

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
LIST OF FIGURES.....	vii
CHINESE ABSTRACT.....	viii
ENGLISH ABSTRACT.....	ix
<b>CHAPTER</b>	
<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Motivation and Goal.....	1
1.2 Purpose of the Study.....	5
1.3 Significance of the Study.....	5
1.4 Research Questions.....	6
1.5 Definition of Terms.....	6
<b>2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 An Interactive Model of Reading.....	8
2.2 Schema Theory.....	12
2.3 Metacognition.....	14
2.4 Metacognition in Reading.....	18
2.5 Difference in Metacognition Among Learners.....	21
2.6 Difference in Strategy Use Among Learners.....	25
2.7 The Relationship Between First and Second Language Reading.....	28
2.8 Selected Metacognitive Reading Strategies.....	33

3. METHOD.....	39
3.1 Subjects.....	39
3.2 Materials and Instruments.....	40
3.2.1 The Pretest and Post-test Questionnaires on the Students' Perception of Reading.....	40
3.2.2 The Reading Materials.....	40
3.2.3 The pretest and Post-test of Reading Comprehension Tests.....	41
3.2.4 Questionnaire II: The Questionnaire on Metacognitive Reading Strategies.....	42
3.2.5 Questionnaire III: A Questionnaire on Responses to the Metacognitive Reading Strategy Training.....	44
3.3 Procedures & Instruction.....	45
3.4 Data Analysis.....	47
4. Results and Discussion.....	51
4.1 The Results of Questionnaire II Before the MRST by HPG & LPG.....	51
4.2 The Results of Questionnaire II After the MRST by HPG & LPG.....	56
4.2.1 Comparison of Strategic Reading of Using Title or Pictures and Using Background Knowledge in Prediction for HPG & LPG between the Pretest and Post-test.....	64
4.2.2 Comparison of Strategic Reading of Summarizing for Students Between the Pretest and the Post-test.....	66
4.3 Comparison of Perception of Reading for Students Before the MRST.....	68
4.3.1 Comparison of Perception of the fixed-up Behaviors for HPG & LPG before the MRST.....	68
4.3.2 Comparison of Attitudes Toward the Nature of Good Reading For LPG and HPG Before the MRST.....	70

4.4 Comparison of Perceptions of Reading For Students After the MRST.....	72
4.4.1 Comparison of Perception of the fixed-up Behaviors for HPG & LPG after the MRST.....	73
4.4.2 Comparison of Attitudes Toward the Nature of Good Reading for the HPG and LPG After the MRST.....	75
4.5 Reading Comprehension Improvement For Both HPG and LPG.....	80
4.5.1 The Responses of HPG and LPG to the Effect of MRST on Reading Comprehension.....	80
4.5.2 The Responses of HPG and LPG to Effect of MRST On Answering Reading Comprehension Questions	
4.5.3 Results of Reading Comprehension Tests For HPG and LPG Between The Pretest and Post-test.....	85
4.6 The Results of Questionnaire III: Evaluation of Responses to the Three Metacognitive Reading Strategies for Participants.....	87
4.6.1 HPG & LPG Students' Responses to the Effectiveness of the Three Metacognitive Reading Strategies.....	87
4.6.2 HPG & LPG Students' Response to the Three Metacognitive Reading Strategies.....	91
4.6.3 The Responses of HPG & LPG to the Preference for the MRST.....	93
4.6.4 The Responses of HPG & LPG to the Effect of MRST on Promoting Interest in English Reading.....	95
5. Conclusions, Implications, and Suggestions.....	99
5.1 Conclusions.....	99

5.2 Implication.....	101
5.3 Suggestions.....	103
REFERENCES.....	106
APPENDIX A: The Questionnaire on the Students' Perception of Reading (Questionnaire I).....	122
APPENDIX B: The Reading Materials.....	124
APPENDIX C: English Reading Comprehension Tests.....	142
APPENDIX D: The Questionnaire of Students' Metacognitive Reading Strategy (Questionnaire II).....	151
APPENDIX E: Response to the Metacognitive Reading Strategies Instruction (Questionnaire III).....	161

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>TABLE</b>	<b>Page</b>
Table 4.1 Frequency and Percentage of Metacognitive Reading Strategies Used by HPG and LPG in Questionnaire II before the MRST.....	53
Table 4.2 Frequency and Percentage of Metacognitive Reading Strategies Used by HPG and LPG in Questionnaire II after the MRST.....	59
Table 4.3 Comparison of Strategic Reading of Using Title or Pictures, Using Context, and Using Background Knowledge in Prediction for HPG & LPG Between the Pretest and Post-test.....	65
Table 4.4 Comparison of Summarizing for HPG & LPG Students between the Pretest and Post-test.....	66
Table 4.5 Comparison of Perception of the fixed-up Behaviors for HPG & LPG Students Between the Pretest and Post-test.....	74
Table 4.6 Comparison of Attitudes Toward Good Reading for Students Between the Pre-test and Post-test.....	78
Table 4.7 The Responses of HPG & LPG to the Effect of MRST on the Reading Comprehension.....	81
Table 4.8 The Responses of HPG & LPG to the Effect of MRST on Answering the Reading Comprehension Questions.....	84
Table 4.9 The Paired Samples T-test for the Pre-tests and Post-test of HPG...	86
Table 4.10 The Paired Samples T-test for the Pre-tests and Post-test of LPG..	86
Table 4.11 HPG & LPG Students' Responses to the Effectiveness of the Three Metacognitive Reading Strategies.....	89

Table 4.12 HPG & LPG Students' Responses to the Three Metacognitive Reading Strategies.....	93
Table 4.13 HPG & LPG Students' Likes and Dislikes for the MRST.....	95
Table 4.14 The Responses of HPG & LPG to the Effect of MRST on Promoting Interest in English Reading.....	96

## LIST OF FIGURES

	<b>PAGE</b>
Figure 1 Interaction of Metacognitive Components.....	17

國立政治大學英國語文學系碩士在職專班

碩士論文提要

論文名稱：後設認知閱讀策略對國中生英語閱讀理解及態度的效益研究

指導教授：余明忠博士

研究生：曾鈺惠

論文提要內容：

本研究的目的是在探討後設認知閱讀策略在 EFL 國中生英語閱讀上的效益。尤其是探究此訓練對高、低分組學生後設認知閱讀策略的使用差異，對英語閱讀觀點及理解之影響，以及學生對後設認知閱讀策略訓練所作的回應。

本研究以新竹縣某國中的一個七年級班級 30 位學生為研究對象，將學生分為高分組及低分組。這些學生接受為期四週的三種後設認知閱讀策略訓練（分別為文意圖像策略、預測策略、總結策略）在英語閱讀上之運用。

在資料分析上，主要是針對高、低分組在前後實驗，在後設認知閱讀策略使用上的差異作比較及質的分析。高分組及低分組在閱讀理解測驗上的閱讀能力表現也會做量的分析。除此之外，學生們對於後設認知策略訓練所作的回應，予以質的分析。

本研究的主要總結如下：

1. 後設認知閱讀策略訓練能有效提升高分組及低分組兩組在後設認知閱讀策略上的使用。
2. 後設認知閱讀策略訓練有助於改善高分組及低分組的英語閱讀理解，學生們對後設認知閱讀策略訓練在閱讀理解方面的效益，皆抱持肯定的態度，尤其是低分組學生。
3. 後設認知閱讀策略訓練有助於高分組及低分組的學生，尤其是低分組學生，建立更正確的英語閱讀觀念。
4. 大部分的學生對於後設認知閱讀策略訓練的效益皆表示肯定的態度，並且樂於運用這些後設認知閱讀策略於英語閱讀上，且樂於學習新的閱讀策略。

最後，根據實驗的結果提供一些教學上的建議。



## **Abstract**

The purpose of the present study is to investigate the effects of metacognitive reading strategy training (MRST) on junior-high-school students' EFL reading. Specifically, the differences of metacognitive reading strategy use between HPG and LPG, perceptions of reading, English reading comprehension, and their responses to the metacognitive reading strategy training (MRST) are probed.

The participants of this study were thirty junior high school students from one seven-grade class in Shingchu C. The participants were divided into high-proficient group and low-proficient group. These participants received the four-week training (MRST) with three metacognitive reading strategies (semantic mapping, prediction, and summarizing) in reading English texts. In the data collection, the differences between HPG and LPG in metacognitive reading strategy use in the pre-treatment and post-treatment were compared and analyzed qualitatively. Also, HPG and LPG students' reading performance in reading comprehension tests between the pre-treatment and post-treatment were analyzed quantitatively. In addition, students' perceptions toward the effects of the MRST were analyzed qualitatively.

Based on the data analyses, the findings of the study are summarized as follows:

1. The MRST was effective in enhancing both HPG and LPG readers' metacognitive awareness of strategy use.
2. The MRST helped improve both HPG and LPG readers' comprehension in reading English texts, and students, especially LPG, had positive attitude toward the effectiveness of the MRST in improving reading comprehension.
3. The MRST helped both groups of students, especially LPG readers, have more

correct perceptions toward English reading.

4. Most of the students exhibited positive attitude toward the effectiveness of the MRST and showed their willingness to apply the learned metacognitive reading strategies as well as to learn new reading strategies in English reading.

Finally, some pedagogical implications and suggestions are provided on the basis of the findings in this study.