

Acknowledgements

Grateful acknowledgement is made to my advisor, Professor Chiou-Lan Chern, for her instructive advice. I am also indebted to the anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments. A special thank you goes to those who contributed to this paper: Yu-Ching Kelly Tseng, Yi-Hung Eric Chiou, Yu-Hsien Eunice Chiou, Tzu-Chiao Su, Chen-Yu Jenny Chen, Mei-Rong Alice Chen, John-Michael Nix, Ya-Wen Fu, and Ying-Ping Grace Huang.

References

- Alderson, J. C. (1984). Reading in a foreign language: A reading or a language problem? In J. C. Alderson & A. H. Urquhart (Eds.), *Reading in a foreign language* (pp. 1-24). London, UK: Longman.
- Alderson, J. C., & Urquhart, A. H. (1985). The effect of students' academic discipline on their performance on ESP reading tests. *Language Testing*, 2, 192-204.
- Al-Shumaimeri, Y. A. N. (2006). The effects of content familiarity and language ability on reading comprehension performance of low-and high-ability Saudi tertiary students studying English as a foreign language. *Journal of King Saud University, Educational Sciences & Islamic Studies*, 18(2), 1-19.
- Anderson, R. C., James, W. P., & Larry, L. S. (1983). Effects of the reader's schema at different points in time. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75, 271-279.
- Anderson, R. C., Reynolds, R. E., Schallert, D. L., & Goetz, E. T. (1977). Frameworks for comprehending discourse. *American Educational Research Journal*, 14, 367-381.
- Bartlett, F. C. (1932/reissued 1995). *Remembering: A study in experimental and social psychology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bensoussan, M., & Kreindler, I. (1990). Improving advanced reading comprehension in a foreign language: Summaries vs. short-answer questions. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 13(1), 55-68.

- Bernhardt, E. B. (1991). *Reading development in a second language: Theoretical, empirical and classroom perspectives*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Bernhardt, E. B. (2005). Progress and procrastination in second language reading. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25, 133-150.
- Bernhardt, E. B. (2011). *Understanding advanced second-language reading*. New York: Routledge.
- Bernhardt, E. B., & Kamil, M. L. (1995). Interpreting relationships between L1 and L2 reading: Consolidating the linguistic threshold and the linguistic interdependence hypotheses. *Applied Linguistics*, 16(1), 15-34.
- Brown, A. L., & Day, J. D. (1983). Macrorules for summarizing texts: The development of expertise. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 22(1), 1-14.
- Carrell, P. L. (1984a). The effects of rhetorical organization on ESL readers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18, 441-469.
- Carrell, P. L. (1984b). Evidence of a formal schema in second language comprehension. *Language Learning*, 34, 87-112.
- Carrell, P. L., & Eisterhold, J. C. (1983). Schema theory and ESL reading pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17, 553-573.
- Casazza, M. (1993). Using a model of direct instruction to teach summary writing in a college reading class. *Journal of Reading*, 37, 202-208.
- Chang, Y. F. (2006). On the use of the immediate recall task as a measure of second language reading comprehension. *Language Testing*, 23, 520-543.
- Clapham, C. (2001). Discipline specificity and EAP. In J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes* (pp. 84-100). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Clarke, M. (1980). The short circuit hypothesis of ESL reading -- Or when language competence interferes with reading performance. *The Modern Language Journal*, 64, 203-209.
- Cook, G. (1997). Key concepts in ELT: Schemas. *ELT Journal*, 51(1), 86.
- Cummins, J. (1991). Interdependence of first- and second-language proficiency in bilingual children. In E. Bialystok (Ed.), *Language processing in bilingual children* (pp. 70-89). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Day, J. D. (1986). Teaching summarization skills: Influences of student ability level and strategy difficulty. *Cognition and Instruction*, 3, 193-210.
- Delli Carpini, M. X., & Keeter, S. (1991). Stability and change in the U.S. public's knowledge of politics. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 55, 583-612.
- Delli Carpini, M. X., & Keeter, S. (1993). Measuring political knowledge: Putting first things first. *American Journal of Political Science*, 37, 1179-1206.
- Delli Carpini, M. X., & Keeter, S. (1997). *What Americans know about politics and why it matters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Douglas, D. (2000). *Assessing languages for specific purposes*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Dudley-Evans, T., & St. John, M. J. (1998). *Developments in english for specific purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Grabe, W. (1988). Reassessing the term interactive. In P. L. Carrell, J. Devine, & D. E. Eskey (Eds.), *Interactive approaches to second language reading* (pp. 56-70). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hare, V. C., & Borchardt, K. M. (1984). Direct instruction of summarization skills. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 20(1), 62-78.
- Hidi, S., & Anderson, V. (1986). Producing written summaries: Task demands, cognitive operations, and implications for instruction. *Review of Educational Research*, 56, 473-493.
- Iyengar, S. (1990). Shortcuts to political knowledge: The role of selective attention and accessibility. In J. A. Ferejohn & J. H. Kuklinski (Eds.), *Information and democratic processes*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Jennings, M. K. (1996). Political knowledge over time and across generations. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 60, 228-252.
- Johns, A. M. (1988). Reading for summarizing: An approach to text orientation and processing. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 4(2), 79-90.
- Johnson, R. E. (1970). Recall of prose as a function of structural importance of the linguistic units. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 9(1), 12-20.

- Kintsch, W. (1998). *Comprehension: A paradigm for cognition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kintsch, W., & Kozminsky, E. (1977). Summarizing stories after reading and listening. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 69*, 491-499.
- Kintsch, W., & van Dijk, T. A. (1978). Toward a model of text comprehension and production. *Psychological Review, 85*, 363-394.
- Koh, M. Y. (1985). The role of prior knowledge in reading comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign language, 3*, 375-380.
- Krekeler, C. (2006). Language for special academic purposes (LSAP) testing: The effect of background knowledge revisited. *Language Testing, 23*(1), 99-130.
- LaBerge, D., & Samuels, S. J. (1974). Towards a theory of automatic information processing in reading. *Cognitive Psychology, 6*, 293-323.
- Lamberta, R. D., Curtisa, J. E., Kaya, B. J., & Browna, S. D. (1988). The social sources of political knowledge. *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique, 21*, 359-374.
- Lee, J.-W., & Schallert, D. L. (1997). The relative contribution of L2 language proficiency and L1 reading ability to L2 reading performance: A test of the threshold hypothesis in an EFL context. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 713-739.
- Lin, T.-J., & Wang, S.-H. (2007). Changes and sources of political knowledge in taiwan. *Soochow Journal of Social and Political Sciences, 25*(3), 93-129.
- Nassaji, H. (2002). Schema theory and knowledge-based processes in second language reading comprehension: A need for alternative perspectives. *Language Learning, 52*, 439-481.
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Perfetti, C. A., Van Dyke, J. A., & Hart, L. (2001). The psycholinguistics of basic literacy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 21*, 127-149.
- Phakiti, A. (2003). A closer look at the relationship of cognitive and metacognitive strategy use to EFL strategy reading comprehension test performance. *Language Learning, 53*, 649-702.

- Phakiti, A. (2008). Construction validation of Bachman and Palmer's (1996) strategic competence model over time in EFL reading tests. *Language Testing, 25*, 237-272.
- Ridgway, T. (1997). Thresholds of background knowledge effect in foreign language reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 11*(1), 151-166.
- Rumelhart, D. (1980). Schemata: The building blocks of cognition. In R. J. Spiro, B. C. Bruce, & W. F. Brewer (Eds.), *Theoretical issues in reading comprehension* (pp. 33-58). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schmidt-Rinehart, B. C. (1994). The effects of topic familiarity on second language listening comprehension. *Modern Language Journal, 78*, 179-189.
- Shaker, L. (2009). Citizens' local political knowledge and the role of media access. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, 86*, 809-826.
- Smith, F. (1975). *Comprehension and learning*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Stanovich, K. E. (1980). Toward an interactive-compensatory model of individual differences in the development of reading fluency. *Reading Research Quarterly, 16*(1), 32-71.
- Stanovich, K. E. (2000). *Progress in understanding reading: Scientific foundations and new frontiers*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Van Dijk, T. A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.
- Yu, G. (2008). Reading to summarize in English and Chinese: A tale of two languages? *Language Testing, 25*, 521-551.
- Zaller, J. (1990). Political awareness, elite opinion leadership, and the mass survey response. *Social Cognition, 8*, 125-153.

Appendix A

Background Knowledge Test

1. 請問您我國臺灣立法委員的任期為幾年？
2. 請問您現任美國總統是誰？
3. 請問您臺灣現任的副總統是哪一位？
4. 請問您現在中國國家主席是誰？
5. 哪一個臺灣機關有權解釋憲法？
6. 日本現任總理是誰？
7. 由金大中與盧武鉉兩任總統執行的對北韓（朝鮮）政策為？

Appendix B

摘要寫作

About the Author: Michael Robert Auslin (1967-) is an American academic, historian, Japanologist. He was formerly an Associate Professor of at Yale University; and he is now Director of Japanese Studies at the American Enterprise Institute, which is a conservative think tank in Washington, DC.

閱讀下面的文章，請將下列文章濃縮成 300 字的中文摘譯

Beating the War Drums in Korea

Most of the time, political rhetoric doesn't matter much. Either it's for a domestic audience, or it's a way of letting off steam in international relations. I wouldn't want to bet that the rhetoric coming out of the two Koreas is so innocent, however. Relations between the two have been deteriorating since the North sank a South Korean naval vessel back in 2010 and then shelled an island, killing South Korean citizens. There was some hope that the inauguration of the new president Park Geun-hye would lead to some type of new approach to the North, though many worried that Madame Park would be too eager to shift Seoul back towards the unrealistic Sunshine Policy that failed during the 1990s.

If anything, the war of words between Pyongyang and Seoul is worse than under hardline former president Lee Myung-bak. Of course, young North Korean dictator Kim Jong Un has continued the family tradition of provocation and aggression, launching ballistic missiles and setting off nuclear explosions. That has led to more U.N. sanctions talk, this time with China supposedly on board. The result has been the rhetorical equivalent of Defcon One. Last week, Pyongyang threatened to end the armistice that has held on the peninsula since the end of the Korean War in 1953 (no peace treaty was ever signed, and so the two sides formally remain at war). That would be a grave change to the status quo, literally indicating that hostilities

had once again commenced -- even if no attack was actually undertaken. From North Korea's twisted legal logic, the U.N. sanctions are a form of warfare, so they are justified in responding; moreover, having given warning of the end of the armistice, they could "legally" launch military attacks on the South.

In response, the South Korean military warned it would target North Korea's command leadership," including, presumably, Kim Jong Un himself. The South's fear is that young Kim, relatively untested yet brashly confident of his country's missile forces and nuclear capability, may wind up authorizing limited attacks, confident the South won't respond. Thus, the rhetorical one-upmanship.

The real danger here is that the two sides may talk themselves into conflict, even war. President Park cannot begin her six-year term by seeming to cower before the North, while Kim has had a string of successes that make him as "successful" as his dictator father and grandfather before him; however, he may not have the savvy his forebears had in pulling back just before going over the edge. Mix in nationalist passions in both countries (usually directed against Japan, but able to pivot against each other when necessary), and an itchy trigger finger along the Demilitarized Zone, and the potential for conflict grows alarmingly large.

That, of course, would bring in the U.S., which still has over 27,000 troops pledged to come to the aid of the South, along with the airpower of the U.S. Air Force and Navy. Word on the street is that Washington talked Seoul down in 2010, when former President Lee wanted to strike back in some way for the North's unprovoked aggression. This time, I'd wager it will be nearly impossible to prevent a new president from proving her bona fides if Kim Jong-un is stupid enough to actually launch an attack that winds up costing innocent South Korean life. In short, watch the rhetoric levels to see if they decline a bit to "normal" hatred, or if they seem to moving into ever more provocative territory. Before long, Washington may have to field a call from Seoul's Blue House, asking President Obama if he is prepared to back a South Korean military response to the North's madness.

Appendix C

評分說明

主／次要概念	完整句與拆句	分數分配	總分
主要概念 Sentence represents main idea	南北韓的政治喊話，可能導致雙方關係越演越烈		10
	南北韓的 2 / 政治喊話 3 可能導致 1 / 雙方關係 2 / 越演越烈 2	$2 + 3 = 5$ $1 + 2 + 2 = 5$	
	金正恩承襲了家族的恫嚇，進行導彈試射		10
	金正恩 2 / 承襲了 2 / 家族的 1 / 恫嚇 1	$2 + 2 + 1 + 1 = 6$	
	進行 1 / 導彈試射 3	$1 + 3 = 4$	
	聯合國對北韓進行制裁，被（北韓）視為宣戰		10
	平壤宣布將終止兩韓停戰協定作為回應		
	聯合國 1 / （對北韓）進行制裁 2 / ， 被（北韓）視為 1 / 宣戰 1	$1 + 2 + 1 + 1 = 5$	
	平壤宣布 1 / 將終止 1 / 兩韓停戰協定 2 / 作為回應 1	$1 + 1 + 2 + 1 = 5$	
	美國曾阻止南韓對北韓反擊，若雙方言語（攻訐）激化，北韓發動攻擊，戰爭無可避免		10
	美國 1 / 曾阻止 1 / 南韓對北韓 2 / 反擊 1	$1 + 1 + 2 + 1 = 5$	
	倘若雙方 1 / 言語（攻訐）激化 1 / 北韓發動攻擊 1 / 戰爭無可避免 2	$1 + 1 + 1 + 2 = 5$	

評分說明（續）

主／次要概念	完整句與拆句	分數分配	總分
次要概念 Sentence represents supporting idea	朴槿惠不可能在上任之初，就對北韓 展現出軟弱的姿態		5
	朴槿惠 1 / 不可能在 1 / 上任之初 1 就對北韓 0.5 / 展現出 0.5 / 軟弱 1 (的 姿態)	1 + 1 + 1 = 3 0.5 + 0.5 + 1 = 2	
	金正恩 / 急於塑造 / 自己 (承繼父執 輩) / 的強人形象 但不見得有 / 父執輩的智慧		5
	金正恩 1 / 急於塑造自己 (承繼父執 輩) 1 / 的強人形象 1 但不見得有 1 / 父執輩的智慧 1	1 + 1 + 1 = 3 1 + 1 = 2	
	聯合國將舉行制裁會，預料中國持贊 成的立場		5
	聯合國 1 / 將舉行 0.5 / 制裁會 1 / 預料中國 1 / 持贊成的 1 / 立場 0.5	1 + 0.5 + 1 = 2.5 1 + 1 + 0.5 = 2.5	
	南韓軍方因此而警告將鎖定北韓領導 階層給予打擊		5
	南韓軍方 1 / 因此而警告 1 / 將鎖定 1 北韓領導階層 1 / 給予打擊 1	1 + 1 + 1 = 3 1 + 1 = 2	