

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**AN EXPLORATORY COMPARISON
OF THE INFERENTIAL ABILITY
OF EFL AND ESL STUDENTS**

**A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfilment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Management**

at Massey University

Palmerston North

New Zealand

Weidong Zhang

2003

Abstract

The ability to access and interpret information is a very important component in generating knowledge. However, people are not always able to discover information, quickly evaluate the importance of the information and access it (Tichenor, Donohue & Olien, 1970; Chatman, 1991; Sligo & Williams, 2002). Especially in a tertiary academic setting, the ability to access information and integrate information from various sources to infer what is not overtly stated in a text is an essential skill during the reading process (Kintsch, 1994; Barnes, Dennis, & Haefele-Kalvaitis, 1996; Cain, Oakhill, Barnes, & Bryant, 2001).

Because of differences among people's educational background, existing pools of knowledge and communication abilities, the ability to access information will affect their inferential ability in the reading process (Alexander, 1994; Ericsson, 1996; Mckoon & Ratcliff, 1992). Although inferential ability is to be of consequence for academic functioning, very little research has been done on the comparison of inferential ability among students with English as their first language and those with English as their second language.

This study examines the relative extent of text inferential ability among students with English as a first language (EFL) and students to whom English is a second language (ESL), employing the knowledge gap hypothesis, and assesses its implications. Using a procedure to assess inferential ability, this thesis compares the differences in inferential ability demonstrated by EFL and ESL students, employing cloze tests.

This study found that EFL students' performance on the inferential ability and cloze item completion task is significantly better than that of their ESL counterparts via the first two scoring methods (Methods A and B). However, the inferential ability of ESL students is almost as good as their EFL counterparts when assessed by the third scoring method (Method C). The research findings suggest that Sligo and Williams (2002) are right in terming the knowledge gap as an amalgam of knowledge, comprehension and

inference (p.6). Subsidiary analyses of the source of inference failures revealed different underlying sources of difficulty for both EFL and ESL students.

The results of the research provide insights into the nature of gaps in accessing information and inference making. Education in a tertiary institution may or may not reduce gaps. Though both EFL and ESL students improved from their original starting level, the gaps of inferential ability between EFL and ESL students in the two tests, especially via Methods A and B, widened. In the second test, both EFL and ESL students made progress in inferential ability. Yet there still remained a gap between the two groups of students in test two as the knowledge rich individuals improved at a similar rate as the knowledge poor.

The present study supports the contention of Sligo and Williams (2002) that there is an unexamined area at the heart of the knowledge gap hypothesis literature. The findings of the present study suggest the correctness of the proposal by Sligo and Williams (2002) that what knowledge gap hypothesis researchers call knowledge gaps should in fact be better described as some amalgam of gaps in knowledge, and/or inferential ability. This is the most significant finding of the present research.

Acknowledgements

Acknowledgements are due to my supervisors Associate Professor Frank Sligo and Dr. Margie Comrie for their experience, wisdom and commitment throughout this year. Without their guidance, support and constant motivation, this thesis would not have been completed.

This study would not have been possible without the participation of the first year business students and many staff from Massey University. I would like to sincerely thank them for their participation.

Thanks are also due to a variety of friends and colleagues at Massey University for their continual encouragement and support over the period of time this thesis has taken to complete. Particular appreciation goes to Lois Wilkinson, Ted Drawneek and Lance Gray.

Special expressions of appreciation should go to my family for giving their love, support and encouragement throughout these years. Without them, it is very hard for me to imagine that I could finish this thesis.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|------|
| Abstract..... | i |
| Acknowledgements..... | iii |
| Table of Contents..... | iv |
| List of Tables..... | vii |
| List of Figures | viii |
| CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Purpose and Context of the Research..... | 1 |
| Knowledge Gap Hypothesis and the Present Research | 3 |
| Research Question | 9 |
| Research Objectives | 9 |
| Importance of the Research..... | 10 |
| Structure of the Thesis..... | 12 |
| CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW | 13 |
| Introduction | 13 |
| 1. The Knowledge Gap Hypothesis | 13 |
| The Original Hypothesis | 15 |
| The Development of the Knowledge Gap Hypothesis | 16 |
| 2. Communication through Reading | 22 |
| 3. Studies of Inferential Ability..... | 25 |
| Sources and Constraints | 27 |
| Comparative Studies | 28 |
| Educational Factors | 28 |
| 4. Methodological Issues and Cloze Testing..... | 34 |

Introduction 34

Strengths & Weakness of the Tool 36

Sources and Constraints 39

Comparative Studies 40

Educational Issues and Cloze..... 42

Conclusion.....45

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY 46

Introduction 46

Setting for the Study 46

Research Design..... 46

Research Process.....47

Sample and Procedure47

Materials and Procedures 48

Ethical Considerations..... 48

Preliminary Data Collection 49

Main Study Data Collection..... 50

Structural Measures..... 51

Data Analysis..... 51

Expert Judgement.....52

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS54

Introduction54

Description of Sample.....55

Empirical Results..... 58

Entire Study Sample 58

Results in Test One 62

Results in Test Two..... 64

| | |
|--|-----|
| Results by First Language..... | 66 |
| English as First Language (EFL) | 66 |
| English as Second Language (ESL) | 68 |
| Results by Methods..... | 70 |
| Method A..... | 70 |
| Method B..... | 73 |
| Method C..... | 74 |
| CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS | 76 |
| Knowledge Gap Implications..... | 77 |
| The Inferential Gap between EFL and ESL Students | 78 |
| Inferential Gap and Its Implications | 81 |
| Barriers to Obtaining Information to Support Inference | 82 |
| Summary of Main Findings | 87 |
| The Implications of the Findings..... | 88 |
| Limitations of the Study and the Future Directions | 90 |
| REFERENCES | 91 |
| APPENDICES | 114 |
| 1. Information Sheet for Test One | 114 |
| 2. Cloze Passage for Test One | 115 |
| 3. Information Sheet for Test Two..... | 117 |
| 4. Cloze Passage for Test Two..... | 118 |

List of Tables

| Table | Page Number |
|---|--------------------|
| TABLE 1: SOME BASIC DEFINITIONS | 7 |
| TABLE 2: TYPOLOGY OF ASSESSMENT METHODS EMPLOYED | 53 |
| TABLE 3: AGE OF TOTAL PARTICIPANTS ACROSS TESTS ONE & TWO | 55 |
| TABLE 4: PARTICIPANTS' AGE DISTRIBUTION | 56 |
| TABLE 5: FREQUENCIES BY GENDER | 57 |
| TABLE 6: FREQUENCIES BY FIRST LANGUAGE | 57 |
| TABLE 7: T-TESTS FOR THE COMPARISON OF THE MEAN SCORES OF THE ENTIRE STUDY SAMPLE | 58 |
| TABLE 8: COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OF EFL AND ESL GROUPS VIA THREE SCORING METHODS | 61 |
| TABLE 9: T-TESTS FOR THE COMPARISON OF EFL STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE IN TESTS ONE & TWO | 66 |
| TABLE 10: T-TESTS FOR THE COMPARISON OF ESL STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE IN TESTS ONE & TWO | 68 |
| TABLE 11: T-TESTS FOR THE COMPARISON OF THE PERFORMANCE VIA METHOD A | 70 |
| TABLE 12: T-TESTS FOR THE COMPARISON OF PERFORMANCE VIA METHOD B | 73 |
| TABLE 13: T-TESTS FOR THE COMPARISON OF PERFORMANCE VIA METHOD C | 74 |

List of Figures

| Figure | Page Number |
|---|--------------------|
| FIGURE 1: PARTICIPANTS' AGE DISTRIBUTION | 56 |
| FIGURE 2: COMPARISON OF THE MEAN SCORES OF THE ENTIRE STUDY SAMPLE | 59 |
| FIGURE 3: COMPARISON OF EFL AND ESL STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE VIA THREE SCORING METHODS IN TEST ONE | 62 |
| FIGURE 4: COMPARISON OF EFL AND ESL STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE VIA THREE SCORING METHODS IN TEST TWO | 64 |
| FIGURE 5: COMPARISON OF EFL STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE IN TESTS ONE & TWO | 66 |
| FIGURE 6: COMPARISON OF ESL STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE IN TESTS ONE & TWO | 68 |
| FIGURE 7: COMPARISON OF THE PERFORMANCE VIA METHOD A | 71 |
| FIGURE 8: COMPARISON OF THE PERFORMANCE VIA METHOD B | 73 |