

Japanese High School Students' Metacognitive Awareness of EFL Reading: The Effect of Grade Difference

Kinue HIRANO*

(Received October 30, 1998)

ABSTRACT

This study investigates Japanese senior high school readers' metacognitive awareness or judgements about their reading ability and strategies in EFL to explore the effect of differences in grade level or the number of years of target language experience on their metacognitive awareness or perceptions of reading ability and reading strategies. The results revealed that there was a significant difference in only one of five factors identified, i. e., 'students' perceptions of top-down strategies' between Japanese 1st-year and 3rd-year high school students. The 3rd-year high school students (n=97) showed a higher score for their awareness of global strategies than the 1st-year high school students (n=131). The two groups did not significantly differ in their perceptions of the other four factors.

KEY WORDS

metacognitive awareness
reading strategies

EFL reading
target language experience

1. Introduction

Previous research in English as a second or foreign language (ESL or EFL) (e. g. Devine 1984; Barnett 1988; Pardon and Waxman 1988; Carrell 1989) has shown that readers' knowledge or perceptions of their reading and reading strategies, i. e. metacognitive awareness or judgments play an important role in reading and are related to successful and unsuccessful ESL/EFL reading.

Some researchers in EFL have investigated metacognitive perceptions of reading strategies with Japanese students: junior high school students (e. g. Uehara 1995); senior high school students (e. g. Iijima 1998); university students (e. g. Shirato 1991; Tsudajuku 1992; Konoeda 1994; Hirano 1996); combinations of senior high school and university students (e. g. Kimura et al. 1997); comparisons among high school, undergraduate and graduate students (e. g. Hirano 1998).

Little research has investigated the effect of differences in grade level or the number of years of target language experience on Japanese senior high school students' metacognitive awareness or perceptions of reading strategies. Iijima (1998) examined the

* Department of Foreign Languages

Table 1 Means and SDs for the Items on the Questionnaire (n =228)

Item	Statement	Mean	SD
A) Confidence			
When reading silently in English,			
1.	I am able to anticipate what will come next in the text.	2.67	0.76
2.	I am able to recognize the difference between main points and supporting details.	2.89	0.93
3.	I am able to relate information which comes next in the text to previous information in the text.	2.84	0.91
4.	I am able to question the significance or truthfulness of what the author says.	2.46	0.92
5.	I am able to use my prior knowledge and experience to understand the content of the text I am reading.	3.12	1.03
6.	I have a good sense of when I understand something and when I do not.	3.19	0.98
B) Repair			
When reading silently in English, if I don't understand something,			
7.	I keep on reading and hope for clarification further on.	3.53	1.08
8.	I reread the problematic part.	3.59	0.93
9.	I go back to a point before the problematic part and reread from there.	3.63	0.99
10.	I look up unknown words in a dictionary.	4.01	1.03
11.	I give up and stop reading.	2.36	1.03
C) Effective			
When reading silently in English, the things I do to read effectively are to focus on			
12.	mentally sounding out parts of the words.	2.78	1.07
13.	understanding the meaning of each word.	3.88	0.87
14.	getting the overall meaning of the text.	4.21	0.74
15.	being able to pronounce each whole word.	2.91	1.02
16.	the grammatical structures.	3.47	0.96
17.	relating the text to what I already know about the topic.	2.89	0.88
18.	looking up words in the dictionary.	3.76	0.92
19.	the details of the content.	3.01	0.75
20.	the organization of the text.	3.20	0.94
D) Difficulty			
When reading silently in English, things that make the reading difficult are			
21.	the sounds of the individual words.	2.48	0.93
22.	pronunciation of the words.	2.75	1.10
23.	understanding word meanings	4.09	0.83
24.	the grammatical structures.	4.04	0.83
25.	the alphabet.	1.83	0.91
26.	relating the text to what I already know about the topic.	2.85	0.88
27.	getting the overall meaning of the text.	3.78	0.91
28.	the organization of the text.	3.37	0.90
E) Effective			
The best reader I know in English is a good reader because of his/her ability to			
29.	understand word meanings.	3.89	0.92
30.	sound out words.	3.62	1.13
31.	understand the overall meaning of a text.	4.19	0.82
32.	use a dictionary.	3.07	1.11
33.	guess at word meanings.	3.52	1.04
34.	integrate the information in the text with what he/she already knows.	3.33	1.01
35.	focus on the details of the content.	3.39	0.92
36.	grasp the organization of the text.	3.70	0.98

[For the items (except No. 23 & No. 29), see Carrell (1989)]

differences in the use of reading strategies between tenth-grade students and twelfth-grade students. He found that twelfth-grade students paid more attention to the structural aspect of English and showed lower awareness of their emotion and opinions than tenth graders in reading an expository prose. He used his own questionnaire, on the basis of his preliminary study of reading strategies, in order to investigate the students' perceptions about their reading strategies, not Carrell's (1989) questionnaire.

The present study employs Carrell's questionnaire and investigates the differences between two grade levels (i. e., tenth-grade and twelfth-grade high school students in their metacognitive awareness or perceptions of confidence in their reading abilities (i. e., their confidence) (Carrell 1989: 125), repair strategies, effective strategies, and what causes them difficulty.

2. Method

2. 1 Subjects

Two groups of Japanese senior high school EFL students participated in the study. Group One consisted of 131 first-year high school students in four classes from one public senior high school in Niigata Prefecture. They had studied English for three years and nine months by the time of data collection. Group Two consisted of 97 3rd-year students in three classes from the same high school as that of Group One. They had had five years and nine months of English language experience up to the point at which they participated in this study. On average, the students were considered to represent middle- and low-proficiency levels in English, compared to other high school students in general.

2. 2 Materials

All of the items(except No. 23 and No. 29) in the metacognitive awareness questionnaire were taken from Carrell(1989: 131-132) (see Table 1 and Appendix). The original English questionnaire was translated into Japanese. The Japanese questionnaire was the

Table 2 Metacognitive Questionnaire

		(Item No.)
1) Confidence	6 statements	(1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
2) Repair	5 statements	(7, 8, 9, 10, 11)
3) Effective	17 statements	
a) global strategies	6 statements	(14, 17, 20, 31, 34, 36)
b) local strategies	11 statements	(12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35)
4) Difficulty	8 statements	
a) global strategies	3 statements	(26, 27, 28)
b) local strategies	4 statements	(21, 22, 23, 24, 25)

(Hirano 1998: 37, based on Carrell 1989)

same as the one used in Hirano (1998), which was mainly based on Tsudajuku's (1992) questionnaire and modified so that high school students could understand the content of each item well. Using a five-point Likert Scale (1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree), subjects judged thirty-six statements about their own perceived ability to read and silent reading strategies in EFL.

Carrell (1989) classified metacognitive awareness into four components: (1) confidence in reading ability, (2) repair strategies, (3) effective strategies, and (4) difficult-strategies (see Table 2). (3) and (4) are readers' awareness or perceptions about their silent reading strategies used in different reading situations. The effective strategies are subcategorized into (1) sound-letter (3 statements), (2) word-meaning (5 statements), (3) grammatical structures (1 statement), (4) content details (2 statements), (5) text gist (2 statements), (6) background knowledge (2 statements), and (7) textual organization (2 statements). (1), (2), (3), (4) are related to local, bottom-up types of reading strategies. (5), (6), (7) are global, top-down types of reading strategies.

Eight statements are related to readers' awareness of things that make reading difficult for them (Items 21-28). Like the effective strategies, these are subcategorized into two types: global and local strategies. Local strategies are related to: (1) sound-letter (3 statements), (2) word-meaning (1 statement), and (3) grammatical structures (1 statement). Global, top-down strategies are related to (1) text gist (1 statement), (2) background knowledge (1 statement), and (3) text organization (1 statement).

2. 3 Procedure

Immediately after the students listened to their teachers' brief explanation about what English paragraphs, main ideas, topic and supporting sentences were, they were administered the metacognitive awareness questionnaire. They completed the questionnaire within 20 minutes.

2. 4 Data Analysis

The underlying factors on metacognitive awareness were discerned through factor analysis. The variables which showed significant differences between the two grade levels were investigated through analyses of variance (ANOVAs) on factor scores.

3. Results and Discussion

One-way ANOVAs were conducted to compare the two means of each item among groups and to find out which items showed developmental differences between the Japanese students (see Table 3). The results indicated that statistical significant differences in metacognitive awareness between them were found for the ten items. I next employed factor analysis.

Table 3 Means, SDs, and the Results of ANOVAs for the Items on the Questionnaire

Item No.	Grade 10	Grade 12	F	
	(n=131) Mean (SD)	(n=97) Mean (SD)		
1) Confidence				
1	2.78 (0.76)	2.52 (0.74)	7.20**	Grade10>Grade12
2	2.91 (0.95)	2.88 (0.90)	ns	
3	2.85 (0.93)	2.82 (0.88)	ns	
4	2.48 (0.92)	2.43 (0.91)	ns	
5	3.14 (1.06)	3.10 (1.01)	ns	
6	3.18 (1.04)	3.21 (0.89)	ns	
2) Repair				
7	3.50 (1.13)	3.58 (1.00)	ns	
8	3.56 (0.93)	3.63 (0.94)	ns	
9	3.61 (1.03)	3.65 (0.94)	ns	
10	4.02 (1.06)	3.99 (0.98)	ns	
11	2.30 (1.06)	2.44 (0.98)	ns	
3) Effective				
12	2.61 (1.11)	3.01 (0.98)	7.98**	Grade10<Grade12
13	3.92 (0.88)	3.82 (0.85)	ns	
14	4.28 (0.78)	4.10 (0.68)	ns	
15	3.05 (1.08)	2.73 (0.92)	5.33*	Grade10>Grade12
16	3.44 (1.00)	3.51 (0.91)	ns	
17	2.73 (0.90)	3.11 (0.80)	10.90**	Grade10<Grade12
18	3.79 (0.99)	3.73 (0.82)	ns	
19	2.99 (0.86)	3.03 (0.57)	ns	
20	3.10 (1.02)	3.34 (0.80)	ns	
4) Difficulty				
21	2.42 (0.98)	2.56 (0.85)	ns	
22	2.81 (1.18)	2.67 (0.98)	ns	
23	4.11 (0.87)	4.06 (0.79)	ns	
24	4.11 (0.85)	3.93 (0.81)	ns	
25	1.81 (0.94)	1.87 (0.87)	ns	
26	2.71 (0.87)	3.03 (0.87)	7.55**	Grade10<Grade12
27	3.75 (0.99)	3.82 (0.78)	ns	
28	3.32 (0.93)	3.44 (0.87)	ns	
5) Effective				
29	3.85 (1.01)	3.94 (0.77)	ns	
30	3.76 (1.23)	3.42 (0.94)	5.20*	Grade10>Grade12
31	4.14 (0.86)	4.26 (0.77)	ns	
32	3.10 (1.17)	3.02 (1.02)	ns	
33	3.34 (1.11)	3.75 (0.90)	8.87**	Grade10<Grade12
34	3.21 (1.08)	3.49 (0.88)	4.65*	Grade10<Grade12
35	3.21 (1.00)	3.64 (0.74)	12.99***	Grade10<Grade12
36	3.59 (1.11)	3.86 (0.76)	4.19*	Grade10<Grade12

*p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

Table 4 Factor Analysis Results (n=228)

Item No.	Factor Loading					Communalities
	I	II	III	IV	V	
3	0.69					0.49
2	0.62					0.41
4	0.62					0.41
1	0.60					0.37
5	0.54					0.44
36		0.69				0.52
34		0.69				0.55
35		0.67				0.48
28		0.56				0.41
20		0.51				0.38
14			0.61			0.45
18			0.59			0.45
13			0.58			0.46
9			0.56			0.38
16			0.52			0.39
22				0.78		0.64
21				0.77		0.67
15				0.56		0.39
30				0.50		0.34
29					0.71	0.63
33					0.55	0.39
32					0.53	0.35
Eigenvalue	3.03	2.92	2.66	2.60	1.99	
Percent of variace explained(%)	9.19	8.85	8.06	7.89	6.04	

Note: Only items with loadings equal to or over 0.50 are indicated in the table.

3. 1 Factor analysis result

The items whose means plus or minus one standard deviation were above 5 or below 1, respectively, were excluded. As a result, a factor analysis was performed on 33 items for the total students. Using the principal component procedure and Varimax rotation, five factors were extracted. The pattern matrix, using a loading greater than .50 as a criterion of factor salience, appears in Table 4. These five factors accounted for 40.02% of the variance in the 33 items.

As can be seen in Table 4, Factor I receives loadings from five variables pertaining to students' awareness of their ability to use top-down strategies. Thus, this factor is best labeled as confidence in one's ability to use top-down strategies (see Table 5). Factor II is

Table 5 Five Factors

Item No.	Statement
Factor I (confidence in one's ability to use top-down strategies)	
3	I am able to relate information which comes next in the text to previous information in the text.
2	I am able to recognize the difference between main points and supporting details.
4	I am able to question the significance or truthfulness of what the author says.
1	I am able to anticipate what will come next in the text.
5	I am able to use my prior knowledge and experience to understand the content of the text I am reading.
Factor II (top-down strategies)	
36	the best reader I know in English is a good reader because of his/her ability to grasp the organization of the text.
34.	the best reader I know in English is a good reader because of his/her ability to integrate the information in the text with what he/she already knows.
35	the best reader I know in English is a good reader because of his/her ability to focus on the details of the content.
28	things that make the reading difficult are the organization of the text.
20	the things I do to read effectively are to focus on the organization of the text.
Factor III (strategies which make reading effective)	
14	the things I do to read effectively are to focus on getting overall meaning of the text.
18	the things I do to read effectively are to focus on looking up words in the dictionary.
13	the things I do to read effectively are to focus on understanding the meaning of each word.
9	if I don't understand something, I go back to a point before the problematic part and reread from there.
16	the things I do to read effectively are to focus on the grammatical structures.
Factor IV (bottom-up strategies focusing on sound-letter)	
22	things that make the reading difficult are pronunciation of the words.
21	things that make the reading difficult are the sounds of the individual words.
15	the things I do to read effectively are to focus on being able to pronounce each whole word.
30	the best reader I know in English is a good reader because of his/her ability to sound out words.
Factor V (effective bottom-up strategies focusing on word meanings)	
29	the best reader I know in English is a good reader because of his/her ability to understand word meanings.
33	the best reader I know in English is a good reader because of his/her ability to guess at word meanings.
32	the best reader I know in English is a good reader because of his/her ability to use a dictionary.

defined by five variables, the four relating to students' perceptions of top-down strategies. The three variables belong to effective top-down strategies: Items 36 (grasp the organization of the text), 34 (integrate the information in the text with what he/she already knows) and 20 (focus on the organization of the text). Item 28 is a difficulty-causing global (top-down) item. Only Item 35 (focus on the details of the content) belongs to the type of local, bottom-up strategies, although it reflects readers' awareness of effective strategies. Therefore, it seems best to label this factor as top-down strategies.

Factor III includes Items 14, 18, 13, 9, and 16. Three of them (i. e., Items 14, 18, and 13) reflects readers' awareness of effective strategies focusing on meaning. Item 16 (focus on the grammatical structures) also belongs to effective strategies. Only one item (Item 9, go back to a point before the problematic part and reread from there) belongs to repair strategies. Thus this factor is labeled as strategies which make reading effective.

Factor IV is defined by four variables which belong to bottom-up strategies relating to sound-letter: two difficulty-causing items such as Items 22 (pronunciation of the words) and 21 (sounds of the individual words); and two effective-local strategies like Items 15 (pronounce each whole word), and 30 (sound out words). Therefore, it is labeled as bottom-up strategies focusing on sound-letter.

Finally, Factor V shows students' perceptions of effective bottom-up strategies as characteristics of best readers. These items (i. e., Items 29, 33, and 32) focus on word meanings. Thus it is labeled as effective bottom-up strategies focusing on word meanings.

3. 2 Differences in factor scores on metacognitive awareness

The factor scores were submitted to one-way ANOVAs to determine whether significant developmental differences in metacognitive awareness existed between tenth and twelfth graders. Table 6 shows the means and standard deviations for items on each factor. Each item was grouped by factor and the order was rearranged so that the item with the highest score of the total subjects came on the top. Table 7 indicates the means and standard deviations of factor scores for two groups and the results of one-way ANOVAs.

The results of ANOVAs based on factor scores revealed that there was a statistical significant difference in metacognitive awareness between the two groups for only one factor, i. e., Factor II (students' perceptions of top-down strategies). That is, the twelfth graders were significantly ($p < .0001$) more aware of global, top-down strategies than the tenth graders. This indicates that the two-year difference in students' target language experience affected their perceptions of top-down strategies. Hirano (1998) also found that first-year undergraduate students' perceptions of global, or top-down reading strategies as effective were significantly higher than those of 2nd-year high school students (i. e., eleventh graders).

However, no significant differences in factor scores were found between the two groups for the other four factors, Factors I, III, IV, and V. Whether students increased in target language experience or not, there was no developmental change in metacognitive

Table 6 Means and SDs for the Items in Each Factor

Factor No.	Item No.	Grade 10	Grade 12	Total
		(n=131) Mean(SD)	(n=97) Mean(SD)	(n=228) Mean(SD)
Factor I	5	3.14 (1.06)	3.10 (1.01)	3.12 (1.03)
	2	2.91 (0.95)	2.88 (0.90)	2.89 (0.93)
	3	2.84 (0.93)	2.82 (0.88)	2.84 (0.91)
	1	2.79 (0.76)	2.52 (0.74)	2.67 (0.76)
	4	2.48 (0.92)	2.43 (0.91)	2.46 (0.92)
Factor II	36	3.59 (1.11)	3.86 (0.76)	3.70 (0.98)
	35	3.21 (1.00)	3.64 (0.74)	3.39 (0.92)
	28	3.32 (0.93)	3.44 (0.87)	3.37 (0.91)
	34	3.21 (1.08)	3.49 (0.88)	3.33 (1.01)
	20	3.10 (1.02)	3.34 (0.80)	3.20 (0.94)
Factor III	14	4.28 (0.78)	4.10 (0.68)	4.21 (0.74)
	13	3.92 (0.88)	3.82 (0.85)	3.88 (0.87)
	18	3.79 (0.99)	3.73 (0.82)	3.76 (0.92)
	9	3.61 (1.03)	3.65 (0.94)	3.63 (0.99)
	16	3.44 (1.00)	3.51 (0.91)	3.47 (0.96)
Factor IV	30	3.76 (1.23)	3.42 (0.94)	3.62 (1.13)
	15	3.05 (1.08)	2.73 (0.92)	2.91 (1.02)
	22	2.81 (1.18)	2.67 (0.98)	2.75 (1.10)
	21	2.42 (0.98)	2.56 (0.85)	2.48 (0.93)
Factor V	29	3.85 (1.01)	3.94 (0.77)	3.89 (0.92)
	33	3.34 (1.11)	3.75 (0.90)	3.52 (1.04)
	32	3.10 (1.17)	3.02 (1.02)	3.07 (1.11)

Table 7 Means, SDs and the Results of ANOVAs on Factor Scores

Factor No.	Grade 10	Grade 12	F
	(n=131) Mean(SD)	(n=97) Mean(SD)	
I	0.015(1.08)	-0.020(0.88)	0.07 ns
II	-0.240(1.00)	0.324(0.91)	19.17 p<.0001
III	0.104(1.04)	-0.141(0.93)	3.38 ns
IV	0.007(1.09)	-0.010(0.87)	0.02 ns
V	-0.039(1.07)	0.053(0.91)	0.47 ns

awareness between the two groups for the four factors. Years of language study did not affect the students' perceptions of their reading ability and reading strategies for Factors I, III, IV and V. The twelfth graders did not show more confidence in the use of top-down strategies than the tenth graders. Hirano(1998) found that the degree of the students' confidence in their reading ability to use top-down strategies(Factor I) did not increase until the students reached the graduate level, suggesting that this factor might belong to the 'late change' type.

Furthermore, Factor IV(bottom-up strategies focusing on sound-letter) did not differ between the tenth and twelfth graders. This finding is supported by Hirano(1998), who found that there was no significant difference among high school, undergraduate, and graduate students. She suggested that this factor belongs to the 'no significant change' pattern.

It should be noted that there was no significant decrease between the two groups in their perceptions of local strategies focusing on word meanings (Factor V). Hirano's (1998) findings revealed that no significant difference was found between high school and undergraduate students. The students' perceptions did not decrease until the graduate student level. She stated that this factor might reflect 'late change'. This might be due to the fact that third-year Japanese high school students still tended to perceive the understanding of word meanings as being effective.

4. Conclusion

The present study investigated the effect of differences in grade level on Japanese high school students' metacognitive awareness(i. e. , judgments) about their reading abilities(i. e. , their confidence), and reading strategies. The findings of the present study indicated that the twelfth graders(readers with more years of language study) were more aware of top-down strategies than the tenth graders(readers with less study). Japanese high school students' target language experience and age difference affected only one factor, i. e. , Factor II(their perceptions of top-down strategies). However, years of language study did not affect the students' perceptions of reading and reading strategies in the other four factors such as Factors I, III, IV and V.

This study dealt with middle- or low- proficiency high school students on average in Japan. Additional research should investigate the degree to which years of study will affect more advanced high school students' metacognitive awareness about reading and reading strategies.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Goro Arakawa and English teachers at Arai Senior High School for their help with data collection.

References

- Anderson, N. "Individual differences in second language reading strategies." *Modern Language Journal*, 75(1991): 460-472.
- Baker, L. & Brown, A. "Metacognitive skills and reading." *The Handbook of Reading Research*. Ed. P. Pearson. 1984. 353-394.
- Barnett, M. "Reading through content: How real and perceived strategy use affects L2 comprehension." *Modern Language Journal*, 72(1988): 156-162.
- Block, E. "The comprehension strategies of second language readers." *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(1986): 463-493.
- Carrell, P. "Metacognitive awareness and second language reading." *Modern Language Journal*, 73(1989): 121-134.
- Carrell, P., Pharis, B. , & Liberto, J. "Metacognitive strategy training for ESL Reading." *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(1989): 647-673.
- Carrell, P. "Strategic reading." *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*. Ed. J. Alatis. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1991. 167-178.
- Casanave, C. "Comprehension monitoring in ESL reading: A neglected essential." *TESOL Quarterly*, 22(1988): 283-302.
- Devine, J. "ESL readers' internalized models of the reading process." *On TESOL ' 83*. Eds. J. Handscombe, R. Orem and B. Taylor. Washington, DC: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, 1984: 95-108
- Garner, R. *Metacognition and Reading Comprehension*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1987.
- Hirano, K. "Nihonjin gakusei no dokkai sutorateji ni taisuru ninshiki to dokkairyoku, eigogakuryoku to no kankei [Japanese students' metacognitive awareness, reading comprehension, and language proficiency]." *Atarashii Yomi no Shido Mokuteki o Motta Reading [New Instruction in Reading: Purposeful Reading]*. Ed. T. Watanabe. Tokyo: Sanseido, 1996. 100-114.
- Hirano, K. "Japanese students' metacognitive awareness and EFL reading (recall): comparisons among high school, undergraduate, and graduate students." *JACET Bulletin*, 29(1998): 33-50.
- Iijima, H. "Nihonjin kokosei gakushusha no eibun dokkai sutorateji shiyo no tokucho to sono gakunensa ni kansuru kenkyu: ronsetsubun no dokkai ni kanshite [Characteristics and grade difference in Japanese high school students' reading strategy use]." *Bulletin of the Kanto-Koshin-Etsu English Language Education Society*, 12(1998): 1-8.

- Jung, H. *The Relationship between Adult Second Language Readers' Metacognitive Awareness of Reading and their Reading Processes in a Second Language*. Unpublished Ph. D Dissertation. The University of Arizona, 1992.
- Kimura, Y. et al. "Nihonjin EFL gakushusha no dokkai sutorateji ni kansuru chousa [Survey on reading strategies by Japanese EFL learners]." *Bulletin of the JACET Kansai Chapter*, 4(1997): 66-75.
- Konoeda, Y. "Metacognitive awareness and English reading ability: A case study of Baika Junior College students." *Study Reports of Baika Junior College*, 42(1994): 29-43.
- Pardon, Y. & H. Waxman. "The effect of ESL students' perceptions of their cognitive strategies on reading achievement." *TESOL Quarterly*, 22(1988): 146-150.
- Shirato, Y. "Dokkai sutorateji ni kansuru anketo chosa [Questionnaire survey on metacognitive awareness]." *Kenkyu Ronshu of Joetsu University of Education*, 6(1991): 31-46.
- Tsuda Juku Daigaku Gengo Bunka Kenkyu Jo Dokkai Kenkyu Group (Tsudajuku). Eds. "*Gakushusha Chushin no Dokkai Shido [Learner-Based Teaching of Reading]*." Tokyo: Taishukan, 1992: 122-132.
- Uehara, K. "EFL dokkai sutorateji toreiningu: Recall eno eikyo [EFL reading strategy training: effects on recall]." *Bulletin of the Kanto-Koshin-Etsu English Language Education Society*, 9(1995): 29-40.
- Zhang, Y. *Chinese Students' Metacognitive Awareness in Reading English and its Effect on Comprehension*. Unpublished Ph. D Dissertation. Ohio University, 1994.

Appendix

全
く
そ
う
思
わ
な
い

 そ
う
思
わ
な
い

 ど
ち
ら
と
も
言
え
な
い

 そ
う
思
う

 全
く
そ
う
思
う

英語を黙読する時,

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1) 文章中次にどんな内容が書かれているかを予測できる。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2) 主要部分とそれを支える(説明する)詳細部分との違いがわかる。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3) 文章中にすでに書いてある情報と次に出て来る情報とを関係づけられる。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4) 著者の言っていることの重要性や真実性に問いを発することができる。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5) 読んでいる文章の内容を理解するために、自分のこれまでの知識や経験を利用できる。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6) ある事柄が理解できているかいないかをよく認識できる。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

英語を黙読する時, 何か理解できないことがあるときは,

- | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7) 読み続けて, 先に行けばわかるだろうと期待する。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8) 問題のある部分を読み返す。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9) 問題のある部分より前にもどって, そこから読み返す。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10) 知らない単語を辞書で調べる。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11) あきらめて, 読むのをやめる。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

英語を黙読する時, (自分が) 効果的に読むために焦点を当てる事柄は,

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12) 心の中で単語の一部を発音することである。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13) それぞれの単語の意味を理解することである。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14) 文章全体の意味をつかむことである。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15) それぞれの単語全体の発音ができることである。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16) 文法や構文である。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17) その話題について自分がすでに知っていることと文章を関連づけることである。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18) 単語を辞書で引くことである。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19) 内容の詳細部分である。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20) 文章の構成である(例えば出だし・展開・終わりといった構成。時間の流れにそったり, 原因と結果の関係をたどった書き方。また, 比較・対照, 実例などによる展開, 構成)。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

英語を黙読する時, (自分にとって) 読解が難しくなる原因は,

- | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 21) 単語の中の一つ一つの音である。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22) 単語の発音である。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23) 単語の意味を理解することである。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24) 文法や構文である。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25) アルファベット(一つ一つの文字)である。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26) その話題について自分がすでに知っていることと文章を関連づけることである。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27) 文章全体の意味をつかむことである。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 28) 文章の構成である(上記の20)参照)。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 自分の知っている人の中で、最もすぐれた英語の読み手は、 | | | | | |
| 29) 単語の意味がよくわかる。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 30) 単語を発音することが上手である。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 31) 文章全体の意味をつかむことが上手である。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 32) 辞書を使うことにすぐれている。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 33) 単語の意味を推測することが上手である。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 34) 文章中の情報と自分がすでに知っていることを関連、統合させることがうまい。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 35) 内容の詳細部分に焦点を当てることにすぐれている。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 36) 文章の構成(上記の20)参照)を把握することが上手である。 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |