ABSTRACT

This study investigates the differences in the choice of metacognitive and cognitive strategies employed by second language learners while reading expository texts in print and hypertext.

The research sample comprised 10 students from the Faculty of Law, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Shah Alam. The subjects were required to verbalise their thoughts while reading in print and hypertext. They were asked to read and say everything either in their L1 or English aloud regardless of how trivial the thinking seemed.

A number of instruments were used in this study. A questionnaire (Student’s Profile) was given at the beginning to obtain information on the subjects. The questions ranged from age to age, level and type of education to proficiency in the English Language.

Another questionnaire The Online Survey of Reading Strategies (OSORS) was given after the subjects had written the summary for the hypertext. The 38 items of the OSORS were about their perception of the on-line reading strategies that they used. Both expository texts, the printed and hypertext used in the study had a predetermined 12th grade readability level. The hypertext was designed to have six hyperlinks which the students could access. A retrospective interview was used to supplement the think aloud procedure. This was done so as to probe into some of the statements made during the think aloud, thereby improving the reliability of the protocol analysis.
A coding scheme of reading strategies was adapted from Sheorey and Mokhtari (2001), and Anderson (1991, 2003) assisted in identifying and determining which reading strategies students employed when reading the printed and hypertext. The data from the verbal reports, questionnaire and summary were analysed in a variety of ways. These include using frequency counts, percentage scores, mean scores, T-test, Spearman correlation analysis and the Wilcoxon test of significance.

The findings in general revealed that there was no real significant difference in the choice of strategies used when reading printed and hypertext except for these reading strategies; *determine what to read, prior knowledge, use text features* and *try to stay focused*. The ESL learners used more of these strategies when reading hypertext than printed text. Also most of the scores the students obtained for the summary of the printed text were better than the hypertext.

The findings of the study hold important implications for the reading curricula, teacher and research concerned with improving the ESL learners reading skill in hypertext.
ABSTRAK

Kajian ini mengkaji perbezaan dalam pilihan strategi metakognitif and kognitif yang digunakan oleh pelajar bahasa Inggeris sebagai bahasa kedua (ESL) semasa membaca teks ekspositori dalam bentuk bercetak dan hyperteks.

Sampel kajian ini terdiri daripada 10 orang pelajar dari Fakuliti Undang-Undang, UiTM, Shah Alam. Subject diminta berfikir lantang apa yang mereka fikirkan semasa membaca teks dan hyperteks. Mereka diminta membaca dan menyebut dengan jelas apa sahaja yang mereka fikirkan sama ada perkara tersebut penting atau tidak dalam bahasa pertama mereka atau bahasa Inggeris. Beberapa instrument kajian digunakan dalam penyelidikan ini. Sata soal seliddik (profail pelajar) diberikan awal kajian untuk mendapatkan maklumat mengenai mereka. Soalan-soalannya dibina mengikut umur, tahap dan jenis kemahiran mereka belajar bahasa Inggeris. Soal selidik Strategi Pembacaan secara Atas Talian (The Online Survey of Reading Strategies/OSORS) pula diberi selepas subjek menulis ringkasan hyperteks. 38 perkara yang terdapat dalam Soal selidik Strategi Pembacaan secara Atas Talian ialah mengenai persepsi mereka terhadap strategipembacaan secara atas talianyang mereka gunakan,

Kedua-dua jenis teks yang bercetak dan hyperteks merupakan teks terpilih dengan tahap kebolehbacaannya ialah pada Gred 12. Hyperteks yang digunakan ialah yang mempunyai 6 hyperlink yang boleh diakses oleh pelajar. Temubual secara retrospektif pula digunakan untuk melengkapi prosedur berfikir lantang. Temubual ini bertujuan
untuk menyelidik secara lebih mendalam maklumat yang diperoleh semasa kaedah berfikir lantang dilakukan seterusnya menjadikan analisa berfikir lantang lebih andal.


Secara umumnya, dapatan kajian ini menunjukkan tidak wujudnya signifikan yang jelas dalam pilihan strategi semasa membaca bahan bercetak atau bahan hyperteks, kecuali untuk strategi-strategi berikut iaitu menentukan apa yang dibaca, aspek pengetahuan sebelum, menggunakan fitur yang ada pada teks dan cuba memfokus secara tetap. Pelajar ESL lebih menggunakan strategi yang dinyatakan ini apabila membaca hyperteks berbanding dengan teks bercetak. Dapatan kajian juga menunjukkan skor pelajar lebih tinggi dalam ringkasan melalui teks bercetak berbanding hyperteks.

Dapatan kajian ini penting untuk pembinaan kurikulum bacaan serta berguna untuk guru dan pengkaji yang berminat menambah baik kemahiran membaca hyperteks oleh pelajar ESL.
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