Language Testing
1–25
© The Author(s) 2019
Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/0265532219893384
journals.sagepub.com/home/ltj


(Klein & Moosbrugger, 2000). In fact, w9gnte8brugg7deration describes rugonly a linear

2. Does strategy use ability differ among students with different levels of language knowledge? If it does, to what extent do they differ?

The answer to the first question would help to reveal the constraining or amplifying effects of language knowledge on the effect of strategy use ability across students of different levels of language knowledge. The answer to the second question may help to identify possible reasons leading to different effects of strategy use ability across students of different language knowledge.

Participants

The study included 1491 nursing students from eight medical colleges in China. All 7

completing this test"), and evaluating (e.g., "I double-checked my reading comprehension or performance"). The cognitive strategies subscale were also in three categories: memorizing (e.g., "I made notes during the reading"), retrieving (e.g., "I related the information from the reading or tasks to my prior knowledge or experience"), and comprehending (e.g., "I read to see what all or most sentences were in common"). The measurement validity of the SUAS was evaluated using multidimensional item response theory (MIRT) (see Cai, 2013) and the MIRT results showed that a general strategrement .008wil

validity of the NERT was examined using multidimensional item response theory (see Cai & Kunnan, 2018). A general nursing English reading ability factor with four domain-

gecyl nursingknowledge, and interonalmedicral nursingknowledge)(was fond to)

CFI = 0.99. The standardized loadings for SUAS ranged from .83 (retrieving) to .95 (evaluating), the loadings for the GKT ranged from .76 (meaning) to .79 (form), and the loadings for the NERT ranged from .82 (Texts 1 and 4) to .99 (Text 2).

A structural model was then constructed by regressing L2 reading (NERA) and strategy use ability (SUAS) on language knowledge (GKT). This model was then used as the baseline model (Model 1) to test the three hypothetical moderations: the linear moderation (Model 2), the quadratic moderation (Model 3), and the cuboid moderation (Model 4). The results of model fit are shown in Table 5. The fit indices for the baseline model (Model 1) met the criteria for a good-fit model:

reading

sea level, and the peak, respectively; and their corresponding ***x***-axis locations were labeled as the first through the third language threshold. At these three points (or language thresholds), the whole curve was divided into four continuous sections, each with

smallest mean (−0.22) was planning and memorizing, and the largest mean (−0.17) was monitoring and evaluating. The overall mean for the resurfacers was −0.20 with a standardized deviation of 0.02. For the uphillers or the largest group (1275 students), the smallest mean was retrieving (0.14) and the largest was evaluating (0.18). The overall mean for the uphillers was 0.17, with a standardized deviation of 0.01. For the downhillers (30 students), the smallest mean was comprehending (0.80) and

result, the cuboid moderation that took the metaphorical shape of an island ridge curve (IRC) emerged as the most plausible model. The IRC consisted of four continuous con

This desperation again would force students to turn to strategies that were more acces-

limitation of their advance is their focus on the "activity" aspect of strategic competence rather than the "ability" aspect of strategic competence. Our study provided a solution by asking test takers to evaluate their efficiency of using these strategies during test performance. To regain the flavor of "competence" as it was originally conceptualized

METS. (2007). ***Medical English Test System Level Two (for Nurses)***. Shanghai: Higher Education Press.

Mokhtari, K., & Sheorey, R. (2002). Measuring ESL students' awareness of reading strategies. ***Journal of Developmental Education***, ***25***(3), 2–11.

Mueller, R. O., & Hancock, G. R. (2010). Structural equation modeling. In G. R. Hancock & R. O. Mueller (Eds.), ***The reviewer's guide to quantitative methods in the social sciences*** (pp. 373–383). New York: Routledge.

Muthén, B. Q. (2012). Latent variable interactions. Retrieved from http://statmodel2.com/down.

Schoonen, R., Hulstijn, J., & Bossers, B. (1998). Metacognitive and language-specific knowledge in native and foreign language reading comprehension: An empirical study among Dutch students in grades 6, 8 and 10. ***Language Learning***, ***48***(1), 71–106. doi:10.1111/1467–9922.00033

Sheorey, R., & Mokhtari, K. (2001). Differences in the metacognitive awareness of reading strategies among native and non-native readers. ***System***, ***29***(4), 431–449. doi:10.1016/S0346–251X(01)00039–2

Skehan, P. (1989). ***Individual differences in second language learning***
SkT mecasef reself-reguliveonn sevocabuliramocquisiveon