teaching vocabulary in the EFL classroom and defined teaching lexical chunks as one of the most effective way of teaching EFL vocabulary. According to the interviews, it can be claimed that the teachers in Norwegian upper secondary schools were focused on developing the vocabulary knowledge using this method in addition to practicing language in use.

The teachers in the Norwegian context followed the idea, which was also presented by Mukoroli (2011), that learning the English language vocabulary could confront with the student's mother tongue and culture that resulted in having the strong Norwegian accent while reading a text aloud, or not being successful at reflective reading, because the themes of texts were not always familiar to them and they did not have sufficient active "adult"

vocabulary.

It is clear from the given results that the Norwegian participants had to teach students of different levels and capacities, and they tried to adjust the study process according to the level of the majority.

It is significant to mention what types of reading skills the Norwegian teachers were focused on. Based on Nunan's (1999) work, there are four different types: receptive, reflective, skimming and scanning. As the results have shown, the teachers tried to work on different texts and tasks, so that all the reading types could be developed. At least two of the three participants supported this idea, whilst Teacher 2 ignored a wide variety of pre-reading tasks and introduced only vocabulary. Furthermore, the participants employed different reading strategies, discussed by Wiland (2000:189-190), such as the basic bottom-up and the more advanced top-down reading, depending on tasks given. Bottom-up reading, according to Nunan (1999), did not develop an in-depth understanding of a text and was suitable for skimming and scanning, which was used by the Norwegian teachers. In spite of the fact that they used different reading types, the highest focus was on the understanding of the text idea, main characters and problematics, thus working on receptive reading. In addition to that, students were involved in active practice of expressing their opinions towards texts, which revealed the point of reflective reading.

Relying on the list of the "good" reading tasks elaborated by Nunan (1999), the researcher could conclude that the Norwegian participants used several elements from this list, such as challenging or authentic texts; rhetorical and topical framework; mixture of oral, silent and rereading; reading in groups and pairs, which contributes to interaction between the students; text analyses and interpretations; and critical reading.

Moreover, the data received during the ongoing research agrees with Brevik's (2015) study, devoted to developing reading comprehension in Norwegian upper secondary schools. Her main conclusion was that teachers had started paying much attention to reading and comprehension enabling the Sherlock Holmes mode. The results of this research confirm this fact. The participants put definitely much effort into shifting from reading without comprehension to thinking on the text ideas. Unfortunately, in terms of this research it was impossible to distinguish whether teachers in vocational programmes were more encouraged to teach reading and comprehension.

5.3.2 Writing skills

The Norwegian participants mostly agreed with each other concerning teaching reading skills and reading vocabulary, and it was expected that the same tendency would be kept for teaching writing.

The only difference is that on the one hand, two participants preferred to follow the academic standards while teaching essay-writing, thus their students found it complicated to express their opinions. Oppositely,   Teacher 3 also involved ideas that were more familiar to students along with the education plan, thus trying to raise their motivation and productivity.

The development of writing skills includes the development of elements, such as grammar and vocabulary. In the Norwegian context the students were expected to have a sufficient level of vocabulary. Thus, there was very little time devoted to learning new words. Nevertheless, attention was paid to the most complicated elements, especially when it concerned essay writing. In this way, the teachers did not support either explicit or implicit strategies of teaching vocabulary, but rather combined both of them, following the idea of Carter and Nunan (2011). The most important aim of the writing activities during the EFL lessons at upper secondary school in Norway was to get prepared for essay writing. It meant that the students needed both awareness of the suitable "adult" vocabulary and correct spelling. Thus, the explicit model was responsible for the former and implicit for the latter.

A feature, such as 'language corpora' (Harmer 2004:16), was discussed much during the interviews. All students at this level were supposed to have an enriched vocabulary, so the teachers worked only on especially complicated or new elements.

In the Norwegian context, there could be traced interconnectivity of reading and writing activities. As discussed above, during the lessons, the teachers paid much attention to reflective reading and writing down the most significant information that could be used for the final language exam. As a result, there were common fields between the reading and writing vocabulary (Cummins 1999, Herrel 2004). Same lexical items could be recognised in a text, written down for further studying and applied for an exam essay. Mukoroli (2011) underlined the importance of vocabulary development for the production and comprehension, which made this bipartite approach convenient for the development of writing skills through reading.

Concerning focus on teaching the whole-word structure in the EFL classroom,

Norwegian teachers left it as the responsibility of the secondary level.

It is clear that vocabulary learning was included in both reading and writing sessions. As inclusion in the introductory task before a text vocabulary seemed to be different and more profound compared to the essay vocabulary. To begin with, during reading and writing sessions, students were taught to give their own feedback or reflect on the given topic. According to the interviews, reflective reading did not include the strict pattern or rules on how the correct answer looked like. Even though the Norwegian students were expected to practice extensive reading and extensive viewing at home, the struggles were caused by differences between the target vocabulary required by the curriculum, and the vocabulary they acquired outside the classroom (Siyanova-Chanturia and Webb 2016).

Oppositely, writing sessions included strict patterns of reflective essays and the most important lexemes are those that "shaped" a piece of writing such as introductory words and phrases typical for this type of writing. It was logical to raise a question about how students were taught to make a logical reflective speech and apply thematic vocabulary during the writing session. In this case one could talk again about the above mentioned co-development of reading and writing vocabulary (Mukoroli 2011), which enriched each other.

Lexical chunks are, according to Mukoroli (2011), representation of vocabulary in use. In terms of this study, the participants paid attention to the 'typical functional language use,' which could be supported by teaching the patterns that were typical for topics of essay-writing at the upper secondary level. Furthermore, topic vocabularies were also taught with the help of the method of contextualization, when single words the students were introduced to during the pre-reading activities, were presented as "living" elements within the texts' 'organism (Mukoroli 2011).

Nowadays, there exist several strategies of teaching grammar. Despite the fact that, according to Ur (2012), the grammar translation method was leading during a long period of time, it was not supported in the Norwegian context. Of course, the participants followed the rules of the "standardised" English language, but they chose the communicative approach. During the interviews none of them mentioned 'presentation-practice-production' method, even though two claimed that it was preferred by their EFL teachers. Writing practice at the upper secondary level in Norway was based on writing reflective essays, as the part of the final language exam. As it followed from the

interview, the teachers developed the grammar knowledge from the functional use of the English language. The communicative approach plays a leading role in the Norwegian context, and despite the suggestions given by Fazal, Ahmad and Majoka (2017) and Shih-Chuan Chang (2011) about combining it with the grammar-translation approach, it has benefits in Norwegian education. In this context the English language is the frontier between the EFL and ESL (Rindal 2014). More attention is paid to English as the tool for communication, which is developed by creating the 'real-life' situation both inside and outside the classroom. Positively, students enrich their knowledge via 'learning by doing', enrich experience of communicating and get immersed in the cultural cluster (Brumfit 2000).

The process of teaching grammar was focused on controlling the most common mistakes and repetition of the rules. Pre-writing activities did not include introduction into the English grammar. Relying on the data collected, the researcher could create the common pattern of involvement of e grammar into the writing process: during the first stages students were taught about the most important elements regarding grammatical correctness in essay writing. After that they worked on the structure and content of essays either by themselves or with the help of a teacher. Students had fixed deadlines for delivering their works. Further on it was the teacher's turn to check the correctness. Consequently, if there happened to be some typical grammar errors, it could be either discussed with the whole class or taken up personally with each student. Grammar teaching in the Norwegian context was found on the *focus on form* approach (Long 2000, Yu 2013). This approach did not interrupt the flow of the 'natural communication' and was beneficial for both teachers and their students in terms of teaching with the basis on communicative skills (Yu 2013).

The last point cleared up that the participants preferred the communicative approach, but with the constant focus on grammar. This way they agreed with Ur (2012), who claimed that it was more effective to combine functional use of English with explicitly taught grammar. Teacher 3 could be called as the best example for that, because this participant used extra time from the lesson to inductively find grammatical mistakes in a text by giving the students an incorrect example, introducing or repeating the rule and working on it by giving a task to build correct sentences.

According to Ur (2009:87-90), there are three approaches to teach grammar based on explicit and implicit methods. After analysing the role of teaching grammar in the

Norwegian participants' lesson planning and the way they organised the teaching process, it can be concluded that they taught EFL implicitly with explicit attention to grammar applying the "focus on form" method. Its distinctive features are: grammar teaching only in case of need, and in terms of this research the participants pay attention to it only of there are mistakes; spontaneity, that it typical for the participants who do not have grammar teaching on a regular basis; and not encountering in the main lesson planning, that is explained by several reasons, such as few time left for writing sessions or teachers' expectations to see the well-built at a secondary level grammar basis.

While teaching essay writing the Norwegian participants definitely focused on the correctness of the final result, and by correcting the mistakes between handing-ins they expected to see the positive progression. The whole teaching process was focused on work with the whole piece of text. The teachers did not follow step by step from word to a sentence, but taught how to create correct pieces of writing from scratch. It has been said already that the Norwegian upper secondary students should have enough experience from work with "blocks" that build up a whole text, before they enter upper secondary school. There the participants applied already existing knowledge and tried to combine their original thoughts and knowledge with the help of pre-prepared essay structures and extracts from the syllabus and handing outs. Because essay writing was a significant part of the final English language exams, the teaching process was focused on a successful final result but doing it gradually with interim products and handing-ins, supporting the process approach (Nunan 1999). Because this approach presupposed progressive improvement of the writing skills, in terms on the EFL classroom in Norway based on the interview results, the students could get closer to an absolutely correct essay by both "learning by doing" and following the templates presented in a study book or by a teacher. As the result, it could be stated that the Norwegian participants followed the top-down approach, where students learned from their mistakes, but at the same time provided with essay schemes and the most significant elements, that should be included into students' works (Nunan 1999:272-274).

From Hoverak's (2006) point of view, argumentative writing in Norway could be successfully taught with the genre-pedagogical approach. In this research, the Norwegian participants claimed to use different templates and handing outs presenting the correct shape and structure of a reflective, argumentative or descriptive essay. So the participants were also representatives of the genre-pedagogical approach, which, according to

Hoverak's study (2016), had positive influence on the development of writing skills.

5.3.3 Exam preparation

While talking about exam preparations, the Norwegian participants focused on the final English language exam, which was compulsory only for some students that are chosen randomly. The interviews did not present only one tendency of applying teaching EFL literacy for exam preparation, because the teachers presented different opinions concerning this point.

On the one hand, two of the three Norwegian participants agreed about preparation beforehand when the main focus was on essays. In addition to tasks from the compulsory syllabus they offered work with previous exam papers as the examples. Such preparation started a couple of months before the exam. At the same time, these participants ignored practicing EFL reading during that period. Moreover, minimum 24 hours before the exam, they were obliged to provide extra preparation to the students who were selected for the English language exam. During topic revisions and essay writing, one teacher also included grammar and vocabulary, but in comparison with regular EFL lessons, the preparation session did not involve any new elements and was based on revising and correcting the mistakes, while talking face-to-face to each student. So especially grammar teaching was up to the teacher. So two teachers worked on practicing process writing or 'learning by doing' (Nunan 1999:272). Moreover, they based the preparation process on the genre-pedagogical approach (Horverak 2016:98-110), when the students got writing instruction only related to the given exam tasks.

On the other hand, the third participant excluded working with the previous exam papers from the preparatory session. This teacher did not include additional elements to lesson planning. Furthermore, one can trace disagreement between the above mentioned participants and this teacher concerning the importance of the reading practice during the exam preparation. The main preparatory session before exam, had the focus shifted from exclusively writing skills to including receptive and reflective reading (Nunan 1999:251), supported by the active use of digital tools, for example showing movies and videos related to the topic. This participant did not exclude working with grammar and vocabulary. Right before the exam they made the students revise topic vocabulary. If one participant was mostly focused on writing vocabulary, another participant worked mostly

with reading by going through topical texts, listening vocabulary by watching topic-related videos, and speaking vocabulary by giving the students tasks to reflect on the given problem or give a description of something (Cummins 1999, Herrell 2004). Grammar teaching during exam preparations was based, first of all, on error correction, which is supported by Ur (2012). If one participant aimed at written grammar, the second one was sure that it was enough to focus on spoken grammar (Harmer 2004:14).

5.3.4 Technology in EFL literacy teaching

The Norwegian participants had different experiences concerning using the IT technologies in the educational process. Summarizing the data, the researcher can state that first of all, the participants used the online facilities in order to make students work on tasks more conveniently. They were no longer forced to do handwriting, but worked with different multifunctional programs to create written texts and presentations, and were obliged to be registered in the school portal in order to deliver homework and have access to the newest information the teacher provided them with. According to Levy (2012:281-282) and Alqahtani (2019),such use of the IT technology was beneficial for the education process, and development of writing skills in general.

Moreover, the teachers in the Norwegian context agreed about the effectiveness of the use of the projector. This technology was claimed to be applied during the wide spectre of activities, for example while watching movies as visual support during reading and comprehension, work with grammar rules and mistakes, and presentation of new vocabulary. The researcher concluded that the Norwegian teachers found the projector as a tool that was suitable for any classroom size and any class with different levels of students' abilities. Furthermore, one participant also mentioned e-mail as a tool to check students' writing skills, including grammar and vocabulary.

5.4 Teaching English literacy in the Russian context

5.4.1 Reading skills

The Russian participants agreed regarding paying attention to teaching new English vocabulary to students. The most part of the EFL vocabulary, according to the interviews,

was learnt under the teacher's control and was included into lesson planning to be practiced on a regular basis. For instance, it was the most common task in the pre-reading activity. Following the Carter and Nunan's (2001) division of the vocabulary teaching strategies, the researcher could sum up that the participants in the Russian context supported implicit learning. Following the idea of Schmidt (1993) and his theory of language awareness their model of teaching reading vocabulary was based on conscious learning depending on the words' meaning and their inner shapes rather than leaving the outer graphological shape as the main preference (Carter and Nunan 2011:45). This was the first element where the Russian participants agreed with the Norwegian teachers. Moreover, in the EFL classroom in Russia same as in Norway, much more attention was paid to controlled intentional learning, rather than incidental (Schmidt 1993:208).

Vocabulary teaching was not limited only to presenting a list with new words and phrases, but included teaching synonyms and equivalents. As Mukoroli (2011) claimed, teachers included the introduction into the whole word structure, which also was limited by the needs of lesson planning and involved only useful elements for further use.

The Russian participants introduced new vocabulary shaped by the contextual meaning, so that students got familiar with lexical chunks. This method was introduced by Mukoroli (2011:22), who claimed that this was one of the most effective methods, because students practiced language in use instead of learning only single words.

Summing up, it could be stated that the Russian participants did not separate reading and writing vocabularies (Cummins 1999; Herrell 2004), and topic vocabulary was one of the main sources for writing.

Moreover, vocabulary teaching implied challenges in the EFL classroom in Russia, as well as in Norway. Two of the three participants from Russia agreed that working with English vocabulary caused complications because students tried to compare it to the mother tongue and thus got confused concerning the breadth and depth of vocabulary. This point was emphasised in Mukoroli's (2011:41-42) work, where he discussed challenges for vocabulary teaching in the EFL classroom. Moreover, one Russian teacher pointed out that the influence of TV, Internet, computer games and social media also could negatively influence the students' ability to work successfully with English words. In this study it is hardly possible to take the last point for the absolute truth, because it requires extra data collected, especially from the students. Nevertheless, the researcher finds it necessary to be mentioned, because it can be good basis for the further development of this study.

Based on the interviews, EFL reading practice at Russian upper secondary schools included work with different types of texts. All teachers included pre-, while- and post reading activities, that were connected to four types of reading: receptive, reflective, skimming and scanning (Nunan 1999:251). All three participants paid attention that all types of activities were included in the reading process and worked on their development. So they agreed with the teachers in the Norwegian context and, what is more, also underlined that types of reading depended on the tasks provided in the syllabus or additional handing-outs. In his work, Wiland (2000:189-190) determined two types of reading approaches: bottom-up and top-down. Relying on the results received from the interviews it must be noticed that teachers developed different reading techniques and provided their students with the varieties of tasks focused on both close and surface reading. Nevertheless, the highest amount of attention was paid to reflective reading and text analysis, as well as working with extracting bits of information from the text. Thus, it means that the Russian participants preferred the top-down approach, while they sometimes worked on reading techniques and correct pronunciation based on the bottom-up approach, including tasks, such as reading aloud.

In terms of Brevik's (2015) study, devoted to the development of reading comprehension in Norwegian upper secondary school, it has been claimed that more teachers in the Norwegian context tried to follow up with the Sherlock Holmes mode of reading (Brevik 2015:215-217). After studying the results concerning the Russian context, it can also be stated that the Russian participants were actively promoting reading and text comprehension instead of using only the Nike Mode (Brevik 2015:215-217).

All Russian participants underlined that students encountered different obstacles while practicing in-depth and reflective reading. That was very similar to the obstacles the Norwegian participants mentioned. In this case, the Russian teachers blamed, first of all, social networks and, secondly, the lack of active vocabulary in English that could be relevant to the topics.

5.4.2 Writing skills

Teaching EFL writing in Russian upper secondary school took much less time, compared to teaching other literacy and oral skills, according to the Russian teachers. Nevertheless, the teachers tried to provide students with as profound knowledge as possible.

The Russian participants expected the students to be aware of the most part of writing vocabulary (Cummins 1994, Herrel 2004) and main grammar rules from the previous study years, but nevertheless included in their planning such elements as teaching grammar and vocabulary.

Russian upper secondary students were provided with writing vocabulary from the main syllabus. Even though Mukoroli (2011:7-8) defined four different types of vocabulary related to each literacy and oral skills, the Russian participants agreed that these elements could not exist and function separately. Especially concerning teaching literacy skills they tried to involve the topic vocabulary and words or phrases from the text into the writing process. Moreover, they kept track on students' progress by giving them tests on the topic vocabulary, thus they could check both correct spelling and definition. These facts hint at that the teachers did not prefer either explicit or implicit model of vocabulary learning that was described by Carter and Ninan (2011), but rather combined them. The researcher explains such combination by teachers' requirements for perfect acquisition of both graphological shapes and connotations.

Tasks connected to learning the new words were aimed at both reading and writing vocabularies and that means that the Russian participants generally paid attention not only to translation of the elements from Russian to EFL, but also working with the whole word structure (Mukoroli 2011:13).

Teaching EFL writing vocabulary in the Russian context happened with the help of lexical chunks, because students received the pre-prepared word constructions they had to learn by heart and use correctly in writing, particularly when it concerned elements shaping letters and essays. Moreover, concerning topical vocabulary, teachers used either whole texts or abstracts that present new words and phrases in the context, which meant that they also applied the method of contextualization along with single words. (Mukoroli 2011:22-32).

The Russian participants did not have the same opinion on the obstacles connected to teaching writing vocabulary and its acquisition by the learners. While Teacher 5 claimed that the students were rather good at vocabulary acquisition during the writing sessions, the other two participants disagreed with that and underlined that writing vocabulary was one of the most complicated elements for students. Particularly, they struggled a lot with relevant "academic" words suitable for such genre as official letter and reflective essay. Summing up, the researcher can say that in the Russian context both opinions have the

right to exist. A possible reason for the negative tendency was described in the Mukoroli's work (2011), where he brought up a problem of the lack of time that was devoted to the vocabulary development. One more reason is that Russian students were not aware of topic vocabulary, because the use of English in Russia was still limited by specific spheres and was not included into the daily life (Ustinova 2005). The main purpose of the Russian participants teaching EFL at the upper secondary level was to prepare students successfully for the final control test and the English language exam. Grammar and vocabulary elements were included in both of them as separated entities that came aside from creating the pieces of writing. This supports Ur's (2012) and Newby's (2012) statements that grammar knowledge took the leading place in the EFL proficiency.

As well as the Norwegian participants, the Russian ones had the conventions that define acceptable or "correct" grammar that had to be taught in the EFL classroom at the upper secondary level (Maley 2009, Ur 2012).

The Russian participants were focused on grammar correctness both within a whole piece of writing and separately in single tasks. So the students' grammatical awareness was given the top priority. Despite the fact that Ur defined the methodology of teaching grammar preferably implicitly with some explicit elements (Ur 2012:87), teachers in the Russian context put more weight onto the explicit side. According to the interviews, the typical EFL grammar session followed the presentation-practice-production pattern (Ur 2012:84), where a teacher presented a rule to the students, in both deductive and inductive ways, they worked on examples, or with the whole pieces of texts based on the use of a definite grammar rule, and after that created their own writing pieces, based on the given text of smaller examples.

Concerning grammar tasks, two of the three participants chose tasks that were not necessarily strictly connected to an essay or a letter, and only Teacher 4 tried to keep the same pace and did not practice grammar separately from the main writing process.

It was up to the participants whether the mistakes or misunderstandings from the already studied material were going to be discussed or not, but at the same time students systematically worked with different grammar tasks with the meaning related to the topic. This way one can conclude that focus on form and skill-based learning (Ur 2012:87-90) are the methods that were actively practiced by the Russian participants.

Producing whole pieces of writing (particularly letters and essays) in the Russian EFL classroom included not only essay as it took place in the Norwegian context, but also

involved two types of letters: official and unofficial response.

While working with single grammar tasks, the Russian participants drew their students' attention to the accurate reproduction of correct grammatical forms, given in a rule or example. This way students did not produce anything by themselves, but only transformed the given model. According to Nunan (1999:272), the focus was on a product, which is very effective when a learner works only with single "bricks": words or sentences.

Writing a whole piece of text teaching process was more focused on the process, even though the aim was a perfect letter or essay that could get the highest grade. Thus, students mastered their writing skills with the help of 'learning by doing' (Nunan 1999).

If the first case described the bottom-up approach, the second one was top-down (Nunan 1999), so that in the Russian context there were two approaches coexisting and separated by task differences.

While teaching letter or essay writing, the participants prepared the materials that helped the students develop writing texts of specific genres. In spite of that Hoverak (2016) did her study only in the Norwegian context, it can be claimed that genre-pedagogical approach also can be applied to the Russian EFL classrooms. The Russian participants created templates - instructions, that demonstrated the main parts of an essay or letters and also some important lexemes that must be used in the piece of writing. Based the Hoverak's (2016) and Hyland's (2007) findings, the researcher can claim that it was also beneficial for the EFL classroom in the Russian context. This approach requires adjustment of the teaching process with the focus on the main target: the final control work or the state exam. The teachers put the main effort into producing the relevant tasks, thus making the students to participate in the writing process effectively, mastering their essay- and letter-writing skills.

5.4.3 Exam preparation

The Russian participants prepared their students for two different English language exams. The first one concerned the final English language control work that was compulsory for all upper secondary students.

The preparatory process started a couple of weeks before and included work on sample control tests from previous years, syllabus and handouts with similar tasks.

Preparation included same teaching approaches used during regular English lessons, because the control work combined tasks aimed at checking writing skills by creating a reflective essay and an unofficial letter, reading skills by working with a text and tasks after, vocabulary and grammar knowledge (Kapikova 2016).

Teaching writing skills for the exam was based on the process approach (Nunan 1999: 272) and the students mastered their skills by creating whole essays and letters. As well as during regular EFL lessons, the participants preferred to rely on the genre-pedagogical approach (Hoverak 2016) and focused strictly on writing instruction related to the genre of texts students would be asked to create during the control work.

According to the interviews, grammar and vocabulary were not taught but revised and corrected in case there occurred mistakes. The Russian participants worked with the topical vocabulary defined in the main syllabus. Tasks students worked on, involved single elements, word formation and contextual tasks. Thus, practicing vocabulary was based on many methods, such as word families, collocations, lexical chunks, identifying productive pre- and post-fixes, and etc. (Mukoroli 2011).

Grammar instruction included work based on error-correction, same as writing and vocabulary, when students did not receive any new information but mastered the use of already acquired lexical items. Error correction, as it was claimed in Ur's (2012) and Lei Zhu's (2017) works, was an effective method of teaching grammar.

The Russian participants focused not only on writing but also reading skills. There were few changes in comparison with regular reading sessions during English lessons. Students did not receive any new information, but processed texts they read based on information they already had. The main teaching approach was error correction, which was also supported in the study of Lei Zhu (2017). Direct error correction during the EFL reading session at a Russian upper secondary school could be described as a beneficial approach to teaching English literacy during the exam preparation. Instant, even oral, feedback on the students' and its correction during intensive reading could be viewed as the positive tool, both students and teachers would have positive attitude about (Lei Zhu 2017:71). This point, nevertheless, cannot be claimed undoubtedly and requires further investigation.

Besides the compulsory control work, some upper secondary students also decided to take the final English language state exam. As the participants claimed, the structure of the exam was very similar to the final control work, and the preparatory process was same.

This information was also proved by the official examples of the control work and the state exam provided by the educational organisations[7]. The main difference lay in time devoted to preparations. If the compulsory control work required two weeks and occupied the whole lesson, the state exam required approximately a year and one extra hour of the English language a week, so it did not clash with the main lesson planning.

5.4.4 Technology in EFL literacy teaching

The teachers in the Russian context had the same opinion concerning the use of IT technologies in teaching English literacy. When asked about the use of different digital tools, including both hard- and software, they stated that classrooms were majorly not equipped with anything else but the teacher's PC. Sometimes they got a chance to use the projector during reading sessions to show topic-related videos, or presentations, especially when introducing a new topic. This way, the teachers brought the solution for the standard routine of teaching the EFL, as it follows in the research of Alqahtani (2019). The teachers made an attempt to replace standard teaching using books by using the projector, supporting this way a shift towards integration of the modern solutions, despite the existing barriers, and a lack of IT tools, which was also described in the research of Şahin-Kizil (2011).

It cannot be claimed that the process of integration in the teachers' ? was moving with the great speed. Only one teacher used online e-mail communication during teaching writing, so that students could get a chance to practice letter writing in real life. This practice could be firstly, beneficial for the development of the students' communicative skills when they acquired the language in a realistic way; secondly, pushed away the limitations of the classroom, thus students got the opportunity to practice the English language communication from outside the school building, providing the broader space for facilitation of teaching process; thirdly, introducing the students to the modern teaching technologies that would develop the increasing positive attitude and motivation in terms of studying the language (Kasapoglu-Akyol, 2010).

Nevertheless, the results agreed with the studies by Agbatogun (2006) and Şahin-Kizil (2011) concerning the point that the teachers had positive attitudes towards

---

[7] http://www.minobr.orb.ru

using IT technologies in EFL classrooms and expressed their wish to work with them on a regular basis.

6 Conclusion

This master thesis aimed at examining differences and similarities between the EFL teachers' approaches to teaching EFL literacy in the Norwegian and Russian contexts. The topic was based on the need of the researcher to know more about the ways Russian and Norwegian teachers approached teaching EFL literacy in upper secondary schools. There have been conducted few research studies related to this topic. Norway and Russia are two countries where the English language plays different roles.

For this study, there the following research question was raised: 'To what extent do the EFL teachers' approaches to teaching English language literacy at the upper secondary level in the Norwegian context differ from the Russian one?' This question was further divided in six sub-questions, concerning the teachers' approaches to teaching reading skills, teaching writing skills, teaching literacy in the exam preparation and use of digital tools for teaching EFL literacy instruction.

The project was qualitative research. For this research, six semi-structured interviews with Norwegian and Russian upper secondary EFL teachers were conducted. An overall impression of the collected data was that the participants in both contexts were educated English language teachers with different amount of teaching experience and type of teaching practice. What is more, all the participants paid attention to teaching literacy skills in the EFL classrooms. When it concerns lesson planning, in both contexts, they had to follow the governmental standards, but are allowed to decide the lesson structure by themselves. Thus, there are differences between time they decide to pay for teaching reading and writing. It was clear that, teaching reading was generally under more focus than writing in both contexts.

The way teachers approached teaching writing skills in the Norwegian and Russian contexts were different. The Norwegian EFL teachers mostly focused on the communicative approach, while the Russian EFL teachers on the grammar-translation approach while teaching EFL skills. In the Russian context, the focus was on the product-oriented approach, such as building texts with the 'bricks' and 'learning by doing.' In the Norwegian context, the process-oriented approach was prioritized. . Compared to the Norwegians, the Russian teachers paid more attention to teaching vocabulary and

grammar. The teaching process included work with grammar- and vocabulary tasks together with error-correction.

When it concerns teaching reading, the participants in both contexts worked on development the implicit learning of the reading vocabulary with the focus on contextual meaning. At the same time the Russian teachers also put effort into teaching the graphological shapes. The learning process was mostly under the teacher's control and approached vocabulary teaching as the explicit process. The Russian participants used pre-, while- and post-writing activities, while the Norwegian teachers could omit some of them, if they did not find them significant. What is more, in both contexts, there were developed all four types of reading: skimming, scanning, reflective and receptive, and focused on development of the implicit reading rather than explicit.

The teachers from the Norwegian and Russian contexts had totally different approaches to teaching EFL literacy during preparation to the final English language exam. On the one hand, the Norwegians expressed more freedom in choice of teaching approaches and choosing between emphasis on writing or reading skills. On the other hand, the teachers in the Russian context had a preference to pay attention to development of both reading and writing skills. Nevertheless, there were common elements: firstly, in both contexts, the genre-pedagogical approach was applied to teaching writing; secondly, teaching was based on occasional error correction; thirdly, students were taught implicit reading; and fourthly, teaching writing implied the product-oriented approach.

The use of IT tools for teaching EFL was different. The participants in the Norwegian context were seemingly more active users of digital tools than in the Russian context. That tendency was mainly explained by the lack of the sufficient IT equipment in classrooms. The most widespread tool for teaching EFL literacy was the projector. It was, anyway, noticeable that both the Norwegians and Russians expressed positive attitudes towards further integration of IT tools into the EFL education process.

Because the number of the participant was limited, the study could not be generalized and needs further development. Moreover, there was paid no attention to the effect of teaching approaches on the upper secondary students in order to define their efficacy. In this study, only one research method was used, namely in-depth interviews, so that it was hard to find out whether teachers provided with the actual information.

The way teachers approach teaching EFL literacy in upper secondary school in the Russian and Norwegian contexts is a recent field of research in Norway and Russia. The

study findings suggest that there is a need for closer and more diversified research into topics related to teaching EFL literacy at various school levels in different contexts. The researcher finds it highly important to deepen this research by using several methods of data collection, such as classroom observations, as well as recruiting a higher number of participants. A greater and more correct insight into the process of teaching EFL literacy can also be provided by implying mix-method research targeting: combining qualitative and quantitative studies with the greater sample of participants. Furthermore, EFL teaching involves oral skills, and that would be interesting to define in which way teachers in the Norwegian and Russian contexts approach teaching these skills and how effective their approaches are compared to each other.

References

Agbatogun, O.A. 2006. 'Attitude of teachers towards the integration of computer education into secondary school curriculum.' *Journal of Research Curriculum Teaching,* 1: 1-20.

Alderson, J.C. 2000. *Assessing Reading.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Andrews, S. 1994. 'The grammatical awareness and knowledge of Hong Kong teachers of English.' In Bird, Falvey, Tsui, Allison and McNeill (eds.), *Language and learning.* Hong Kong: Education Department. 508-520.

Barman, B. 2013. 'Shifting education from teacher-Centered to learner-centered paradigm.' *ICTERC 2013*. Daffodil International University.

Basit, T. N. 2010. *Conducting Research in Educational Contexts.* London: Continuum.

Beittel, M. 2002. 'Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives.' *ELT Journal,* 56(4): 426-429.

Brevik, L.M. 2015. 'PhD revisited: How teachers teach and readers read. Developing reading comprehension in English in Norwegian upper secondary school.' In Rindal and Brevik (eds.), *English Didactics in Norway - 30 Years of Doctoral Research.* Universitetsforlaget. 207-228.

Brumfit, C. J. and K. Johnson. 2000. *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching.* Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Burns, A. and Richards, J. C. 2012. *The Cambridge Guide to Pedagogy and Practice in Second Language Teaching.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Carter, R., Nunan, D. 2001. *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. 2011. *Research Methods in Education.* 7th edn. New York, Routledge.

Craik, F.I.M. and Lockhart, R.S. 1972. 'Levels of processing: A framework for memory record.' *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behaviour,* 11: 671-684

Cummins, J. 2000. *Language, Power, and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Davies, F., and T. Green. 1984. *Reading for Learning in the Sciences*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd.

Davies, F. 1995. *Introducing Reading.*London: Penguin.

Dekeyser, R. 2003. 'Implicit and explicit learning'. In Doughty and Long (eds.), *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. New Jersey: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. 312-348.

Dörnnyei, Z. 2007. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Freeman, D. 2001. 'Second language teacher education.' In Carter and Nunan (eds.), *Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.* 72-79.

Fylan, F. 2005. 'Semi-structured interviewing.' In Miles and Gilbert (eds.), *A Handbook of Research Methods for Clinical and Health Psychology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 65-77.

Grabe, W. 2009. *Reading in a Second Language: Moving from Theory to Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harmer, J. 2001. *The practice of English Language teaching*. 3rd edn. Longman.

Hellekjær, G.O. 2012. 'Fra Reform 94 til Kunnskapsløftet: en sammenligning av leseferdigheter på engelsk blant avgangselever i den videregående skolen.' In Hopfenbeck, Kjærnsil and Olsen (eds.), *Kvalitet i Norsk Skole.* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget. 153-171.

Herrel. A.L. 2004. *Fifty strategies for teaching English language learners*. 2nd edn. Winnipeg: Penguin Publishers.

Holbrook, D. 1961. *English for Maturity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Horverak M.O. 2019. 'PhD revisited: English writing instruction in Norwegian upper secondary school – a linguistic and genre-pedagogical perspective.' In Rindal and Brevik (eds.), *English Didactics in Norway - 30 Years of Doctoral Research*. University of Agder: Universitetsforlaget. 98-117.

Hyland, K. 2003. 'Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process.' *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(1): 17-29.

Kasapoglu-Akyol, P. 2010. 'Using educational technology tools to improve language and communication skills of ESL students.' *P. Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 4 (2): 225-241.

Khaled, A. 2013. 'Teacher-Centered Versus Learner-Centered Teaching Style.' *Journal of Global Business Management*,9 (1): 22-34.

Koda, K. 2005. *Insights into Second Language Reading: A Cross Linguistic Approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Krashen, S.D. 1987. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition.* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall International.

Krashen, S. 1988. S*econd Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Pergamon Press Inc. [first published 1982]

Krashen, S. 1989. 'We acquire vocabulary and spelling by reading: Additional evidence for the input hypothesis.' *Modern Language Journal,* 73: 445-464.

Krashen, S. 1999. 'Seeking a role of grammar: A review of some recent studies.' *Foreign Language Annals,* 32(2): 245-57.

Legutke, M. 2012. 'Teaching learners'. In Burns and Richards (eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to Pedagogy and Practice in Second Language Teaching.* New York: Cambridge University Press. 112-119.

Levy, M. 2012. *Technology in the classroom.* In Burns and Richards (eds.),*The Cambridge Guide to Pedagogy and Practice in Second Language Teaching.* New York: Cambridge University Press. 279-286.

Long, M.H. and Robinson, P. 1998. 'Focus on form: Theory, research and practice.' In Doughty and Williams (eds.), *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University press. 15-41.

Long, M. 2000. 'Focus on Form in Task-Based Language Teaching.' In Lambert and Shohamy (eds.), *Language Policy and Pedagogy*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 179-192.

Lyster, R., Lightbown, P.M. and Spada, N. 1999. 'Response to Truscott's 'What's wrong with oral grammar correction'. *The Canadian Modern Language Review,* 55 (4): 457-461.

Maley, A. 2009. 'ELF: A teacher's perspective.' *Language and Intercultural Communication,* 9 (3): 187-200.

McNeill, A. 1990. 'Vocabulary learning and teaching: Evidence from lexical errors in the spontaneous speech of ESL learners.' *Institute of Language in Education Journal*, 7, pp. 141-153.

Newby, D. 2012. 'Cognitive + communicative grammar in teacher education.' In Huttner, Mehlmauer-Larcher, Susanne and Schiftler (eds.), *Theory and Practice in EFL Teacher Education*. Bristol: Channel View Publications Ltd. 101-123.

Norris, J.M. and Ortega, L. 2001. 'Does type of instruction make a difference? Substantive findings from a meta-analytic review.' *Language Learning,* 51 (1): 157-213.

Nunan, D. 1999. *Second Language Teaching & Learning*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Nunan, D. 2001. 'Second language acquisition.' In Carter and Nunan (eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to the Teaching English to Speakers of other languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 87-92.

O'Neil, R. 1991. 'The plausible myth of learner-centredness or the importance of doing ordinary things as well'. *ELT journal*, 45(4).

Paltridge, B. and Phakiti, A. 2015. *Research methods in applied linguistics: A practical resource*. Sydney: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.

Paris, C. and Gespass, S. 2001. 'Examining the Mismatch Between Learner-Centred Teaching and Teacher-Centered Supervision.' *Journal of Teacher Education*,52 5). New Jersey: Rider University.

Rahman S. 2016. 'The advantages and disadvantages of using qualitative and quantitative approaches and methods in Language "Testing and Assessment" research: A literature review.' *Journal of Education and Learning,* 6(1): 102-112.

Richards, J.C. and Rodgers, T.S. 2014. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. 3rd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [first published 1986]

Schmidt, R. 1990. 'The role of consciousness in second language learning.' *Applied Linguistics.* 11(2): 129-158.

Shastri, P. D. 2010. *Communicative approach to the teaching of English as a second language*. Mumbai: Himalaya Publishing House.

Simesen, A.M. 2005. 'Ja, engelsk er noe vi møter som barn og det er ikke lenger et fremmedspråk.' *Sprogforum*, 11 (35): 57- 61.

Simensen, A.M. 2010. 'English in Scandinavia - a success story.' In Wyse, Andrews & Hoffman (eds.), *The Routledge International Handbook of English, Language and Literacy Teaching*. Abingdon: Routledge. 472 – 483.

Siyanova-Chanturia, A. and Webb, S. (2016). 'Teaching vocabulary in the EFL context.' In Renandya, W. and Widodo (eds.), *English Language Teaching Today.* 227-239.

Spada, N. and Lightbown, P.M. 1999. 'Instruction, first language influence, and developmental readiness in second language acquisition.' *Modern language Journal*, 83 (1): 1-22.

Sternberg, R. J. 1987. 'Most vocabulary is learned from context.' In McKeown and Curtis (eds.), *The Nature of Vocabulary Acquisition*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum. 89-105.

Ter-Minasova, S. G. 2005. 'Traditions and innovations: English language teaching in Russia.' *World Englishes*, 24 (4): 445-454.

Truscott, J. 1996. 'The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes.' *Language Learning*, 46 (2): 327-69.

Ur, P. 2009. *A Course in Language Teaching Practice and Theory.* Rev. edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [first published 1996]

Ur, P. 2012. 'Grammar teaching: Theory, practice and English teacher education.' In Huttner, Mehlmauer-Larcher, Susanne and Schiftler (eds.), *Theory and Practice in EFL Teacher Education*. Bristol: Channel View Publications Ltd. 83-100.

Ustinova, I.P. 2005. 'English in Russia.' *World Englishes, 24(2):* 239-252.

Wang, L. 2005. 'The advantages of using technology in second language education.' *T.H.E. Journal*, 32 (10): 1-6.

White, R. and Arndt, V. 1991. *Process Writing.* London: Longman.

Wiland, S.M. 2000. 'Bottom up and top-down reading strategies.' In Ibsen and Wiland (eds.), *Encounters with Literature.* Kristiansand: Norwegian Academic Press. 189-190.

Xiaoqiong, H. and Xianxing, J. 2008. 'Using film to teach EFL students English language skills.' *Changing English*, 15 (2): 235–240.

References in other languages:

Kapikova M.M. 'Основные трудности подготовки учащихся средней школы к сдаче егэ по английскому языку.' *Cyberleninka*. 2016. Accessed 29.04.2020. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/osnovnye-trudnosti-podgotovki-uchaschihsya-sredney-shkoly-k-sdache-ege-po-angliyskomu-yazyku>.

Galskova, N. D. 2003. *Современная Методика Обучения Иностранным Языкам.* Moscow: Arkti.

Online references:

Aalborg, I. 'The English Language Revolution: An Investigation of the Status of English in Norway.' *DuO Vitenarkiv.* Nov. 2010. Accessed 12 Jan. 2020. <https://www.duo.uio.no/bitstream/handle/10852/25274/Master_Aalborg.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>.

Alqahtani, M. 'The use of technology in English language teaching.' *Researchgate*. 30 Aug. 2019. Accessed 02 May 2020. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/335504030_The_Use_of_Technology_in_English_Language_Teaching>.

Bergqvist, T., Lithner, J., and Sumpter, L. 2006. 'Upper secondary students' task reasoning.' *Taylor & Francis Online.* 22 Sep. 2006. Accessed 12 Dec. 2020. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1468794111426607>. Brevik, L. M., Rindal, U. 2019. *English Didactics in Norway: 30 Years of Doctoral Research.* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Bernhard E.B. 'A compensatory model of second-language reading.' *Researchgate*. 2011. Accessed 20 Jan. 2020. <https://www.researchgate.net/figure/A-compensatory-model-of-second-language-reading-revised_fig1_264984778>.

Bonnet, G. 'The assessment of pupils' skills in English in eight European countries 2002: The European Network of policy makers for the evaluation of educational systems.' *Ministerio de Educación y Formación Profesional.* 2004. Accessed 04.05.2020. <https://www.educacionyfp.gob.es/inee/dam/jcr:d426c134-5c58-44f0-8641-3b5e4354ed37/habilidadesingles2002-1.pdf>.

Collins Dictionary. "Literacy". Accessed 05 May 2020. <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/literacy>

Cummins, J. 'BICS and CALP: Clarifying the distinction.' *ERIC database.* 1999. Accessed 15 Apr. 2020. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED438551.pdf>.

Ellis, N.C. 'Frequency effects in language processing: A review with implications for theories of implicit and explicit language acquisition'. *Studies in second language acquisition,* 24 (2). 12 July 2002. Accessed 15.01.2020. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/studies-in-second-language-acquisition/article/frequency-effects-in-language-processing/C4A2C08A0900E306078B9819D7ABF428#>.

Fazal, S., Dr. Majoka, M.I. and Dr. Ahmad. 'Integration of Grammar Translation Method with Communicative Approach: A Research Synthesis.' *Researchgate*. Dec. 2017. Accessed 02 May 2020. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322083426_Integration_of_Grammar_Translation_Method_with_Communicative_Approach_A_Research_Synthesis>.

Hanna, P. 'Using internet technologies(such as Skype) as a research medium: a research note.' *Sage Journals.* 5 Apr. 2012. Accessed 10 Dec. 2019.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794111426607>.

Holt, A. 'Using the telephone for narrative interviewing: a research note.' *Sage Journals.*
15 Feb. 2010. Accessed 10 Dec. 2019.
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1468794109348686>.

Hyland, K. 'Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction.'
Researchgate. Sept. 2007. Accessed 25 Feb. 2020.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228645075_Genre_pedagogy_Language_literacy_and_L2_writing_instruction>.

Keiko, K. 2007. 'Reading and Language Learning: Crosslinguistic Constraints on Second
Language Reading Development.' *Wiley Online Library.* 15 June 2007. Accessed
17 Feb. 2020.
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/0023-8333.101997010-i1>.

Lei Zhu1. 'Error Correction in the Intensive Reading Class of English Majors.'
Researchgate. 2 Nov. 2017. Accessed 02 May 2020.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320833625_Error_Correction_in_the_Intensive_Reading_Class_of_English_Majors>.

McMillan Dictionary. "Literacy". Accessed 05 May 2020.
<https://www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/literacy>.

Mukoroli, J. 'Effective Vocabulary Teaching Strategies For The English For Academic
Purposes Esl Classroom'. *MA TESOL Collection.* 2011. Accessed 01 Feb. 2020.
<https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/ipp_collection/501>.

Norwegian Centre for Research Data. "NSD - Norwegian Centre for Research Data (aims
and values)." Accessed 04 May 2020. <https://nsd.no/nsd/english/index.html>.

Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. "Education plan for the English
language." Accessed 20 March, 2020. < https://www.udir.no>.

Oxford Dictionaries. "Literacy". Accessed 05 May 2020.
<https://www.lexico.com/definition/literacy>.

Poppulo. "10 Advantages and Disadvantages of Qualitative Research." Accessed 15 Apr.
2020.<https://www.poppulot.com>.

Rindal, U. (2014). 'What is English?' *Acta Didactica Norge,* 8 (2). Art. 14, 17 pages.
Accessed 02 March 2020. <https://journals.uio.no/adno/article/view/1137/1016>.

Russian Ministry of Education and Science. "Studying English Language at School."
Accessed 04 May 2020. <http://www.minobr.orb.ru>.

Russian Ministry of Education and Science. "Studying Foreign Languages at Educational

Institutions". Accessed 05 May 2020. <http://docs.cntd.ru/document/901782389>.

Şahin-Kizil, A. 'EFL teachers attitudes towards information and communication technologies (ICT).' *Semanticscholar.* 22-24 Sept. 2011. Accessed 02 May 2020. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/d646/eb3fda4bb29717079d3d85239f01121f27fe.pdf?_ga=2.248722563.567337344.1588878177-1645303276.1588878177>.

Schutz, R.E. 'Stephen Krashen's Theory of Second Language Acquisition.' 1998. Accessed 27 Apr. 2020. <https://www.sk.com.br/sk-krash.html>.

Shih-Chuan Chang. 'A contrastive study of grammar translation method and communicative approach in teaching English grammar.' *Researchgate*. June 2011. Accessed 02 May 2020. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/266467156_A_Contrastive_Study_of_Grammar_Translation_Method_and_Communicative_Approach_in_Teaching_English_Grammar>.

TESOL. (2008). 'TESOL Technology Standards Framework.' *Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.* 2008. Accessed 17 Feb. 2020. <https://www.tesol.org/docs/default-source/books/bk_technologystandards_framework_721.pdf?sfvrsn=4bd0bee6_2>.

Warschauer, M. and Meskill, C. 'Technology and second language learning.' *UCI School of Education.* 2000. Accessed 15 Apr. 2020. <http://education.uci.edu/markw-tslt.html>.

'What is literacy? An investigation into definitions of English as a subject and the relationship between English, literacy and 'being literate'. *Cambridge Assessment*. Jan. 2013. Accessed 05 May 2020. <https://www.cambridgeassessment.org.uk/Images/130433-what-is-literacy-an-investigation-into-definitions-of-english-as-a-subject-and-the-relationship-between-english-literacy-and-being-literate-.pdf>

Appendices

Appendix 1

Interview guide

<u>**Opening remarks**</u>

This interview is done only for obtaining the information for this Master Thesis. All participants and schools they work at will remain anonymous. The interviews are recorded with the voice recorder and later transcribed into written summaries, which also are included as appendix to to this work.

The specific focus lies on participants' approaches to teach English language reading and writing skills at upper secondary school in Norway and Russia; whether there can be found any difference or similarities between these two contexts. The focus of this research will not be on defining whether the approaches presented by the participant are correct and effective.

<u>**Part 1: Professional experience and background**</u>

1. What type of school do you work at?

2. How long is your professional experience as an English teacher?

3. What qualifications and education do you have?

4. What can you tell about your own experience from learning the English language in terms of studying literacy at upper secondary school?

5. How many students do you have in your English language studying group?

6. How do you plan the English language lessons? Are you the only responsible for that or you have to satisfy some standards?

<u>**Part 2: Methodology of teaching EFL, results and expectations**</u>

A) Teaching reading:

1. How many hours a week do you teach English reading skills?
2. What methods do you choose to teach English reading skills?
3. Can you tell us about materials you use while teaching reading? (For example, books, handing outs, IT tools)
4. Are there any points students are especially good at?
5. Are there any points that need extra improvement?
6. How can you explain students' success and unsuccess?

B) Teaching writing:

1. How many hours a week do you teach English writing skills?
2. What methods do you choose to teach English writing skills?

   2.1 What are the main methods you use to teach vocabulary?

   2.2 what are the main methods you use to teach grammar?

3. Can you tell us about materials you use while teaching writing? (For example, books, handing outs, IT tools)
4. Are there any points students are especially good at?
5. Are there any points that need extra improvement?
6. How can you explain students' success and unsuccess?

Part 3: Preparation for the final English language exam?

1. What type of exam do you prepare the students for?
2. Mastering of what literacy skills do you focus at?
3. What is the lesson planning while preparing for the exam?
4. What materials do you use while teaching literacy skills during exam preparations? (including IT tools)

Appendix 2

NSD NORSK SENTER FOR FORSKNINGSDATA

NSD sin vurdering

Prosjekttittel

Methods of teaching English literacy at upper secondary school in Norwegian and Russian context.

Referansenummer

546168

Registrert

26.12.2019 av Anastasia Amosenkova - a.amosenkova@stud.uis.no

Behandlingsansvarlig institusjon

Universitetet i Stavanger / Fakultet for utdanningsvitenskap og humaniora / Institutt for kultur- og språkvitenskap

Prosjektansvarlig (vitenskapelig ansatt/veileder eller stipendiat)

Dina Lialikhova , dina.lialikhova@uis.no, tlf: 96735267

Type prosjekt

Studentprosjekt, masterstudium

Kontaktinformasjon, student

Anastasia Amosenkova, nastenka2931@gmail.com, tlf: 40349669

Prosjektperiode

01.02.2020 - 15.05.2020

Status

28.04.2020 - Vurdert

Vurdering (2)

28.04.2020 - Vurdert

Vi viser til endring registrert 26.04.2020. Vi kan ikke se at det er gjort noen oppdateringer i meldeskjemaet eller vedlegg som har innvirkning på NSD sin vurdering av hvordan personopplysninger behandles i prosjektet.

Les mer om hvilke endringer som skal registreres hos NSD før endringer meldes inn i fremtiden:
nsd.uib.no/personvernombud/meld_prosjekt/meld_endringer.html

OPPFØLGING AV PROSJEKTET
NSD vil følge opp ved planlagt avslutning for å avklare om behandlingen av personopplysningene er avsluttet.

Lykke til videre med prosjektet!

Kontaktperson hos NSD: Tore Andre Kjetland Fjeldsbø

Tlf. Personverntjenester: 55 58 21 17 (tast 1)

06.01.2020 - Vurdert

Our assessment is that the processing of personal data in this project will comply with data protection legislation, so long as it is carried out in accordance with what is documented in the Notification Form and attachments, dated 06.01.2020, as well as in correspondence with NSD. Everything is in place for the processing to begin.

NOTIFY CHANGES
If you intend to make changes to the processing of personal data in this project it may be necessary to notify NSD. This is done by updating the information registered in the Notification Form. On our website we explain which changes must be notified. Wait until you receive an answer from us before you carry out the changes.

TYPE OF DATA AND DURATION
The project will be processing general categories of personal data until 15.05.2020.

LEGAL BASIS
The project will gain consent from data subjects to process their personal data. We find that consent will meet the necessary requirements under art. 4 (11) and 7, in that it will be a freely given, specific, informed and unambiguous statement or action, which will be documented and can be withdrawn. The legal basis for processing personal data is therefore consent given by the data subject, cf. the General Data Protection Regulation art. 6.1 a).

PRINCIPLES RELATING TO PROCESSING PERSONAL DATA
NSD finds that the planned processing of personal data will be in accordance with the principles under the General Data Protection Regulation regarding:

- lawfulness, fairness and transparency (art. 5.1 a), in that data subjects will receive sufficient information about the processing and will give their consent
- purpose limitation (art. 5.1 b), in that personal data will be collected for specified, explicit and legitimate purposes, and will not be processed for new, incompatible purposes
- data minimisation (art. 5.1 c), in that only personal data which are adequate, relevant and necessary for the purpose of the project will be processed
- storage limitation (art. 5.1 e), in that personal data will not be stored for longer than is necessary to fulfil the project's purpose

THE RIGHTS OF DATA SUBJECTS
Data subjects will have the following rights in this project: transparency (art. 12), information (art. 13), access (art. 15), rectification (art. 16), erasure (art. 17), restriction of processing (art. 18), notification (art. 19), data portability (art. 20). These rights apply so long as the data subject can be identified in the collected data.

NSD finds that the information that will be given to data subjects about the processing of their personal data will meet the legal requirements for form and content, cf. art. 12.1 and art. 13.

We remind you that if a data subject contacts you about their rights, the data controller has a duty to reply within a month.

FOLLOW YOUR INSTITUTION'S GUIDELINES
NSD presupposes that the project will meet the requirements of accuracy (art. 5.1 d), integrity and confidentiality (art. 5.1 f) and security (art. 32) when processing personal data.

Skype and the phone services WhatsApp and Viber can be used as data processors for the project. NSD presupposes that the use of these services is clarified with the institution in advance.

To ensure that these requirements are met you must follow your institution's internal guidelines and/or consult with your institution (i.e. the institution responsible for the project).

FOLLOW-UP OF THE PROJECT
NSD will follow up the progress of the project at the planned end date in order to determine whether the processing of personal data has been concluded.

Good luck with the project!

Contact person at NSD: Tore Andre Kjetland Fjeldsbø
Data Protection Services for Research: +47 55 58 21 17 (press 1)

Appendix 3

Are you interested in taking part in the research project

"*A comparative study of Norwegian and Russian EFL teachers' approaches to teaching English literacy at upper secondary school*" ?

This is an inquiry about participation in a research project where the main purpose is to analyze methods of teaching literacy skills in Norwegian and Russian upper secondary schools. In this letter we will give you information about the purpose of the project and what your participation will involve.

Purpose of the project
The main purpose of the project is to define differences and similarities between teaching English literacy in Norwegian and Russian upper secondary schools.
The research question is: To what extent do approaches of to teaching English language literacy at the upper secondary level in the Norwegian context differ from the Russian one?
This is a master thesis.

Who is responsible for the research project?
The University of Stavanger is the institution responsible for the project.

Why are you being asked to participate?
The selection criteria was, firstly, that a participant has experience of teaching English in upper secondary school, and secondly, that a participant has experience of teaching in a Norwegian or Russian school.

What does participation involve for you?
- « If you chose to take part in the project, this will involve that you answer the interview questions. It will take approx. 30 minutes. The interview includes questions about your experience of teaching English language at upper secondary school. Your answers will be recorded electronically»

Participation is voluntary
Participation in the project is voluntary. If you chose to participate, you can withdraw your consent at any time without giving a reason. All information about you will then be made anonymous. There will be no negative consequences for you if you chose not to participate or later decide to withdraw.

It will not affect your treatment at the hospital your relationship with your school/employer. school/teacher, place of work/employer etc.

Your personal privacy – how we will store and use your personal data

We will only use your personal data for the purpose(s) specified in this information letter. We will process your personal data confidentiality and in accordance with data protection legislation (the General Data Protection Regulation and Personal Data Act).

- *S*tudent and supervisor are responsible for the project in connection with the institution.
- I will replace your name and contact details with a number and they will not be, transcribed or analyzed. The recorded data will be saved on the account that requires password and PC used for this project will be locked automatically after short time so that the access will require a code.

Participants will not be recognizable in the project. Personal information that will be published is: age, occupation and education (for ex. bachelor degree in linguistics).

What will happen to your personal data at the end of the research project?
The project is scheduled to end 11th May 2020. All digital recording will be deleted at the end of the research project. The transcribed data is anonymized can be deleted after the research project is delivered and graded.

Your rights
So long as you can be identified in the collected data, you have the right to:
- access the personal data that is being processed about you
- request that your personal data is deleted
- request that incorrect personal data about you is corrected/rectified
- receive a copy of your personal data (data portability), and
- send a complaint to the Data Protection Officer or The Norwegian Data Protection Authority regarding the processing of your personal data

What gives us the right to process your personal data?
We will process your personal data based on your consent.
Based on an agreement with University of Stavanger, NSD – The Norwegian Centre for Research Data AS has assessed that the processing of personal data in this project is in accordance with data protection legislation.

Where can I find out more?
If you have questions about the project, or want to exercise your rights, contact:
- The University of Stavanger via Anastasia Amosenkova (student, e-mail: nastenka2931@gmail.com) and Dina Lialikhova (supervisor, e-mail: dina.lialikhova@uis.no)
- Our Data Protection Officer: Kjetil Dalseth (e-mail: personvernombud@uis.no)
- NSD – The Norwegian Centre for Research Data AS, by email: (personverntjenester@nsd.no) or by telephone: +47 55 58 21 17.

Yours sincerely,

Project Leader   Student (if applicable)
(Researcher/supervisor)   Anastasia Amosenkova
Dina Lialikhova

Consent form

Consent can be given in writing (including electronically) or orally. NB! You must be able to document/demonstrate that you have given information and gained consent from project participants i.e. from the people whose personal data you will be processing (data subjects). As a rule, we recommend written information and written consent.
- *For written consent on paper you can use this template*
- *For written consent which is collected electronically, you must choose a procedure that will allow you to demonstrate that you have gained explicit consent (read more on our website)*
- *If the context dictates that you should give oral information and gain oral consent (e.g. for research in oral cultures or with people who are illiterate) we recommend that you make a sound recording of the information and consent.*

If a parent/guardian will give consent on behalf of their child or someone without the capacity to consent, you must adjust this information accordingly. Remember that the name of the participant must be included.

Adjust the checkboxes in accordance with participation in your project. It is possible to use bullet points instead of checkboxes. However, if you intend to process special categories of personal data (sensitive personal data) and/or one of the last four points in the list below is applicable to your project, we recommend that you use checkboxes. This because of the requirement of explicit consent.

I have received and understood information about the project "A comparative study of Norwegian and Russian EFL teachers' approaches to teaching English literacy at upper secondary school*"* and have been given the opportunity to ask questions. I give consent:

- ☐ to participate in *(insert method, e.g. an interview)*
- ☐ to participate in *(insert other methods, e.g. an online survey) – if applicable*
- ☐ *for my/my child's teacher to give information about me/my child to this project (include the type of information)– if applicable*
- ☐ *for my personal data to be processed outside the EU – if applicable*
- ☐ *for information about me/myself to be published in a way that I can be recognised (describe in more detail)– if applicable*
- ☐ *for my personal data to be stored after the end of the project for (insert purpose of storage e.g. follow-up studies) – if applicable*

I give consent for my personal data to be processed until the end date of the project, approx. *[11 May, 2020]*

(Signed by participant, date)

Appendix 4

Teacher interviews

Here are presented transcripts of the interviews with six teachers from Russia and from Norway. The interviews are enclosed partially and there are highlighted only the most important elements according to the researcher's opinion. Moreover, according to NSD regulations, only the researcher and the supervisor can have access to the full interviews. Questions of the researcher are given in bold (**Interviewer***)*. Teachers' answers have the regular font (Teacher).

Interview with Teacher 1

Hva slags skole jobber du i?

Jeg jobber på videregående skole med studiespesialisering.

Hvor lenge jobber du som Engelsklærer?

Jeg jobber som Engelsklærer siden 2012 og har undervist på nesten alle nivå fra småtrinn til videregående, unntatt 10. trinn.

Hva slags kvalifikasjon og utdannesle har du?

Jeg har bachelor i Engelsk fra universitetet i Kristiansand. Etterpå tok jeg årsstudium i Historie og Pedagogisk-Praktisk Utdannelse i Engelsk og Historie.

Hva kan du si om din egen erfaring med Engelsk literacy på videregående?

Jeg husker nesten ingenting fra min egen erfaring fordi at det var for mange år siden og kan ikke komme på noe skikkelig akkurat nå. Jeg tok yrkesspesialisering på videregående og vi hadde ikke så mye Engelsk. Min studieretning var rettet mot medier og kommunikasjon og lærere prøvde å gi opplegg for utvikling av muntlige ferdigheter, for eksempel, vi hadde mye hørespill på Engelsk og historie i tillegg.

Hvor mange elever har du?

Klassene jeg underviser i akkurat nå er veldig fulle og har 30 elever i hver. De har Engelsk 5 timer i uken. Vil si med en gang at det er alltid forskjell på hvor mye tid vi kan bruke på lesing og skriving. Av og til skjer det sånn at vi praktiserer lesing i hele timen. I tillegg til

det, elevene prøver å skrive i hver time. For eksempel, når det er noen nyttig informasjon. Jeg kan ikke si at vi har så mye til å øve oss på essay-skriving. I løpet av timen er det viktig at vi går gjennom struktur og er ferdig med innledning.

Hvordan planlegger du Engelsktimene?

Planen vårres må tilfredsstille Udir sin standard. Når det gjelder undervisningsprosessen, kan man velge selv. Vi har grovplanen med forskjellige tema vi må dekke opp i løpet av studieåret. Det er helt opp til meg når og hvordan jeg kommer til å gjør det.

Hvor mange timer i uken bruker du på å lære lesing?

Som ble sagt, jeg prøver å ha cirka en time i uken med lesing.

Hva slags metode bruker du til å lære lesing?

Det er litt vanskelig å si presist hva slags metoder jeg bruker. Jeg pleier å følge med oppgavene i boken vårres. Jeg pleier ikke å fokusere meg på bare en type lesing. Selvfølgelig, noen oppgaver krever kun generell tekstforståelse, men jeg prøver å variere så mye som kan.

Hvis du mener noen oppgaver "før", "etter" og "mens" vi leser, kan jeg svare "ja, jeg inkluderer hele sekvensen av leseaktiviteter". Vanligvis, før elevene begynner å lese, må de se kjapt gjennom teksten og gjette hva den handler om. Hvis det gjelder noveller, er oppgaver litt mer avansert og man også må definere selve tematikken. Vi forventer at elevene på videregående har et rikt ordforråd for å følge med på planen og boken de har. Men hvis jeg bruker noen andre tekster, for eksempel Roel Dahl, pleier jeg å lage listen med mest vanskelige ord og fraser vi går igjennom før vi begynner å lese. Mens de leser, er det innholdet som er i fokus. Etterpå analyserer vi teksten slik at elevene kan tolke den og uttrykke sin egen mening. Men man leser teksten må man ha dyp forståelse av den. I blant er de spurt om å finne forskjellige elementer, som,tilhører noen sjanger. For eksempel å beskrive protagonister og antagonister. Selve boken inneholder forskjellige tekster av ulike størrelser. Tydeligvis er det mer tidskrevende å analysere store noveller men det også er mer velgjørende i forhold til, for eksempel, korte artikler. Når man jobber med lange tekster er det en mulighet til å organisere forskjellig samarbeid mellom elevene. Jeg bruker både oversettelser og autentiske tekster. Det kan altså være alle typer samarbeid: en og en, partner- eller gruppearbeid. Jeg lærer dem ikke nye ord. Som det ble sagt, vi forventer at elevene har nok kunnskap på ordene fra forrige trinn.

Kan du fortelle om materiell du bruker til å undervise i Engelsk lesing?

Min hovedmateriell er selvfølgelig boken vi må følge, men av og til jeg finner noen tekster, særlig forskjellige noveller fra eksterne ressurser og dele de ut til elevene. Jeg kan ikke si at jeg bruker mye av IT for undervisningen, kanskje, bare en projektor med skjermet. Men det også er svært nyttig, så lenge elevene får se teksten og skriver ned noen elementer dermed øver seg på skriving. Jeg ville si at skriving og lesing går ofte sammen.

Når det gjelder lesing, hva er elevene flinke i?

De er flinke i uttalelse. Men problemet er hvor sene de er.

Synes du dette er et negativt poeng?

Ja, det er sikkert det, når det er stor forskjell på lesehastighet.Det skjer veldig ofte at noen elever er ferdige med teksten og oppgavene mens andre er fremdeles i prosessen. For øvrig, synes elevene det er vanskelig å jobbe med tekstanalyse og uttrykking av sin mening, særlig når språket er "voksen"og avansert, for eksempel i noveller.

Hva er grunnen til dette?

Tema som står på planen finnes av og til ingen relasjon til elevenes hverdagsliv, så de har ikke nok ordforråd til å analysere teksten og uttrykke seg selv på en riktig måte. For eksempel, når det handler om førerkort til 16åringer, har de ingenting å de fordi at det ikke skjer i Norge og de har aldri hørt om det i hverdagslivet.

Du har ikke nevn grunnet til positive utviklingen. Er det, kanskje noe du kommer på?

Dette spørsmål kan jeg, dessverre, ikke svare på, men håper at viktigste grunnen er å bli godt forberedt på ungdomsskolen.

Hvor mange timer i uka bruker du på å lære skriving?

Jeg kan ikke si hvor mye det egentlig er. Alle uker er forskjellige. De skriver noe i hver timen, men øver seg på essay-skriving veldig sjeldent.

Hva slags metoder bruker du til å lære dem skriving? Du kan begynne med vokabular.

Vi har ingen spesiell metode som gjelder vokabular, siden det er forventet av elevene at de er allerede kjent med basis vi krever. Jeg legger fokus på å utvikle mer vokser språk, slik at det bruker "purchase" istedenfor "buy" eller "children" istedenfor "kids". Synes at det er egentlig det de sliter mest med.

Hvordan lærer du dem grammatikken?

Når det gjelder grammatikken, vi øver oss ikke så mye på reglene. Jeg pleier å ha noen innføringstid, når vi repetere de mest kompliserte. Altså, hvis jeg ser at de fleste lager mye

feil, kan samle opp eksemplene på de feilene og diskutere dem og korrigere sammen med elevene.

Hva kan du si om essay-skriving?

Jeg lager instruksjoner på hvordan de må skrive essay med alle delene og mest brukte ord og setninger. Da så elevene øver seg på å skrive essay, leverer dem inn, jeg sjekker og skriver kommentar, slik at det kan forbedre sitt arbeid. Temaene de skriver om gjelder grovplanen.

Hva slags undervisningsmateriell bruker du i skriveundervisning? Du kan også si noe om IT.

Jeg bruker både pensum og mine egne materiell. Selvfølgelig med IT, må alle bruke google classroom-portal og "MinSkole". I klasserommet pleier vi å ha projector. Jeg har ikke så mye tid jeg kan bruke på å undervise ved bruk av IT, men vil uansett gjøre best ut av det.

Når det gjelder skriving, hva er elevene flinke i?

Jeg tror ikke at jeg kan nevne noe elevene er skikkelig god i når det gjelder skriving.

Hva er grunnet til at de strever i å bruke voksen språk? Muligens, sosiale nettverk eller noe annet?

Det kan jeg ikke si, siden jeg ikke er så glad i sosiale nettverk så har ikke peiling på hva slags innvirkning de har.

Hva slags eksamen har elevene?

Engelsk er jo trekkfag, så ikke alle må ta eksamen. Vi får all informasjon to dager eller 48 timer før eksamen og har flere timer på skole til å forberede oss: fire timer. For min del, er et mye bedre å begynne å jobbe på forhånd, så vi starter opp i April. Vi jobber mest med fjorårets eksamensoppgave og svarene på de oppgavene, så elevene kan se hvordan alt må egentlig se ut. Etterpå jobber de selvstendig og leverer oppgavene når de er ferdig med dem. Jeg sjekker dem og redigerer eller skriver kommentar. Hvis jeg synes det er nødvendig, tar noe opp sammen med klassen.

Bruker du også noe IT for forberedelsen?

Bruker ofte bare projektor, på absolutt same måten som i vanlige timene.

Interview with Teacher 2

What type of school do you work at?

I work at upper secondary vocational school.

How long is your professional experience as an English teacher?

Well, I have been teaching at the upper secondary level for fourteen years.

What qualifications and education do you have?

I have the international bachelor degree that I have partially received in the USA during my exchange studies. Its focus lies on teaching English language. Right now I have also finished BI: took my master degree there. I am a lector.

What can you tell about your own experience from learning the English

We did not do anything interesting, to be honest. Everything seemed to be pure learning and drilling. Of course we were working with different texts and videos, wrote essays, but it was anyway more like perception-production with few varieties. This lesson this month we are going to work with nouns or adverbs, or adjectives. WE just had a grammar book and did exercises every week based on grammar-translation method.

How many students do you have in your English language studying group?

Now - 10, usually - much more, but people, unfortunately, drop out.

How do you plan the English language lessons? Are you the only responsible for that or you have to satisfy some standards?

Yes, it is Udir who tell us what to plan, but how I do it is up to me. I usually make plans together with other English language teachers, and adjust topics to the students' levels. So we have divided, if VG1 are studying other English speaking cultures like the United States, Canada, Great Britain, the United Kingdom and Ireland; and next in VG2 they do like Nigeria, South Africa, Australia and India. I also prefer to give them diagnostic tests and in the task to write and unofficial letter they have to send me via e-mail at the beginning of the study year, so I can see what level they stand at. This is very suitable for planning further.

How many hours a week do you teach English reading skills?

I think it is cirka 1 hour a week.

What methods do you choose to teach English reading skills?

Everything depend on the tasks they get in the reading book. I like to organize them in a groups thus students with the high English language level can help those who are on the low level. They usually read one by one, or do it all together, silently. I also give them instant response, if there are some mistakes. As for genre, I personally like to give them fiction and different articles, that I find on the Internet or in other books. My students

also practice correct translation in addition to just understanding of the text. I do not think that actually need to take much into-tasks, but focus should be on smooth reading and translation. After they are done with reading texts, there go a lot of different tasks to show how deeply they understand texts and whether they can orientate in it properly,

Can you tell us about materials you use while teaching reading?

I am satisfied with the book we have, plus I try to find some extra materials if my students need them. Concerning IT elements, there is mostly interactive board or projector. Moreover, my students do tasks using their PCs and hand them in on our education portal.

Are there any points students are especially good at?

They are great readers, when it comes to pronunciation and fluency! I think they are better at reading than writing. And I totally agree that English language media and games that surround them nowadays has the positive influence. And they have like specific words that I do not know.

Are there any points that need extra improvement?

Yes, there definitely are some! The struggle a lot with reflection and getting the idea of a text. Probably, because they are always on socials and are not used to "heavy" texts, to say so. One more reason is that this school is biggest in this are with 35% of foreign students, who struggle with getting the main point.

How many hours a week do you teach English writing skills?

Same as for reading - one hour, but reading and writing usually go together.

What methods do you choose to teach English writing skills?

They learn the new vocabulary by writing it down and learning its meaning If you want me to tell about grammar, there is not much we actually do. Students have rather low grammar level, so I think it is better not waste time on drilling only grammar, but just move on. They are supposed to acquire all essential grammar and vocabulary before that. But still, if they struggle a lot, I have some grammar sessions, when we revise rules and work with te examples. I also prefer to correct mistakes they make and write comments either online, or talk and explain personally.

Can you also talk about essay-writing?

Yes, I can. I make special templates for them, so that they see the structure and the words and phrases to use. Actually, essays are the only written work we put much effort into. Because they will have it at the exam.

Are there any points students are especially good at?

Technically, there is nothing they are good at, but I appreciate their inner motivation and the fact they manage to get to the point very quickly.

Are there any points that need extra improvement?

They have generally very low English language proficiency. In this case I want to put blame on media and social networks. Cause they see what happens on TV, and acquire some incorrect grammar and vocabulary. In a short while of constantly repeating, it starts seeming normal to them and they make same mistakes during studying.

What type of exam do you prepare the students for?

The have the final English language exam, but not everyone is taking it. Only some students are picked to do it. It happens 48 hours before the date and we have several hours to prepare all together. Of course, we also get provided with the preparation materials.

Mastering of what literacy skills do you focus at?

I want them to read. A lot! I also show them movies related to the texts they have to revise as preparation. In addition to it we repeat essay structure. I prefer that my students practice it orally. So they are making reflective texts on topics, do not write them down, but say out loud.

What materials do you use while teaching literacy skills during exam preparations? (including IT tools)

I use preparation book, essay templates, some extra texts and the projector or interactive board.

Interview with Teacher 3

What type of school do you work at?

I work at upper secondary school with vocational studies.

How long is your professional experience as an English teacher?

Two years.

What qualifications and education do you have?

I am educated as an adjunct teacher. So therefore I am still studying, taking my Master degree to become a lecturer and teach at the upper secondary level.

What can you tell about your own experience from learning the English?

The only I can recall from learning English literacy at upper secondary school: it was very boring, we did not have much literacy learning. We just learned some topic and themes we had to go through. We did not have much focus on literacy. And the focus did not lie on writing or reading practice. Mostly, that was just drilling.

How many students do you have in your English language studying group?

Fifteen, and they are at the age of 17-18.

How do you plan the English language lessons? Are you the only responsible for that or you have to satisfy some standards?

I get the full responsibility for lesson planning, that also has to satisfy the Udir planning. At the beginning of the year I have a test to see where my students are at, when it comes to English skills. And then I plan my lessons from their wishes as well, so they can be more interested in learning English.

How many hours a week do you teach English reading skills?

Approximately 1 hours.

What methods do you choose to teach English reading skills?

I have that one hour when we read a book that I have chosen, so we just sit and read. If I am going to add something more, other types of reading skills are reading out loud, listening to someone reading. Before reading I introduce them to the new words, They get some pre-, while- and post-reading tasks, aimed mostly at in-depth understanding of texts and reflecting.

Can you tell us about materials you use while teaching reading? (For example, books, handing outs, IT tools)

I prefer to work with handing outs. But I follow topics in my syllabus. As IT tools, I hva same for both oral and English skills. I work with projector, whiteboard and they use PC with online systems to deliver their homeworks and put out viarious information.

Are there any points students are especially good at?

Since I have a vocational class, they are at same middle-low level, so I cannot define what they are good at.

Are there any points that need extra improvement?

My students barely do what I teach them to do. They struggle with pronunciation and understanding the text.

How can you explain students' success and unsuccess?

There is not much I can say about it.

How many hours a week do you teach English writing skills?

Probably 1-2, at least 1 academic hour a week.

What methods do you choose to teach English writing skills?

I focus on writing essays or longer sentences. I think that this is the most important part and what their exam is about. The receive a topic of discussion, for example: 'What do you think about climate change? Write pros and cons-' And then they write it, hand in and I go into their texts and leave comments. For example: this sentence you need to rephrase, and so on. And also sometimes go through some mostly widespread grammatical faults, so I have lessons when we just practice different grammar rules. They first of all they are introduced to some rules, and are asked if someone actually knows the rule. Then they practice it. They also write reflective essays that are corrected and commented on by me. We follow the template and they try to get better at it.

Can you tell us about materials you use while teaching writing? (For example, books, handing outs, IT tools)

I prefer to use my own handingh outs. What is more, my students receive templates for essay writing with their structure and the most important words and phrases.

Are there any points students are especially good at?

Nothing, basically. They just follow the flow.

Are there any points that need extra improvement?

They struggle mostly with grammar and sentence building.

How can you explain students' success and unsuccess?

I think they do not care that much, because they think that they are on a decent level of the English skills that they understand mostly oral speech and can already communicate on the basic level. So they don't think that they have to develop their skills further. I can assume that they they do not think that English is important or their future.

What type of exam do you prepare the students for?

They prepare for written English language exam, issued by the state. We get these old exams that we elaborate a little bit, same as we receive the preparation material. This is 'trekkfag', so not everyone takes the English exam, so they get randomly selected. But everyone needs to have a grade in English. When they get informed I have 4 extra hours of preparation with the students, that are selected.

Mastering of what literacy skills do you focus at?

I focus on essay writing and repeating the grammar. I do not have any special tasks. I just correct their mistakes, or sometimes they do it themselves under my control. If they write something, I go through and apply certain colours or just write what they need to look for and then they get their texts back and I want them to look for the mistakes that I have found.

What is the lesson planning while preparing for the exam?

I usually start preparation in late April even though I do not know who is coming up to the exam, or whether there is anyone at all, but just to have general preparation and repeating the topics we have gone through and the grammatical rules we have learn about. We go through the preparation material. and I work with a whole group, and they have to stay there for at least 2 hours and after those 2 hours the students who actually want, can go home, and the students who need more help, can stay after. If they have very poor English skills, we have something that is called 'Studieverksted', where a students and a teacher work one-to-one. So if they are really struggling in English, they can apply for going there. They can stay there for several months and get to work with only one teacher.

What materials do you use while teaching literacy skills during exam preparations? (including IT tools)

We are provided with preparation materials about the topics and we also use the exams from the previous years. IT tools are actually same for any lesson type.

Interview with Teacher 4

В какой школе Вы преподаете?

Я работаю учителем английского языка в средней общеобразовательной школе.

Какой у Вас опыт работы?

Работаю в по специальности уже два года и три месяца.

Какое у Вас образование и квалификация?

Я получила педагогическое образование, профиль-иностранный язык, бакалавр.

Что можете сказать о собственном опыте изучения навыков чтения и письма по английскому языку в старшей школе?

Если вспомнить мой опыт обучения в старших классах, то углубленного изучения иностранных языков в школе также не было, но учитель ориентировалась на сильных учеников, которые сдавали ЕГЭ. Поэтому мы отдельно отрабатывали все виды чтения, написание писем и эссе, также мы работали отдельно на повторение грамматических правил и лексики. Ничего особенного не было. Просто натаскивание на экзамен.

Сколько у Вас учеников в классе?

В этом году в моей группе по английскому языку только восемь учеников старшего звена. Это достаточно удобно, так как я могу организовать любой вид деятельности и уделить достаточно внимания всем ученикам. Более того, это положительно влияет на дисциплину в классе, потому что в более младших классах, где я преподаю английский язык, группы по 16 человек, и возникают определенные проблемы.

Сами занимаетесь планированием?

Планирование урока лежит полностью на мне, хотя КТП мы с педагогами составляем на целый год с учетом всех требований и темы прописаны в КТП мы должны будем соблюдать на протяжении всего года, даже их последовательность, но за ход урока отвечаю я лично.

Сколько времени уделяете развитию навыков чтения?

Примерно час в неделю. В план урока я стараюсь включить основные этапы: вступительный, основной и заключение. Учебник наш разделен на части в соответствии с видом речевой деятельности. Сначала это обучение чтению, аудированию, далее грамматика, чтение художественной литературы и письмо. Мы стараемся развивать все виды чтения, плюс есть задания на первичный анализ текста, до чтения, во время самого процесса чтения, ну и после уже, где они работают с пониманием текста, отвечают на вопросы, рефлексируют. Основные задания - это озаглавить текст, расставить части текста по порядку, определить главного героя и так далее.

Что можете сказать о методике преподавания навыков чтения в Вашем классе?

Как уже сказала чтение очень сильно связано с письмом и другими навыками. Мы читаем много вслух, я их корректирую. Тексты все разного размера и жанра, есть и адаптированные, и нет. Перед чтением, мы знакомимся с новой лексикой, которую они должны выучить наизусть, и устно, и письменно. Плюс грамматические задания находятся очень часто прямо в тексте.

Какие материалы используете в процессе обучения чтению?

Учебника нам вполне достаточно. Периодически я могу находить материал отличный от нашего УМК в Интернете. Касательно технического оснащения, с этим в нашей школе не все хорошо. Но если появляется возможность, я использую проектор и показываю фильмы, отрывки из видео, которые соотносятся с текстом, который мы читаем. Моим ученикам это очень нравится.

Вы можете в чем-то похвалить своих учеников?

Ничего особенного сказать не могу, к сожалению. Могу единственное ответить, что дети любят читать.

Есть моменты, которые требуют дополнительной проработки?

Они работают незаинтересованно и малоэффективно, и им очевидно интересны другие предметы, а английский: они даже в одиннадцатом классе говорят: "Мне он не нужен, я не поеду за границу". Плюс я бы все таки поработала над интонацией.

Сколько времени уделяете развитию навыков письма?

Обучение письму также занимает примерно час, но я считаю, что это все равно недостаточно. Может быть даже и реже. Все зависит от типа задания: письмо неофициального характера все пишут очень быстро, так как знакомы с этим со среднего звена. Если это касается эссе, то тут я не могу просто повторять уже заученные правила. Мы отрабатываем структуру того или иного стиля, я им это даже раздаю отдельно. Они могут посмотреть на все части и важные слова и элементы. Ребята получают задания на отработку.

Что можете сказать касаемо лексики?

Лексика учится наизусть, и ученики знакомятся с ней перед чтением текста. Потом отрабатывают ее в письменных упражнениях и используют ее в эссе.

Что можете сказать касаемо грамматики?

Грамматические правила изучаются в системе и указаны в поурочном плане. Ученикам предоставляются правила, которые они должны изучить, а потом даются задания на отработку по нарастающей сложности.

Какие материалы используете в процессе обучения письму?

Те же, что и при обучении чтению.

Вы можете в чем-то похвалить своих учеников?

Задания более легкого типа отрабатываются очень успешно.

Есть моменты, которые требуют дополнительной проработки?

Обучение письму вызывает гораздо больше сложностей, чем чтению, поскольку дети этого боятся. Им не хватает знаний грамматики и лексики.

Как Вы отрабатываете навыки чтения и письма при подготовке к итоговой работе?

Мы отрабатываем все типы заданий, представленных в контрольных и ЕГЭ. Мы иногда убираем устную часть из итоговой контрольной, если знаем, что ученики не справятся с ней.

Interview with Teacher 5

В какой школе Вы преподаете?

Я преподаю в средней общеобразовательной школе без углубленного изучения иностранных языков.

Какой у Вас опыт работы?

Три года полных, сейчас четвертый год. То есть три с половиной года.

Какое у Вас образование и квалификация?

У меня нет категории, то есть молодой специалист. Образование - бакалавриат, педагогика с фокусом на иностранные языки.

Что можете сказать о собственном опыте изучения навыков чтения и письма по английскому языку в старшей школе?

Ну по письму у нас были разработки, с ними работали. То есть мы полностью разбирали грамматику, писали тексты на разные темы. Бывало, что каждому своя тема давалась. Чтение было обычным, то есть читали, работали с текстом, тестовыми заданиями по тексту. Выбирали из текста слова, которые ты знаешь, хотел бы узнать и не знаешь.

Сколько у Вас учеников в классе?

15 учеников.

Сами занимаетесь планированием?

Планирование урока должно соответствовать ВГОСам. Я ответственная за планирование моего урока. Смотря какое: КТП на весь год, то тут главный - руководитель МО, то есть я его пишу. Он проверяет и отдает завучу. А за поурочное планирование я сама ответственная.

Сколько времени уделяете развитию навыков чтения?

У старшеклассников 3 часа английского в неделю. На чтение уходит примерно минут пятнадцать от каждого урока.

Что можете сказать о методике преподавания навыков чтения в Вашем классе?

Вся школа работает по учебнику 'Spotlight' или 'Rainbow'. Основные методы по обучению чтению зависят от заданий в этих учебниках. Мы работает со всеми типами чтения. Плюс есть задания "до", "после" и "во время" чтения. У нас работа с диалогами, чтение вслух. Составляют диалоги по данному диалогу. Чтение очень связано с отработкой письма. Например, мы изучаем прошедшее время то есть у меня идет грамматическое правило с примерами предложений и текстов. После этого идет работа с текстом на данное правило. Потом дается задание на написание своих предложений относительно текста. То есть все дается в системе: отработка правила, чтение и перевод. Тексты разного жанра и формата. Мне нравятся и аутентичные, и те, которые представлены в учебниках.

Какие материалы используете в процессе обучения чтению?

В школе я работаю в основном только по учебнику, потому что по своим - не хватает времени. Иногда делаю свои разработки из грамматического сборника Голицына.

Вы можете в чем-то похвалить своих учеников?

Они читают правильно, у них хорошее произношение, переводят в принципе хорошо. Задания на глубокое понимание текста они тоже очень хорошо выполняют.

Есть моменты, которые требуют дополнительной проработки?

Они не справляются с грамматическими заданиями.

Можете предположить причину таких положительных и отрицательных тенденций?

Они хорошо читают потому что, в предыдущих классах была достойная подготовка. Но есть и те, кто подтянул свои навыки чтения в течение учебного года. Хотя в

предыдущих классах было определенно мало времени уделено грамматике.

Сколько времени уделяете развитию навыков письма?

На развитие письменных навыков уходит примерно по часу в неделю, может быть меньше. Мы и эссе пишем, и неофициальные письма. Они мне даже писали письма на электронную почту. А для грамматики я использую учебник Голицына. В основных учебниках у нас есть грамматические модули. Словарный запас пополняется благодаря работе с текстом, плюс они учат лексику из темы, данную в учебнике. Они учат слова сначала просто из списка, потом учатся их использовать в предложениях, а после этого видят их в текстах для чтения. Эти слова используются как в чтении-понимании, так и в написании писем и эссе. Для написания эссе я раздаю распечатки со структурой письма с фразами-клише. Они отрабатывают по приложениям, а потом собирают все это вместе.

Вы можете в чем-то похвалить своих учеников?

Они хорошо заучивают слова, как значение, так и написание. Но самих текстах могут написать слишком много воды или списать из Интернета.

Как Вы отрабатываете навыки чтения и письма при подготовке к итоговой работе?

Подготовка к ЕГЭ и контрольной работе следует структуре самой работы и экзамена. Так что работаем и со словами, и с грамматикой отдельно, также отрабатываем все виды чтения и работы с текстом. Я ничего нового им не объясняю, но мы исправляем ошибки и повторяем правила, если ситуация вообще тяжелая. Для экзамена и контрольной они отрабатывают написание писем и эссе с выражением собственного мнения.

Какое Вы разработали планирование уроков для подготовки к ЕГЭ и контрольной?

Подготовка к ЕГЭ занимает час в неделю после уроков. Мы работали по примерам заданий и моим разработкам. К контрольной готовимся за 2 недели до даты сдачи и работаем прямо во время уроков.

Какие материалы вы используете?

Только собственные распечатки и примеры задания прошлых годов для подготовки к экзамену, и учебник во время урока. Касательно техники, все зависит от того, оборудован ли класс. Работала с проектором и доской, также на компьютере они писали и отправляли мне письма по имейлу. Пару раз получалось поработать с

интерактивной доской.

Teacher 6

В какой школе Вы преподаете?

Я работаю в средней общеобразовательной школе без какого-либо углубленного направления. Английский у них 3 раза в неделю.

Какой у Вас опыт работы?

Уже получается, что год и четыре месяца.

Какое у Вас образование и квалификация?

Закончила я САФУ по направлению подготовки - лингвистика, потом дистанционные курсы по направлению "учитель английского языка". Я пока что молодой специалист без категории.

Что можете сказать о собственном опыте изучения навыков чтения и письма по английскому языку в старшей школе?

У нас был упор строго на подготовку к ЕГЭ, потому что сдавали все, так что мы следовали строго заданиям в экзаменационных материалах. То есть по письму мы больше оттачивали навыки написания сочинения и письма личного характера. Также нас натаскивали на понимание текстов разного формата, и на выполнение стандартных типовых заданий.

В подгруппе 18 человек. Я считаю, что лучше было бы поменьше, так как сложно контролировать дисциплину в классе.

Сколько у Вас учеников в классе?

Я планирую все сама, опираясь на нормы ВГОС. Никто не осуществляет контроль, изредка есть посещение уроков со стороны более опытных педагогов, но это происходит редко: раз в месяц - два.

Сколько времени уделяете развитию навыков чтения?

Обучение чтению - не на каждом уроке, где-то 1 час в неделю мы уделяем чтению. Учебник так построен, что получается уделить много времени определенным аспектам языка.

Что можете сказать о методике преподавания навыков чтения в Вашем классе?

Мы развиваем все навыки чтения и все зависит от заданий. Обычно мы делим работу

на 3 этапа: дотекстовый, текстовый и послетекстовый. Сначала нам необходимо посмотреть на заголовок, иллюстрации, определить о чем он, знакомимся с лексикой. Если указан автор, то определить тематику и жанр, главного героя. Текст используем в качестве опоры на развитие навыков устной и письменной речи. Но и все же чтение направлено не на понимание содержание, а на понимание смысла, глубины текста. А основном есть практика чтения в группах и парах. Тексты разного формата и жанра. Как адаптивные, так и аутентичные. Они очень подходят под проблематику их возраста. Если честно, я люблю работать с длинными текстами….появляется возможность дать много разных заданий, и ученики более заняты, работая с ними.'

Какие материалы используете в процессе обучения чтению?

Из средств ИКТ я иногда использую проектор, но редко, так как кабинеты не все оборудованы для этого. А так, мы просто работаем с учебником. Плюс, я изредка делаю распечатки с текстами, задания по грамматике и примеры написания текстов.

Вы можете в чем-то похвалить своих учеников?

У них хорошо получается понять идею текста, и чтение на неполное понимание.

Есть что-то, что требует улучшения в формате навыков чтения?

Задание с полным пониманием для них тяжело. Основная проблема - рефлексивное чтение, так как они не могут найти в себе отклик на проблему и даже сформировать собственное мнение, хотя словарный запас у них большой. Есть проблемы в интонации и с фонетикой, читают "по-русски".

Можете предположить причину таких положительных и отрицательных тенденций?

Мотивацию может создать личная заинтересованность в проблеме, представленной в тексте. Компьютерные игры влияют негативно на произношение, так же как и заимствованные англицизмы. Еще они говорят: "Я не сдаю экзамен, поэтому мне не нужен английский".

Сколько времени уделяете развитию навыков письма?

В неделю мы уделяем примерно 1 час в неделю, минут 10-15 каждый урок. Мы стараемся писать постоянно. Разным типам письма уделяется раз в неделю-две.

Письма либо личного характера, либо эссе с повествованием и рефлексией. Я делаю разные памятки по вводным словам, структуре, словами и фразами клише. Все соотносится с темой учебника. Слова учатся сначала на запоминание перевода, потом мы работаем с ними в тестах, как чтение, так и письмо, чтобы дети

отрабатывали их написание. Иногда провожу словарные диктанты.

Что можете сказать касаемо грамматики?

Грамматика изучается по дополнительному сборнику. Сначала мы знакомимся с правилом, а потом мы его отрабатываем на отдельных заданиях: либо просто упражнения с предложениями, либо с отдельными текстами, которые связаны с актуальными для учеников темами. Тут в основном я делаю распечатки из разных справочников и сборников.

Вы можете в чем-то похвалить своих учеников?

Они очень хорошо справляются с письмами личного характера.

Есть что-то, что требует улучшения в формате навыков письма?

Проблема лежит в написании эссе, так как они не могут подобрать нужную лексику и корректно выразить свое мнение.

Они также не замотивированы как и в отношении к чтению.Но с личными письмами у них все легче и проще.

Как Вы отрабатываете навыки чтения и письма при подготовке к итоговой работе?

Подготовка к экзамену и контрольной одинаковы по своей структуре. К контрольной готовимся недели за две. К ЕГЭ мы готовим их с начала учебного года на элективах. Примерно по 1 часу в неделю. Мы фокусируемся на развитие техник письма и чтения, отдельно уделяем внимание грамматическим заданиям и лексике. Проверяем ошибки либо все вместе, либо я отдельно подхожу и беседую с учениками.