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Abstract

This study examined the relationships between reading anxiety and reading performance, and the factors impacting reading anxiety, covering both first language (L1) and second language (L2). Participants were Chinese learners studying English as second language. They were asked to complete the Foreign Language Reading Anxiety Scale and reading comprehension tests. The Foreign Language Reading Anxiety Scale (FLRAS; Saito, Horwitz, & Garza, 1999) was employed to measure reading anxiety in L1 and L2. Reading comprehension tests were used to measure the participants’ reading performance in L1 and L2. Correlation analysis indicated that reading anxiety is negatively related to reading performance for both L1 and L2. In addition, the study found that participants’ self-perceived language proficiency and certain reading behavior were significant factors attributing to the participants’ L1 and L2 reading anxiety. Results from the hierarchical regression indicated that frequency of reading in Chinese Academics and Chinese Newspaper significantly contributed to the decrease of English reading anxiety, indicating the influence of reading behavior across languages, from L1 to L2. The findings from this study can contribute to increasing awareness of the affective domain of reading for both L1 and L2 among language professionals. Teachers are suggested to pay attention to the reading anxiety level experienced by language learners, in order to help students to effectively cope with their language/reading difficulties.
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Chapter 1: Introduction and Literature Review

The Report of the Commission on Reading in the U.S.A. revealed that reading is considered as a cornerstone for success, not just in schools, but also throughout an individual’s adult life (Anderson, Hiebert, Scott, & Wilkinson, 1985). Reading is regarded as a process, a mode of thinking, a kind of real experience and involves many complex skills: the ability to perceive printed words, to skim for information and then perhaps read intensively (Karim, N. S. A., & Hasan, 2007). Kirsch and Guthrie (1984) identified in their research with adult readers that reading contributes to a great extend to job success, career development, and ability to respond to change. The importance of reading has caused in much research work done to understand the cognitive domain of reading (i.e. reading abilities and strategies). However, an affective domain of reading, reading anxiety, has received much less attention in the field. McKenna and Kear (1990) found that the focus of recent research and development in assessment has been comprehension rather than the affective aspects. Martinez, Aricak, & Jewell (2008) also stated that there have been comparatively fewer studies which explored the affective domain of reading. Despite this, recent studies about the affective influences on reading achievement (Ghaith & Bouzeineddine, 2003; Lynch, 2002; Unrau & Schlackman, 2006) underscore the influence of affective factors.

FL Anxiety

FL anxiety is defined as “a distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings and behaviors related to classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process” (Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986, p. 128). It comes from the overall FL learning processes and can be easily identified by teachers as learners try
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to communicate in their target languages (Horwitz et al., 1986). General FL anxiety has been examined in both traditional classrooms and online learning environments (e.g., Coryell & Clark, 2009; Liu & Jackson, 2008; Tallon, 2009), where it was found that FL anxiety has a negative relationship with FL performance (Horwitz et al., 1986; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994; Yan & Horwitz, 2008; Young, 1994).

**FL Reading Anxiety**

Reading anxiety is closely related to but distinguishable from the construct of general foreign language (FL) anxiety. FL reading anxiety is not easily detected by teachers as reading does not involve spontaneous communication in the same way as speaking does. Reading anxiety is the anxiety that learners experience during the reading process and therefore is associated with the specific language skill of reading, among the four language skills which include speaking, reading, writing and listening (Zhao, A., Guo, Y., & Dynia, J., 2013). FL reading anxiety has attracted researchers’ attention only recently and many questions, such as those regarding the predictive power of FL reading anxiety on reading performance and the factors impacting FL reading anxiety, remains unanswered (Saito, Horwitz, & Garza, 1999; Shi & Liu, 2006).

Saito et al. (1999) stated that “there has been relatively little discussion of anxiety and second language (L2) reading.”, and “in fact, we have not been able to identify any material on first language reading anxiety even though first language (L1) reading difficulties are well-known.” Recently, some researchers have attempted to investigate FL reading anxiety in relation to variables such as gender (Matsuda & Gobel, 2004) and the use of reading strategies (Zhou, 2008). In the study conducted by Matsuda and Gobel (2004), it was indicated that gender was not a significant predictor of Japanese students’ reading anxiety in learning English as a second language. In terms of the use
of reading strategies, Zhou’s research showed that in China, for anxious Chinese readers who learnt English as a second language, they were different from less anxious readers in the usage of reading strategies. It was found that highly anxious readers were not able to employ reading strategies efficiently while dealing with English written texts.

**Reading Anxiety and Reading Performance**

Regarding reading performance, a few researchers have found that foreign language reading anxiety is negatively related to foreign language reading performance (Saito et al., 1999; Sellers, 2000; Shi & Liu, 2006). For instance, Saito et al. (1999) used the Foreign Language Reading Anxiety Scale (FLRAS) to assess American university students’ reading anxiety in Japanese, Russian, and French. They found that foreign language reading anxiety does exist, and that it is distinct from overall foreign language anxiety. Besides, Sellers (2000) who replicated the findings by Oh (1990) stated that anxious English speaking Spanish learners tended to have a lower level of reading comprehension ability than those participants who experienced less anxiety. It was concluded that highly anxious learners had lower passage content recall and used more local reading strategies than less-anxious students. Shi and Liu (2006) also identified that Chinese speaking English learners with high FL reading anxiety scored lower on reading performance tests. Contrastingly, different results were reported by other studies. Some research suggested that there was no significant relationship between FL reading anxiety and reading performance (Brantmeier, 2005; Mills, Pajares, & Herron, 2006). Brantmeier (2005) utilized the FLRAS to assess FL reading anxiety in American learners of Spanish. The study showed that no significant correlation was found between anxiety factors and the reading comprehension scores among learners of Spanish. Hence, the relation between reading anxiety and reading performance has not been clear cut. On
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the other hand, due to the limited number of research conducted, especially in the context of learning English as a second language in Asia, the relation between reading anxiety and reading performance is yet to be further examined.

**Reading Anxiety and Reader Characteristics**

Previous research has shown that anxiety does not work in isolation to influence FL reading (Liu & Samimy, 2012). Other factors in relation to reading anxiety should also be taken into consideration in the interpretation of FL reading anxiety. Bernhardt (1990) pointed out that readers play an active role in constructing meaning from the text and interact with texts all the time; therefore, reader characteristics do impact FL reading. However, many fundamental questions concerning the impacts of other variables, at the individual's level, such as self-perceived language proficiency, reading behaviors and background variables (e.g. age, income) have not been thoroughly investigated.

Notwithstanding the remarkable impact of anxiety on FL reading, relatively little research have been carried out to observe reading anxiety in the foreign language learning context, particularly in the context of English as a foreign language in Asia. The researcher could only identify three studies on the FL anxiety of Chinese speaking learners. These include studies performed by Liu (2012), Liu & Samimy (2012), and Shi and Liu (2006). As stated earlier, the researcher was not able to identify any material on first language reading anxiety. There was also no identifiable research which examines reading anxiety for both L1 and L2 in the Chinese speaking population. As a result, this study was conducted to fill a gap in prior research. The main objectives of this study were to examine the relationship between reading anxiety and reading performance, and to identify factors contributing to reading anxiety for both L1 and L2, among Chinese learners learning English as a second language.
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Research Questions

The following research questions were explored in this study:

1. To what extend is reading anxiety related to reading performance in L1/L2?

2. To what extend are self-perceived language proficiency related to reading anxiety in L1/L2?

3. To what extend is reading behavior related to reading anxiety in L1/L2?
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Chapter 2: Methodology

Participants

Eighty four participants aged above 18 were recruited for this research. There were eight participants whose native language was not Chinese, as they were not the target participants of this research, their data were not included in the statistical analysis of the study. Among the seventy six participants, the majority of them were females (78%), young (92% aged below 38) and with high educational level (92% had a bachelor degree or above). Table 1 provided the demographic data.

Instruments

Reading Anxiety Measure

The purpose of this research was to explore the relationship between reading anxiety and reading performance, and to identify factors contributing to reading anxiety for both L1 and L2. For the purpose of this study, the researcher used the FLRAS to measure participants’ reading anxiety. Developed by Saito et al. (1999), the FLRAS was designed to measure the anxiety that learners experience in reading a foreign language, it has been regarded as a highly valid and reliable instrument to measure foreign language reading anxiety (Gonen, 2007; Matsumura, 2001; Miyanaga, 2005). The FLRAS requests for “students’ self-reports of anxiety over various aspects of reading, their perceptions of reading difficulties in their target language, and their perceptions of the relative difficulty of reading as compared to the difficulty of other language skills” (Saito et al., 1999, p. 204). As stated earlier, material on first language reading anxiety cannot be identified, hence, for this study, the FLRAS was adapted in order to be used for first language as well, items which describes specifically the learning challenges in foreign language were adjusted to describe learning in the first language, and two items that are specific to foreign language learning were eliminated (e.g. English culture and ideas seem
very foreign to me; you have to know so much about English history and culture in order to read English). Hence, there are 18 items in the adapted FLRAS. The words “foreign language” in the original scale was changed to “Chinese/English.” Each item is answered according to a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” In calculating the total score of the FLRAS, a numerical value is first given to each item, the highest degree of anxiety received a 5 and the lowest received a 1, then the item score is added up as the total value. The higher score indicates more anxiety of the learners. In this study, the minimum of the FLRAS score for L1 was 25 and the maximum was 66; for L2, the minimum of the FLRAS score was 33 and the maximum was 70.

Hsiao (2002) used confirmatory factor analysis to analyze the construct validity of the Chinese version of the FLRAS and concluded that the unidimensionality of the scale was confirmed and the scale was reliable and valid to obtain reading anxiety of Chinese college students who were learning foreign language. Saito et al. (1999) also reported that the FLRAS had a good internal consistency of .86 (Cronbach’s alpha, n = 383) among learners of French, Russian and Japanese in American universities.

In this study, both the FLRAS for L1 and L2 had good internal consistency as was indicated by the Cronbach’s Alpha. The FLRAS for L1 had a Cronbach’s Alpha of .78 and the FLRAS for L2 had a Cronbach’s Alpha of .79. Table 2 illustrated the data. The magnitude was similar to Saito et al. (1999)’s findings. According to Dornyei (2003), an instrument with a Cronbach’s Alpha of .8 was considered as a very reliable instrument.

**Reading Performance Measure**

In order to measure L1 and L2 reading performance, reading comprehension tests
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in Chinese and English were conducted. For English reading comprehension tests, the test was selected from the site: www.EnglishForEveryone.org, which provides a tool for learners to take reading comprehension tests, earn achievements, track their performance and etc. This site offers to researchers that materials from the site can be used to conduct research study. The English comprehension test is at high school Grade 11 to Grade 12 levels, to cater for participants of this study who are learning English as the second language. The passage describes the benefits of planting English Ivy over house roof and defends English Ivy against opponents’ comments about how invasive English Ivy can be. The passage is about two hundred and fifty words in length and there are eight multiple choice questions (seven questions are provided by the author and one question is created by the researcher). Participants respond to the multiple choice questions after reading the passage. There are five answer choices per question.

For Chinese reading comprehension tests, the test was sourced from the public domain. The test was constructed by Hon Hong Yu, who is a secondary school Chinese Language teacher in a Hong Kong local school. Mr. Yu created this test for students who learn Chinese as the first language and is completing their last year in secondary school. The article explains the importance of improving ones’ weaknesses in the workplace while leveraging on his/her strengths and expertise to cope with the requirements of the changing environments. The article also argues that for those who are not willing to admit or work on their weaknesses, they will never be able to acquire new skills that are required in the workplace. The passage is about one thousand and forty two words in length and there are eight multiple choice questions (six questions are provided by the author and two questions are created by the researcher). Participants also respond to the multiple choice questions after reading the article. There are four
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answer choices per question.

Pilot Testing

The questionnaires were pilot-tested with 10 participants to ensure the questions are easy to be understood and to measure the time required to complete the questionnaires. Based on pilot participants’ feedbacks, the text format was modified to ensure it is easy to read the passages in the comprehension tests in one screen. It was also confirmed that eight multiple choice questions for each passage is appropriate to ensure participants can complete the questionnaires within one hour and thirty minutes.

Background Information Questionnaire

A reading behavior and background information questionnaire designed for this study obtained participant information on: gender, age, ethnicity, educational level, Grade Point Average, income, occupation, native language, average time spent in reading per week, frequency of reading different materials (e.g. Recreational, Academics, Science, Newspaper etc.), and self-perceived written and oral Chinese/English ability.

Procedure

The participants of this study were recruited from two sources. The first source is students enrolled in the general psychology course at City University of Hong Kong, which is one of the eight universities in HK, with a student population of more than 20,000. These students received 1.5 credits for their participations in this study. The second source is researcher’s personal networks or referrals from friends. Invitation emails were sent to the target participants with a link to the online questionnaire, and they were asked to complete the questionnaire online. Participants were first asked to respond to the FLRAS for L1 and L2, followed by the Chinese and English comprehension tests in which participants read the passage and then answered the
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questions. The last part is the Background Information Questionnaire. The online questionnaire platform (www.my3Q.com) was used. The online questionnaire is attached in Appendix 1.

Statistical Analysis

The Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS), version 20 was used to analyze the survey data. In addition to descriptive statistics such as means, standard deviations, percentages and frequencies, three rounds of statistic tests were conducted. First, the Cronbach’s Alpha was calculated on the FLRAS for L1 and L2 to test the internal consistency of the questionnaires. Second, the relationship between reading anxiety and reading performance was examined by running the Pearson Correlation analysis and the hierarchical regression analysis. Third, multiple regression and hierarchical regression analysis were conducted using FLRAS scores as dependent variable, and self-perceived language proficiency variables and reading behavior variables as independent variables.
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Chapter 3: Results

Research Question 1

To what extend is reading anxiety related to reading performance in L1/L2?

Participants in this sample had a mean score of 49.39 (SD = 8.45) in reading anxiety for L1 and a mean score of 53.71 (SD = 8.50) in reading anxiety for L2. For reading performance, participants had a mean score of 3.89 (SD = 1.81) for L1 and a mean score of 2.91 (SD = 1.95) for L2. The descriptive information for reading anxiety and reading performance is provided in Table 3. The Pearson correlation between reading anxiety and reading performance for L1 was marginally significant (r = -0.22, p=0.05). For L2, the Pearson correlation between reading anxiety and reading performance was also significant (r = -0.23, p<0.05). The correlation analysis showed that the participants who experienced more reading anxiety tended to have a lower level of reading performance for both reading in English and reading in Chinese, and vice versa.

To identify the contribution of reading anxiety in explaining the variance of reading performance, hierarchical regression was conducted with the effects of income and age being controlled (income and age were entered as Step 1 independent variables, and reading anxiety entered as Step 2 independent variable). The results revealed that reading anxiety (β = -0.25, p< 0.05) was a significant predictor of reading performance. The hierarchical regression data is provided in Table 4.

Research Question 2

To what extend are self-perceived language proficiency related to reading anxiety in L1/L2? A multiple regression was performed with written English/Chinese proficiency and oral English/Chinese proficiency as the independent variables and reading anxiety as the dependent variable, for both L1 and L2. Participants’ written
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Chinese proficiency level ($\beta = -0.34, p < 0.01$) was a significant factor of reading anxiety, this suggested that participants with higher perceived written Chinese proficiency experienced less reading anxiety and vice versa. For L2, participants with high oral ($\beta = -0.23, p < 0.05$) and written English ($\beta = -0.40, p < 0.001$) proficiency level had less reading anxiety in reading English. These results are summarized in Table 5.

Research Question 3

*To what extend is reading behavior related to reading anxiety in L1/L2?* A multiple regression was performed with reading time per week and frequency of reading different materials (e.g. recreational, academics, business, science, fiction/novels, comics and newspaper) as the independent variables and reading anxiety as the dependent variable, for both L1 and L2. Reading time per week was dummy coded to a variable (none = 0, 1-2 hours = 1, 2-3 hours = 2, 3-4 hours = 3, 4-5 hours = 4, 5-6 hours = 5, more than 6 hours = 6). For L1, from the aspects of participants’ reading behavior, frequency of reading Academics ($\beta = -0.30, p < 0.01$) and Newspaper ($\beta = -0.34, p < 0.01$) significantly predicted reading anxiety. Table 6 demonstrates that even when the effects of income and age were controlled in the hierarchical regression analysis (income and age entered as Step 1 independent variables, and other reading behavior entered as Step 2 independent variables), reading in Academics ($\beta = -0.33, p < 0.01$) and Newspaper ($\beta = -0.45, p < 0.001$) were still significant predictors of reading anxiety. Participants had a lower L1 reading anxiety level if they frequently read Academics and Newspaper. For L2, Table 7 shows that reading time per week ($\beta = -0.32, p < 0.01$) and frequency of reading Science books ($\beta = -0.22, p = 0.05$) and Fiction/Novels ($\beta = -0.27, p < 0.05$) were significant predictors of reading anxiety. It was found that participants who read more frequently on a weekly basis would encounter a lower level of reading anxiety in L2.
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Specifically, reading frequently Science books and Fiction/novels could reduce reading anxiety in L2.

Table 8 demonstrates that when the following variables were controlled: Income and Age (income and age were entered as Step 1 independent variables), and reading behavior for L2 (reading behavior entered as Step 2 independent variables), frequency of reading in Chinese Academics ($\beta = -0.42, p< 0.01$) and Chinese Newspaper ($\beta = -0.27, p< 0.05$) were significant predictors of reading anxiety for L2 (frequency of reading in Chinese Academics and Chinese Newspaper entered as Step 3 independent variables). In other words, participants who frequently read Chinese Academics and Chinese Newspaper on a weekly basis would have less anxiety in reading in English, indicating that there is influence of reading behavior on a cross-language basis, from L1 to L2.
Chapter 4: Discussion and Conclusions

The present study suggested that reading anxiety is negatively related to reading performance for both L1 and L2. Furthermore, it was indicated that participants with high oral and written English proficiency levels had less reading anxiety in reading English. The study also revealed that participants’ reading anxiety level in L2 decreased with the increasing frequency of reading on a weekly basis, and specifically, reading frequently Science books and Fiction/ novels in L2 could reduce reading anxiety in L2. Interestingly, this study found that participants’ reading anxiety level in L2 decreased with the increasing frequency of reading in Chinese Academics and Chinese Newspaper.

Reading Anxiety and Reading Performance

Consistent with the findings of previous studies (Saito et al., 1999; Sellers, 2000; Shi & Liu, 2006), this study showed that FL reading anxiety is negatively related to FL reading performance. In addition, this is the same case for first language reading anxiety as well. From the perspective of cognitive psychology, this negative relationship between reading anxiety and reading performance might be due to human’s limited processing capacity in language learning (Eysenck, 1992). Learners’ reading anxiety might occupy their processing capacity and reduce the attention they could spend on the reading task, and hence negatively influence their reading performance. As the more anxious learners have less attention on the reading task, they might require more time to interpret meanings of the words or if they were given the same amount of time the more anxious learners might not accomplish the same reading results as the less anxious learners. Therefore, the learners with higher reading anxiety might accomplish less in reading tasks.

Language Proficiency and Reading Anxiety
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This study showed that language proficiency and learner anxiety are negatively related (Liu, 2012). Consistent to findings of past studies, learners with low self-perceived language proficiency may experience higher reading anxiety, which in turn impacts learners’ learning process and may eventually result in lower language proficiency. It would be worthwhile for teachers to first pay attention to those learners with high anxiety before enhancing their language proficiency. This will be further discussed below. Although it is believed that this study provides evidence for the relationship of reading anxiety and language proficiency, it is difficult to be sure whether anxiety is the cause or effect of language proficiency. The same goes for the other variables observed in this study. It is also worth to note that participants experienced anxiety as a result of their encounters in L1 and L2 reading (as the reading anxiety measures were administrated before the reading tasks) rather than the anxiety reactions stemming from the reading or language difficulties in the reading tasks.

Reading Behavior and Reading Anxiety

In this study, it was found that participants had a lower reading anxiety level if they frequently read Academics and Newspaper for L1, and if they frequently read Science books and Fiction/novels for L2 respectively. These may reflect the reading environment of Hong Kong people where reading in Chinese involves the daily practical usage, and reading in English happens more with materials (such as Science and Fiction/novels) that are more related to personal interests. Further research can be conducted to investigate the reasons behind people reading different types of materials in order to understand how these factors impact reading anxiety.

In this study, it was found that participants who frequently read Chinese Academics and Chinese Newspaper on a weekly basis would have less anxiety in both
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reading in Chinese and reading in English, indicating that there may be transfer of reading anxiety between L1 and L2. Since participants of this study are EFL learners who had acquired L1 literacy earlier than L2 literacy and their exposure to L1 texts is much greater than L2 texts in daily life, it can be interpreted that there might be a transfer of reading anxiety from L1 to L2. An important pedagogical implication is that teachers should attempt to understand learners’ internal affective reactions to reading not only in L2 but also in L1. If the reading anxiety is high in L1, they should attempt to minimize the anxiety as much as possible. As Liu (2012) has suggested “before students can become more autonomous and independent language learners, it is essential that teachers continue to exert efforts to help students (1) regulate and manage anxiety more effectively and (2) develop genuine interest and motivation in learning English.” The present study has made a further step towards understanding L1 and L2 reading anxiety and reading behavior, more research should be devoted to the understanding of factors that trigger reading anxiety, as well as to practices or methods that help to reduce reading anxiety in L1 and L2.

A difference between L1 and L2 in the relationship between reading behavior and reading anxiety is that the amount of reading time per week for L2 impacted reading anxiety for L2 but this was not the case for L1. A possible reason is that although English is widely used in HK, HK people is more exposed to the Chinese language and they do not have many opportunities to perform English reading. As such, if readers have made efforts in spending more time in reading in English, it is possible that there is a direct impact on the reading anxiety for English. It is also an interesting point to see that the impacts of reading behavior on reading anxiety is transferred from L1 to L2 but not from L2 to L1. It is likely that when students learn to read in a foreign language,
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especially for those who read frequently in their daily activities (as evidence from their reading in Chinese Academics and Chinese Newspapers), they may bring their reading anxiety from their first language to the foreign language. If learners experience less anxiety when reading in the first language, it is possible that they will experience less foreign language reading anxiety.

Implications

The influence of reading anxiety on reading performance and the factors that influence reading anxiety carry important implications in the field of FL teaching. With a better understanding of the importance of reading anxiety, there might be significant inferences for teachers’ understanding of the reading process and the practice of reading instruction. For example, warning students the possibility of anxiety in the reading process may be a useful course of action to alleviate some amount of anxiety. Other teaching measures, such as providing reading strategy instruction to help students to overcome unrealistic expectations for understanding everything they read; assisting students to develop reading practices that are more effective than word to word translation; and careful selection of texts to ensure materials are at an appropriate level of difficulty, can be considered as well to help students cope with anxiety-producing situations. As Zhao, A., Guo, Y., & Dynia, J. (2013) stated in their study of foreign language reading anxiety, participants revealed that they liked group reading because other students provided necessary help when they were trapped by a word and also because they could relate to other students in the FL learning difficulties. It was also suggested that when the level of difficulty of the reading passage is high or the topics are not very familiar to students, group reading is likely to reduce students’ anxiety. Hence, instructors are recommended to use some group reading activities to reduce students’
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anxiety in reading or do teacher-guided reading.

As described earlier on, despite it is often difficult to determine if anxiety has actually disturbed learning, thus impacting achievement levels, or if anxious learners simply have difficulty displaying the language ability they have attained, it would be worthwhile for teachers to first pay attention to those learners with high anxiety before enhancing their language proficiency. Given the possibility of transfer of reading anxiety between L1 and L2, it would also be advisable to handle L1 reading anxiety as soon as it arises, hopefully before the issue is transferred to L2, as it is probably more effective to deal with learning difficulties in L1 than L2, given there would be less challenges around language proficiency in L1 than L2.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The research design involved the use of non-standardized reading test and score. The reading performance score was obtained by adding up the questions answered correctly in the reading performance test. The passage was sourced from and a majority of the questions were designed by a secondary school teacher (the researcher added two questions among the eight questions). Although the reading passage was considered to be at the appropriate level, the content validity and reliability had not been tested. Future research might therefore benefit from using standardized reading comprehension tests. It is worth considering that the convenient sampling method applied in this study could reflect only the responses of certain specific demographic groups, age groups or of people with certain common interests, which could be confounding variables that affect the study's findings. For example, we noted that age groups of our participants mainly lied between 18 and 38. Older age groups (those above 38) who were also target groups of the study might not have involved much, due to the fact that participants were
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recruited through the City University of Hong Kong and researcher’s personal network. Future research is suggested to recruit participants from different sources and examine if the findings of this study can be replicated.

Lastly, as evidenced in this study, anxiety is an important factor in both first language and second language reading performance. As noted earlier, Saito et al. (1999) stated that they were not able to identify any material on first language reading anxiety even though L1 reading difficulties are well-known. It is therefore valuable to examine in greater detail, the reading process in L1, and to identify where anxiety occurs, in order to design ways to decrease anxiety and improve reading effectiveness.

Conclusions

By expanding the scope of investigation of the relationships between reading anxiety and reading performance to both L1 and L2, and other important learner variables impacting reading anxiety, this study aims to provide a more comprehensive insight into the effects of these factors on L1 and L2 reading. Findings and implications from this study can contribute to increasing awareness of the affective domain of reading for both L1 and L2 among language professionals. With a better understanding of the affective needs of language learners, they can assist their students in managing anxiety in a more informed, caring, and effective manner.
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Table 1

*Demographic characteristics of the sample*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-37</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 or Above</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Secondary/Diploma</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Income</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10,000</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-20,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001-30,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001-40,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;= 40,001</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2

*Cronbach’s Alpha of the FLRAS for L1 and L2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FLRAS for L1</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLRAS for L2</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 3**

*Descriptive Statistics of the Reading Anxiety and Reading Performance Scores for L1 and L2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 Reading Anxiety</td>
<td>49.39</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>25-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 Reading Anxiety</td>
<td>53.71</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>33-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 Reading Performance</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 Reading Performance</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* For Reading Performance scores 1 means one question was answered correctly and 8 means all questions in the test were answered correctly.
### Table 4

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Reading Anxiety Predicting Reading Performance for L2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients Beta</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients Beta</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading anxiety for L2</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-2.18*</td>
<td>0.06*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .05.
### Table 5

*Summary of Regression Analysis for Self-perceived Language Proficiency Predicting Reading Anxiety for L1 and L2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Proficiency</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients Beta</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients Beta</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>L1 Reading Anxiety as DV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Chinese</td>
<td>-3.68</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-3.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Chinese</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L2 Reading Anxiety as DV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written English</td>
<td>-4.68</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-3.72***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral English</td>
<td>-2.77</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-1.99*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .05; **p** < .01; ***p*** < .001.
### Table 6

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Reading Behavior Predicting Reading Anxiety for L1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients Beta</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients Beta</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Recreational</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Academics</td>
<td>-2.64</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-2.72**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Business</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Science</td>
<td>-1.62</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Fiction/ Novels</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Comics</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Newspaper</td>
<td>-3.71</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-3.72***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* **p<.01; ***p<.001.
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Table 7

*Summary of Regression Analysis for Reading Behavior Predicting Reading Anxiety for L2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Behavior</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading time per week</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-2.94**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Recreational</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Academics</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Business</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Science</td>
<td>-1.94</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-1.98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Fiction/ Novels</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-2.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Comics</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Newspaper</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .05; **p** < .01.
### Table 8

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Reading Behavior in Chinese Reading Predicting Reading Anxiety for L2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstandardized Coefficients</td>
<td>Standardized Coefficients</td>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>R² Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Reading Behavior in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Reading in Recreational</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Academics</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Business</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Science</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Fiction/ Novels</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Comics</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Newspaper</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Reading Behavior in Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Reading in Recreational</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Academics</td>
<td>-3.38</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>-3.01**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Business</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Science</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Fiction/ Novels</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Comics</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Newspaper</td>
<td>-2.26</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-2.02*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* p < .05; **p < .01.
**Appendix 1**

**A Survey on Reading for Chinese People Learning English**

*Author: MC*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I get upset when I am not sure whether I understand what I am reading in Chinese/English.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading in Chinese</strong></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading in English</strong></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When reading Chinese/English, I often understand the words but still can’t quite understand what the author is saying.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When I am reading Chinese/English, I get so confused I can’t remember what I am reading.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading in Chinese</strong></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading in English</strong></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel intimidated whenever I see a whole page of Chinese/English in front of me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I feel intimidated whenever I see a whole page of Chinese/English in front of me.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading in Chinese</strong></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading in English</strong></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am nervous when I am reading a passage in Chinese/English when I am not familiar with the topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am nervous when I am reading a passage in Chinese/English when I am not familiar with the topic.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading in Chinese</strong></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading in English</strong></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I get upset whenever I encounter unknown grammar when reading Chinese/English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I get upset whenever I encounter unknown grammar when reading Chinese/English.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading in Chinese</strong></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading in English</strong></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When reading Chinese/English, I get nervous and confused when I don’t understand every word.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When reading Chinese/English, I get nervous and confused when I don’t understand every word.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading in Chinese</strong></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading in English</strong></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It bothers me to encounter words I can’t pronounce while reading Chinese/English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It bothers me to encounter words I can’t pronounce while reading Chinese/English.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading in Chinese</strong></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading in English</strong></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I usually end up translating word by word when I am reading Chinese/English.
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17* Reading in Chinese
18* Reading in English

By the time you get past the funny letters and symbols in Chinese/English, it is hard to remember what you are reading about.

19* Reading in Chinese
20* Reading in English

I am worried about all the new symbols I have to learn in order to read Chinese/English.

21* Reading in Chinese
22* Reading in English

I enjoy reading Chinese/English.

23* Reading in Chinese
24* Reading in English

I feel confident when I am reading in Chinese/English.

25* Reading in Chinese
26* Reading in English

Once you get used to it, reading Chinese/English is not so difficult.

27* Reading in Chinese
28* Reading in English

The hardest part of learning Chinese/English is learning to read.

29* Reading in Chinese
30* Reading in English

I would be happy to learn to speak Chinese/English rather than having to learn to read as well.

31* Reading in Chinese
32* Reading in English

I don’t mind reading to myself, but I feel very uncomfortable when I have to read Chinese/English aloud.

33* Reading in Chinese
34* Reading in English

I am satisfied with the level of reading ability in Chinese/English that I have achieved so far.

35* Reading in Chinese
36* Reading in English
閱讀下文，完成以下6題。

《“舍長責短”和“揚長補短”》

（1）關於用人之道，古人發過不少議論。說用人要“用其所長，舍其所短”，不要“舍長貴短”、“用非所長”，便是其中比較明白事理的一種。有的甚至賦而言之：“若錄長捨短，則天下無不用之人；貴短求長，則天下無不棄之士。”點出了恰當對待人才長短一事的重要性。

（2）清代顧炎武在《雜興》中曾說：“駿馬能歷險，力田不如牛。堅車能載重，渡河不如舟。舍長以就短，智者難為謀。生材貴適用，慎勿多苛求。”這意思，從用人應當用其所長的一面說，無疑是很對的；但如果從事業的需要和人才的發展變化的一面說就不那麼簡單了。

（3）任何人不可能樣樣皆通，門門能幹。在這裡，搞什麼“舍長貴短”，求全責備，強人所難，是形而又學，不符合實際，甚至違反常識。可是，人們的有些短處，往往是狹窄或片面性的表現，如不適當克服和補足，也會妨礙其長處的充分發揮。這時，“貴短”是“補短”的一個起點；如果對此無端地加以排斥，多少有點“護短”的味道。“護短”者對於自己的短處不願認識，不願努力加以補足，所謂進步、提高，真是從何談起！

（4）還有的人，每逢接受比較艱難的工作任務時，總是找藉口，不願幹，或者乾得勉強，很馬虎。殊不知，創業難免要從艱難開始。人是有能動性的，人是有能力學習新知識、掌握新本領的。只要認識努力，鑽研、學習、鍛鍊，“所短”可以變為“所長”，“短處”可以變為“長處”。老是遇難則退，怎能學得新本領、新本領？

（5）歸根到底，人的才能之長短，決不是天生的，是社會歷史和時代的需要造成的。在新的歷史需要出現時，無論就整個社會人才長短的總體來說，還是從單個人才能長短的個別情況說，都會發生一系列的變化。有的長處、短處，可以繼續發揮作用，有的短處、優點，需要補足，還有大量的，是要按照新的需要，培訓新的本領。這時候，只要事業需要，即使一時不擅長的工作，也得幹，也得學。這看起來似乎有點“貴短”或“苛求”，實際上，這是事業前進和人才發展的必由之路。

（6）現在，我們正在開創社會主義現代化建設的新局面，各方面都需要大量的人才。各種人才也更加有了可以施展的天地和條件。社會對人新的需要，尤其是層層不窮的。在這種情況下，對於用人，除了應當繼續注意“捨長用短”之外，似乎不能不同時強調一下“揚長補短”，服從事業發展的需要，培養訓練過去比較短的、現在特別需要的新本領。

（7）甲、要不得。乙、也要不得。我們的事業需要並造就各種人才：我們的各種需要應服從事業的需要並積極推動事業前進，這恐怕就是我們研究人才問題應注意的精闢所在吧。

與第①段內容不相符的一項是（ ）

A．轉述古人關於用人之道所發表的各種議論。
B．古人主張，用人要“用其所長，舍其所短”。
C．古人認爲，要錄用天下的人才，就必須“舍長貴短”。
D．轉述古人關於恰當對待人才長短一事的議論。

38* 對第②段《雜興》修辭手法及含義分析正確的一項是（ ）

A．運用比喻、擬人等手法，說明用人要用其所長，不應苛求。
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○ B．運用比喻、對偶等手法，說明用人要用其所長，不應苛求。
○ C．運用擬人、對偶等手法，說明人有長短，應該揚長補短。
○ D．運用比喻、對偶等手法，說明人有長短，應該揚長補短。

39* 對第④段中闡述的做生疏的工作給人帶來的好處，理解不恰當的一項是（ ）
  ○ A．可以促使人們掌握新知識、新本領。
  ○ B．可以鍛鍊人的意志，培養團結協作的精神。
  ○ C．可以調動人的主觀能動性。
  ○ D．可以促使人們參加實踐，在干中使難變易。

40* 文章末段括弧內甲、乙兩處應分別選填下面的哪一項？
  甲處應填（ ） 乙處應填（ ）
  ○ A．“護短”和“放任”
  ○ B．“責短”和“苛求”

41* 在開創社會主義現代化建設的新局面，我們需要
  ○ A．掌握新知識、新本領。
  ○ B．“用其所長，舍其所短”。
  ○ C．參加實踐，在干中使難變易。
  ○ D．“捨短就長”和“揚長補短”。

42* 作者是否贊同“責短”和“苛求”？
  ○ A．是。
  ○ B．否。

43* 對文章內容分析不恰當的一項是（ ）
  ○ A．本文的標題提出了如何對待一個人的長處與短處的兩種不同態度。
  ○ B．作者用科學分析的態度，對古人的用人經驗總結予以全盤否定。
  ○ C．作者在分析前人的用人之道的基礎上，提出“責短”是為了“補短”這一新論點。
  ○ D．文章從事業的需要和人才發展變化兩個方面來論證中心論點。

44* 對文中論證方法及其作用分析不正確的一項（ ）
  ○ A．第①段運用引用論證的方法說明古人的用人之道。
  ○ B．第③段主要運用講道理的方法闡述了“責短”、“護短”和“補短”之間的關係。
  ○ C．第④段主要運用正反對比的論證方法說明“遇難則退”是學不到新本領、新專長的。
  ○ D．文章主要通過擺事實來說明“護短”和“放任”要不得，應該揚長
English Ivy: Friend or Foe?

English Ivy betrays its poor reputation as a nuisance by its unparalleled ability to provide shade. By seamlessly covering the exterior of a building, it works as a natural insulator, blocking the sun and decreasing air conditioning costs. This means big savings for both building tenants and homeowners alike. And it can happen quickly, too. Under the proper conditions, established English Ivy can grow to cover an area of roughly 500 square feet per year. Given that most homes have a roof measuring roughly 2000 square feet, ivy-friendly homeowners can rest assured that their roofs will be completely covered in about four years. When considering growth rates of newly planted ivy, just remember the old adage: First year, it sleeps. Second year, it creeps. Third year, it leaps! For English Ivy, this is especially true.

Now, detractors may take this opportunity to remind readers about how invasive English Ivy can be. For what ivy enthusiast hasn’t been cautioned about its ability to burrow holes, fracture windows, and even deteriorate brick? But be warned. Oftentimes, this suggestion is taken to the comical extreme. Naysayers take a strange pleasure in spinning yarns about a particularly malevolent strand of ivy—one that slips in through the cracks on a hot summer night, silently strangling homeowners in their sleep. Admittedly, this can be a funny story to tell. But are we to believe such a tale? The intelligent gardener will quickly dismiss such rubbish for what it is.

The primary purpose of the passage is to

A. highlight the reasons why English Ivy抯 fast growth rate is beneficial
B. argue that English Ivy is an essential plant for homeowners
C. educate readers about how to use English Ivy to insulate their homes
D. belittle detractors of English Ivy
E. defend the reputation of English Ivy

As used in paragraph 1, which is the best definition for betrays?

A. gives away  B. contradicts
C. reveals  D. supports
E. highlights

In paragraph 1, the author states, “given that most homes have a roof measuring roughly 2000 square feet, ivy-friendly homeowners can rest assured that their roofs will be completely covered in about four years.” Which of the following logical mistakes does the author make in drawing this conclusion?
I. English Ivy will not cover the area of most roofs in 4 years if it only grows 500 square feet per year.
II. Homes may not have the proper conditions necessary for English Ivy to grow at the specified rate.
III. Newly planted ivy does not grow as fast as established ivy.

A. I only  B. II only
C. I and II only  D. II and III only
E. I, II, and III

48* As used in paragraph 2, which is the best antonym for malevolent?
A. wary  B. sensitive  C. virtuous
D. injured  E. willing

49* The word “foe” means?
A. companion  B. enemy
C. acquaintance  D. comrade
E. relatives

50* How does detractors remind readers about how invasive English Ivy can be?
A. it is Naysayers’ strange pleasure
B. first year, it sleeps. Second year, it creeps. Third year, it leaps!
C. English Ivy can grow to cover an area of roughly 500 square feet per year
D. English Ivy burrows holes, fractures windows, and even deteriorates brick
E. it is a funny story to tell

51* This passage would most likely be found
A. in a scholarly journal about botany
B. in a magazine article about gardening
C. in a letter from one gardener to another
D. on a website identifying different types of plants
E. in a pamphlet about the best ways to make a home more energy-efficient

52* The author's tone can best be described as
A. passionate  B. defensive
C. argumentative  D. persuasive
E. accusatory
### Personal Information

53* Your Sex:
- Male
- Female

54* Your Age:
- Below 18
- 18-22
- 23-27
- 28-32
- 33-37
- 38-42
- 43-47
- 48-52
- 53-57
- 58-62
- 63 or Above

55* Your Education Level:
- Primary or Below
- Secondary
- Post Secondary/ Diploma
- Bachelor
- Post Graduate

56* Your Occupation:
- Clerical
- Executive
- Professional
- Business
- Services (e.g. driver, waitress, delivery man)
- Media, creative, art, design
- Other specialty (e.g. construction, hairdresser, chef, broker)
- Housework
- Student
- Others
- Retired
- Unemployed

57* Your average monthly income in HK dollar:
- None
- 1-10,000
- 10,001-20,000
- 20,001-30,000
- 30,001-40,000
- 40,001 or above

58* What is your first language:
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☐ Cantonese  ☐ Mandarin
☐ Others, please specify: ____________________________

59* Do you learn English as a second language?
☐ Yes   ☐ No

Please rate your proficiency level in the following (1=Very Low, 2=Low, 3=Moderate, 4=High, 5= Very High):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60* Oral Chinese language</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61* Written Chinese language</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62* Oral English language</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63* Written English language</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, how much time do you spend on reading in Chinese/ English on a per week basis?

64* Reading in Chinese
☐ None   ☐ 1-2 hours
☐ 2-3 hours ☐ 3-4 hours
☐ 4-5 hours ☐ 5-6 hours
☐ More than 6 hours

65* Reading in English
☐ None   ☐ 1-2 hours
☐ 2-3 hours ☐ 3-4 hours
☐ 4-5 hours ☐ 5-6 hours
☐ More than 6 hours

Please rate your frequency of reading the following books/materials in Chinese.
1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Sometimes, 4=Very Often, 5=Always.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66* Recreational (e.g. magazines, sports, travelling)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67* Academics</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68* Business</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69* Science</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70* Fiction/ Novels</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71* Comics</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72* Newspaper</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Please rate your frequency of reading the following books/materials in English. 1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Sometimes, 4=Very Often, 5=Always.

73* Recreational (e.g. magazines, sports, travelling)

74* Academics

75* Business

76* Science

77* Fiction/ Novels

78* Comics

79* Newspaper

What were your results for the following?

80* Your HKCEE/ DSE Chinese Language result (mark NA if not applicable to you)

81* Your HKCEE/ DSE English Language result (mark NA if not applicable to you)

82* Your maximum GPA score (mark NA if not applicable to you)

83 For City University SS2023 students only (*must fill in to earn the research participation credit)

What is your seating number in SS2023?

Questions with '*' sign must be answered

Thank you.