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ABSTRACT

Previewing a text is a key global reading strategy. Previewing may increase comprehension as it can activate schema, increase global awareness of the text, and enhance the use of other reading strategies. Despite its importance, an explicit focus on previewing skills has been lacking and previous research on the reading strategies of second language (L2) learners’ has largely relied on surveys. This study utilizes eye tracking technology, in addition to surveys, to evaluate the previewing strategies of Japanese L2 readers of English. The eye movement data revealed that most learners did very little previewing of the text. One measure of previewing significantly correlated with learners’ summary protocol scores, which were poor overall. Finally, the eye movement data did not correlate strongly with participants’ survey results. Implications for both reading education and research are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

Reading proficiency greatly enhances a language learner’s academic success, job prospects, and global citizenship, yet second language (L2) readers often struggle to comprehend authentic texts (Grabe & Stoller, 2013; Kern, 1989). While reading proficiency is influenced by a number of factors, including one’s receptive vocabulary and knowledge of syntax (Alderson, 2000; Bernhardt, 1991), reading strategy usage is also a key predictor of reading comprehension (Carrell, 1991; Song, 1998; Wang, 2009). Research using survey instruments has suggested that more proficient L2 readers more often use a variety of reading strategies, compared to less proficient readers (Lau & Chan, 2003; Sheorey & Mokhtari, 2001). Rather than relying on linear reading and bottom-up processing of a text, strategic readers often
utilize top-down reading methods, such as previewing the text and allocating selective attention to the text’s main points or their reading purpose (Sheorey & Mokhtari, 2001).

A significant limitation of the existing research on L2 reading strategies is that the studies tend to rely on participants’ survey responses or think-aloud protocols, and such self-report measures may lack reliability (Bax & Weir, 2012; Hyönä, Lorch Jr, & Kaakinen, 2002). One alternative research method is to use eye-tracking technology to measure students’ eye-movements over a text (Duchowski, 2007, Rayner, 1998). Empirical studies (e.g., Ariasi & Mason, 2014; Kang, 2014; Kaakinen & Hyönä, 2010) have used eye tracking to measure reading strategies with first language (L1) readers. Participants’ eye movement data can validly show if readers are using certain strategies, such as skipping irrelevant sections, re-reading important passages, scanning for information, reading linearly, etc.

However, L2 research utilizing eye tracking has been extremely rare (Bax, 2013; Godfroid, 2012), and L1 research may or may not be relevant to L2 reading since it differs in several ways (Grabe & Stoller, 2013). For example, L2 readers often must cope with a lack of background knowledge and linguistic proficiency, and this may limit the efficacy of their strategy usage (Clarke, 1979; Laufer & Hadar, 1997; Schoonen et al., 1998). Therefore, eye-tracking research on L2 reading strategies has great potential to add to the field.

To fill this gap in the research, the authors have begun a series of studies aiming to utilize eye-tracking technology, along with the Survey of Reading Strategies (SORS; Mokhtari & Sheorey, 2002), to determine the effect of strategic reading on EFL readers’ comprehension. This preliminary study analyzes Japanese university students’ previewing strategies when given the task to read an expository text and to write a summary. Previewing strategy usage was selected for this initial study as it is a core top-down reading strategy; previewing represents cognizance of a text as a whole, including its organization and context, before reading the text. Moreover, few if any studies have focused explicitly on L2 readers’ previewing strategies.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

Theory and research concerning the role of global reading strategies, especially previewing, will be evaluated below. Second, the potential use of eye tracking to validly evaluate readers’ global reading strategies will be described based on the literature.

**The Importance of Global Reading Strategies and Previewing**

While many L2 readers rely on bottom-up processing of a text (Kern, 1989), proficient readers utilize more strategies and they use them more purposely (Anderson, 1991;
Mokhtari & Reichard, 2002). The importance of reading strategy use, and particularly top-down strategies, is strengthened by numerous studies that have shown that strategy training enhances reading comprehension (see Taylor, Stevens, & Asher, 2006 for an overview).

In order to measure and evaluate the strategies of L2 learners, a number of studies have utilized the SORS (e.g., Mónos, 2005; Sheorey & Mokhtari, 2001; Taki, 2015; Tavakoli, 2014). SORS was designed to measure three constructs and consists of 30 items. The factor of interest to the current study was the global reading strategy subscale. Previewing is one of the key strategies of top-down reading, and two of the global reading strategy construct items on SORS directly concern it (Mokhtari & Sheorey, 2002): previewing to note the topic of the text and previewing to recognize text qualities like organization and length. Two additional items in this construct may be done while pre-reading, including determining “what to read closely and what to ignore” and utilizing “tables, figures, and pictures.” Therefore, previewing is central to the global strategies construct. As described below, previewing may strengthen comprehension in that it activates schema, heightens text awareness, and can enable and enhance the use of other global reading strategies.

**Previewing to activate schema.** Previewing the title, section headings, and images to identify the topic and key points is important to activate schema. Bartlett (1932) was influential in defining schema and describing how constructing meaning in discourse is an interactive process based on one’s previous experiences and knowledge. Goodman (1967) linked this process specifically to reading, showing that reading does not solely involve decoding a text in a bottom-up, linear fashion. Instead, he called reading a sort of “psycholinguistic guessing game” in which the reader takes their background knowledge, experiences and expectations to make meaning (p. 126).

While the study involved listening rather than reading, Bransford and Johnson (1972) clearly demonstrated the importance of schema in a research setting. Participants who were shown an image of one scene in the story before hearing it had little difficulty comprehending and recalling the story, while participants who were shown the image after listening to the passage comprehended and recalled roughly half as much. Similar results were shown in other follow-up experiments. For example, Wiley and Rayner (2000) found that the presence of titles improved the reading fluency and comprehension of short L1 texts.

The research by Bransford and Johnson (1972) were influential in highlighting the role of schema. Au (1979) and Langer (1981) later utilized schematic theories to create models to utilize in the reading classroom, and Spires, Gallini, and Riggsbee (1992) empirically examined the effect of strategy training. In the latter study, fourth-grade students who received training on previewing schematic cues significantly improved their comprehension in their L1 compared to a control group. Moreover, the previewing group
improved significantly more than a group that received training on recognizing structure-based cues. Pre-reading tasks in the ESOL classroom have now come to be considered a norm among TESOL-trained educators (Ajideh, 2003; Grabe & Stoller, 2013). Previewing a text may be even more essential for L2 readers, who may lack linguistic knowledge to comprehend a text in a bottom-up fashion (Swaffar, Arens, & Byrnes, 1991).

**Previewing to heighten text awareness.** Proficient readers tend to have more awareness of exactly what they are reading (Pressley & Afflerbach, 2012), and taking a top-down look at a text before reading can enhance awareness. This includes previewing a text’s subheadings, layout, and context to identify aspects such as length, organization, genre, purpose, and source (Swaffar, Arens, & Byrnes, 1991). Cognizance of such aspects as organization helps readers focus on key points and their relationship with each other, and this can assist in both comprehension and retention (Block, 1986; Carrell, 1991; Meyer, & Poon, 2001; Meyer, Brandt, & Bluth, 1980). Carrell (1985) demonstrated that teaching L2 learners to recognize text structure can improve their comprehension. Viewing images has also been shown to aid comprehension and memory of key points partially because they can be used to draw attention to key points and to help learners visualize them (Levie & Lentz, 1982). Understanding the genre and source can also help readers predict what they will read and the discourse and language features that will encounter. This leads to more efficient reading and enhances comprehension (Swaffar et al., 1991).

**Previewing to enable strategic reading.** Previewing the text is also essential to the metacognitive reading strategy of planning (O’Malley & Chamot, 1990). Reading strategies may be planned as readers preview the text and make connections to their prior experience, knowledge, and purpose. For example, previewing the length may prompt a reader to read more quickly based on time constraints and one’s purpose. Previewing section headings may lead effective readers to read a relevant section carefully but to skim or skip over another section.

Indeed, planning one’s reading behavior, along with other metacognitive strategies, such as monitoring one’s strategy usage, has been shown to be a significant factor in reading comprehension (Anjomshoaa, Golestan, & Anjomshoaa, 2012; Ghafournia & Afghari, 2013; Phakiti, 2003; Zhang & Seepho, 2013). While more proficient and less proficient readers often use similar strategies, Anderson (1991) concluded that more successful readers can use the strategies purposefully. Such purposeful strategy usage can be greatly enhanced by previewing the text’s context, genre, length, linguistic complexity, and organization.

Global reading strategies, and specifically previewing, may be becoming even more important as more and more reading is done online (Akyel & Ercetin 2009; Kang, 2014).
There is so much content available online that readers must be more selective, and this involves previewing articles for relevance, interest, and appropriacy.

**Causes of a Lack of Strategic Competence among L2 Readers**

There are several possible reasons that L2 learners may lack strategic competency in reading, including the tendency not to preview a text. First, there is some evidence that people of certain cultures may more often rely on certain reading strategies. For example, Canadian college students reportedly more often use a top-down reading style, while Iranian learners more favored bottom-up reading both in their L1 and L2 (Taki, 2015). L2 learners of Arabic from African backgrounds more often utilize global strategies than learners from Asian backgrounds (Alhaqabani, & Riazi, 2012).

Second, even if L2 learners have strategic competence when reading in their L1, their strategy use may not transfer to L2 reading. ESOL learners who have never had experience in reading English for authentic purposes may not have developed the strategic reading habits in the L2 (Zhang, 2001). Grammar-translation pedagogies are still dominant in certain contexts, such as EFL classes in Japanese high schools, and such learners may have developed the tendency to use bottom-up reading strategies when reading English (Sakurai, 2015). This is because grammar-translation tasks, answering comprehension questions, and test preparation often do not require top-down reading or reading for meaning. Moreover, while browsing media in the L2 to find relevant articles for pleasure or research requires previewing numerous articles, lower-level learners and learners in teacher-dominated classrooms may likely have had little or no experience in doing this.

While most TESOL-trained teachers and textbook publishers may understand the importance of activating schema and purposeful reading (Ajideh, 2003), it is unclear if students actually develop previewing skills through such pre-reading activities. While many strategy training studies have shown results as reported above, not all training has been shown to be successful (Taylor, Stevens, & Asher, 2006). Based on O’Malley and Chamot’s CALLA model (1990), effective strategy training includes developing awareness and knowledge of strategies, extensive practice, reflection, and expansion. However, many instructors and textbooks do not explicitly teach previewing skills and metacognitive strategies. Therefore, simply going through pre-reading activities in class may not enough for learners to develop these habits when engaging in reading tasks on their own.

**Limitations of Previous Research Methodologies and the Potential of Eye Tracking**

While the existing research suggests the importance reading strategies, including previewing, there were many limitations to the research methodologies used. First, it is
difficult to get detailed data using surveys, such as SORS (Denscombe, 2014). Correlating learners’ general reading tendencies and their test scores (the research methodology frequently utilized) does not clearly demonstrate how learners actually use reading strategies on a specific task. Moreover, this does not show how their strategy use affects their comprehension, given various texts and tasks.

Second, honesty and accuracy of respondents is a potential limitation of surveys and retrospective reports (Denscombe, 2014). Research participants may report based on what they perceive as the ideal response. In one study of L2 readers’ strategy use, participants misreported their behavior nearly a third of the time (Bax & Weir, 2012). For example, several participants replied that they had read the whole text, but eye tracking revealed that they had not. This led authors to doubt the reliability of studies that rely on retrospective reports to examine readers’ cognitive processing.

Think-aloud protocols and retrospective surveys, reports, or interviews about readers’ strategy use may be more effective in highlighting how participants’ process a specific text (Pressley & Afflerbach, 2012). However, metacognitive verbal reports may interrupt, interfere with, and influence silent reading (Cohen, 2010), and the protocols may not reliably grasp all the cognitive and metacognitive processes of readers, especially those that have become habitual or automated (Yoshida, 2012).

Eye-movement research in the L1. Given the limitations of surveys and think-aloud protocols, eye-tracking has been increasingly used as the main or supporting methodology in L1 reading research. While most research has looked at the eye movements of linear reading, eye tracking can also be used to reveal one’s strategic processing of the text (e.g., Hyönä, Lorch, & Rinck, 2003). The body of research has convincingly shown that eye movements “reflect moment-to-moment cognitive processes” (Rayner, 1998, p. 372), and that they are “a window into language and cognition” (Spivey, Richardson, & Dale, 2009, p. 225).

Selective attention is a key metacognitive skill, and it may relate to previewing skills. Shebilske and Fisher (1983) carried out one of the earliest eye-tracking studies to measure L1 readers’ selective attention. They found that readers tended to scan passages they perceived as relevant more slowly than passages deemed irrelevant. A series of studies led by Hyönä (Hyönä et al., 2002; Hyönä, Lorch, & Rinck, 2003; Hyönä & Nurminen, 2006) explored the selective attention of Finnish university students while reading expository texts in their L1 in order to complete a summary task. The results revealed that readers could be divided into non-selective linear readers and topic structure processors, who paid more attention to subject headings, topic sentences, and concluding sentences. While topic structure processors were a minority of the readers, they were much more successful on the text summary protocol. Kaakinen and Hyönä (2007) later analyzed how task affected readers’ selective attention. Readers given a task to teach others key points of a text fixated more on relevant
sentences and more frequently skipped over other sentences, compared to readers who were not assigned a specific reading purpose. These studies highlight the importance of metacognitive skills and highlight the potential of eye tracking as a research tool.

**Eye tracking in the L2.** Utilizing eye-movement data in L2 settings is in its infancy, but it has greatly picked up in recent years (e.g., Godfriod, 2012; Godfroid & Spino, 2015; Winke, Godfroid, & Gass, 2013). However, few studies published thus far have examined L2 readers’ strategies. Bax and Weir (2012) identified the various reading behaviors (focusing on the task, skimming, and selective attention of relevant text) of six participants who had successfully answered target test items. However, as the objective of the study was to evaluate the cognitive validity of a reading test, it did not empirically research the efficacy of their reading behaviors. Considering the research methodology, Bax and Weir concluded that eye-tracking provides “unprecedented insights into readers’ moment-by-moment reading behaviour” and that this part of the research methodology was more valid and reliable than retrospective reports (p. 8).

In a follow-up study of 38 Malaysian learners of English, Bax (2013) compared the eye movements of successful and unsuccessful test-takers who needed to scan a text to answer test items. Most of the differences in participants’ eye movement data were found to be related to the readers’ processing of the text at a lexical and grammatical level. However, the analysis of readers’ eye movements on certain items seemed to suggest to the researcher that that readers who answered the questions correctly scanned more strategically. In contrast, while learners who missed the questions were also scanning the text, they “seemed... to be searching almost at random, and with no strategic purpose” (p. 460). Readers who successfully scanned the text may have had more awareness of the text’s overall structure based on previewing, but this was not discussed.

Kang (2014) carried out a small exploratory study comparing the reading comprehension and eye movements of nine native English speakers and nine Chinese graduate students in the United States. Other than the reading speed, few differences were found, but this is not surprising considering the L2 students’ high proficiency. Moreover, the small sample size and the fact that the comprehension test had just five items hinder the validity of the study. Previewing and selective attention to main points was not evaluated.

**Summary**

Previewing a text is one of the core global strategies. Previewing a text may strengthen comprehension in that it activates schema, develops global awareness of the text, and enhances metacognitive strategies. Despite growing awareness of its importance among ESOL educators, many learners may lack top-down reading strategies, including previewing
skills. However, L2 readers’ previewing strategies have not been evaluated empirically. Previous research has relied on survey protocols, which have some limitations. Eye tracking has potential to be a very useful research tool to validly analyze L2 readers’ global strategy usage, including their pre-reading skills.

METHODS

This study analyzes the eye movements of Japanese readers of English to determine if and how they previewed an expository text to complete a summary task. Second, their ability to summarize the main points of the text will be analyzed to evaluate if their previewing behavior had any relationship with their task performance. Finally, the eye movement data will be compared with participants’ responses on relevant items from SORS to consider the reliability and role of the two research methods.

Participants and Procedures

The study involved 38 Japanese university students from two well-known institutions in Western Japan. Their mean score 562 was on the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) by the English Testing Service. While it is extremely difficult to compare TOEIC scores with other tests and frameworks, 562 on the TOEIC seems to roughly equate with at least B1 (“independent users”) on the Common European Framework (ETS, 2015). The students came from a broad range of faculties that included Literature, Arts and Cultural Studies; Law; Dentistry; Engineering; and Environmental Science.

Students were administered the SORS in their classes, and they were invited to further take part in the research study by reading an article the following week in the researchers’ offices. The directions informed the participants that they would be shown a short article for three minutes and that, as in Hyönä, et al. (2002) and Hyönä and Nurminen (2006), they would then need to summarize the main points in five or six sentences in English without access to the article. They were told that they would not need to worry about spelling or grammar in their summary. After the participants confirmed they understood the directions, their eyes were calibrated to the eye tracker and the data collection began.

Materials

One expository text with 471 words was used. The topic of the text was the game rock, scissors, paper, and three subsections discussed game variations, worldwide competitions, and strategies of winning. The text was adapted from a Wikipedia entry, and a similar version was also used in previous research (Prichard, 2011). While research shows
that background knowledge affects comprehension, piloting of the text revealed that
participants knew little of the text’s content. As for the vocabulary level, the text was adapted
so that over 95% of the running words were from the first 3,000 words of the British National
Corpus (2007), after proper nouns and loanwords used in Japanese had been excluded.

As in the texts used in Hyönä, Lorch, and Kaakinen (2002) and Hyönä and Nurminen
(2006), the article contained headings and clear topic sentences, which contained all the text’s
main points. There were six paragraphs, two for each section, and six images. The article was
displayed on two pages open side by side on a monitor (see Figure 1). This enabled
participants to easily preview the entire text without needing to turn pages or scroll down.

The World of Rock Paper Scissors

Rock Paper Scissors is a popular hand game in many parts of the world.

Variations throughout the world

The hand game Rock Paper Scissors varies around the world in
several ways, including the action before the actual move.
For example, in the US and Canada, players often hit the point
of their left hand before, while saying “one, two, three,” but many
other regions just use one hand in the warm up. A variation in
some parts of the US involves a fourth count, “shout,” before
players reveal their move. (This is often played in New England.)

Another way the game varies around the world is using
different weapons, in addition to rock, paper, and scissors.
A variant in Bolivia uses an elephant, a kitten, and an arrow
on target. The way the game is able to climb into the elephant’s ear and
slive it means, while the kitten crashes the cowry and the
elephant crushes the kitten. An example of a 6 weapon game adds
dynamics (using a thumb), which beats rock, but is cut by scissors.

Worldwide competition

The game has developed and been organized into several high-
stakes competitions, including leagues with formal rules.
Since 2002, the World Rock Paper Scissors Society has overseen
competitive play across the globe and standardized a set of official
rules for play, which can be found on their website: USA Rock
Paper Scissors League is a US-based league, developed by Matt
Lersch in 2006. (The league is sponsored by Bud Light.)

Several tournaments have been attended by players from
around the world, and they have attracted much media attention.
In 2004, championships were broadcast on US television. In April
2006, following months of regional qualifying tournaments, 277
players went to Las Vegas for a single elimination tournament
with winner receiving $50,000. (A US man won the first ever Budweiser World Championships held in Beijing)

Strategies & tricks

The main strategy successful players must utilize is to
recognize and predict the non-random play of their opponent.
Instead of mirroring, a more strategic, eavesdrop-like strategy
should be employed, while the World RPS Society states making
rock. A composite game forecast on the New York Times website
has been developed which predicts patterns based on 200,000
moves of player history. (Scissors is the least common move)

A more disputable strategy is quickly recognizing the move
being used by one’s opponent and producing the winning weapon.
Using high-speed cameras, researchers at the University of Tokyo
have created a robot hand that has a 100% winning rate. The
robot recognizes within a fraction of a second which step the
human is making, and produces the winning move. However, it is
unlikely most humans have reaction time quick enough to actually
do this.

Figure 1. The Article File as It Was Displayed on the Monitor.

Equipment

The data collection utilized two Gazepoint GP3 Eye Trackers (one in each of the
researchers’ offices) and Gazepoint Analysis Professional Edition Software. The trackers
were mounted under the screen. The tracker has a refresh rate of Hz 60, which is lower than
the trackers used in many recent studies. However, this was not deemed a significant
limitation as the purpose of the study was to analyze global text processing and eye
movements were analyzed within relatively large chunks of space (i.e., paragraphs and
images). Therefore, a lower sampling rate was considered more acceptable than in studies
analyzing fixations at a lexical level. The article was displayed on a 24-inch high definition
monitor and participants’ eyes were approximately 60 centimeters from the screen. The body
text was Times New Roman. The font size of the text is difficult to accurately gauge as an
image of the file was made and then altered to fit the screen size; however, the body text was between 16 and 18 point.

Analysis

**Previewing strategies of the target text (eye tracking).** To determine the extent and characteristics of participants’ previewing strategies, the following were recorded before the reader started linear reading of the first paragraph:
- the total pre-reading time
- the number of fixations and total fixation duration on the title and subtitle
- the number of fixations and total fixation duration on the body text
- the number of fixations and total fixation duration on the images
- the number of subject headings and topic sentences fixated on
- the number of paragraphs fixated upon
- the number of images fixated upon

**Participants’ summary skills.** As in Hyönä and colleagues (2002) and Hyönä and Nurminen (2006), the participants were given points on their summary based on their recall of the main features of the text. They were given five points for restating the topic, four points for mentioning each of the three subtopics (noted in the subheadings), and three points for their recall of each of the main points (mentioned in the topic sentences of the six body paragraphs). They were given no points for their recall of supporting details and examples and for ideas not presented in the text. The maximum total possible was 35 points. Language use, such as spelling and grammar accuracy, was not accounted for in the scoring. Pearson correlation coefficient was used to determine if there was any significant relationship between the summary scores and the eye-tracking measures.

**Previewing tendencies when reading English texts (SORS).** The SORS was utilized to compare the participants’ previewing behavior on the target text with their self-reported reading tendencies measured on a 5-point Likert scale. The survey was translated into Japanese and reviewed by five Japanese/English bilingual professors to check the accuracy of the translations.

Internal consistency estimates of reliability were conducted for the 30-item SORS and for the 10-item Global Reading Strategies subscale. Values for coefficient alpha were .896 and .834 respectively, indicating good reliability for the SORS and for the subscale.

The following four items were specifically targeted for a statistical comparison:
4. I take an overall view of the text to see what it is about before reading it.
8. I review the text first by noting its characteristics like length and organization.
12. When reading, I decide what to read closely and what to ignore.
15. I use tables, figures, and pictures in text to increase my understanding.

Items four and eight directly concerned pre-reading, while items 12 and 15 may be indirectly related. To determine if there was any significant correlation between the SORS results and the eye-tracking measures and the summary scores, Pearson correlation coefficient was utilized.

RESULTS

Eye-tracking Data

The eye-tracking data revealed that most participants did little or no previewing of the text. Thirteen (34.2%) displayed no other previewing behavior other than reading the title and subtitle. Six of the participants (15.8%) did not even fixate on the title or subtitle before reading the body text. Together these two groups, who represented half of the participants, will be labelled as non-previewers.

Only 18 of the readers (42.1%) fixated on the body text or images before linearly reading. These participants will be labelled as previewers. However, as shown in the fixation heat map (Figure 2) of the first ten seconds of the reading, most of the attention by the previewers was devoted to reading the title, subtitle, and the first subheading; less attention was given to other key parts of the text which can be utilized in previewing, such as the images and section headings.

Figure 1. Fixation Map of the First Ten Seconds of Reading
The two remaining participants spent most of the session scanning the text, with very little linear reading. One did not start reading linearly until 67th second, and another participant spent 42.2 seconds scanning before reading. Even after beginning to read linearly, these two participants soon resumed scanning. Therefore, these participants were omitted from the previewers group and will be labelled as text scanners in this study.

As shown in Table 1, the mean time readers spent before linear reading of the text was 9.5 seconds; the median was much lower (6.7 seconds) considering the two text scanners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Time before Linear Reading</th>
<th>Title &amp; Subtitle Fixation Time</th>
<th>Image Fixation Time</th>
<th>Body Text Fixation Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean (seconds)</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>0 - 67.07</td>
<td>0 - 20.3</td>
<td>0 - 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very little time was spent previewing the images and text. Three-fourths of the students (76.3%) did not fixate on any of the images before they started linear reading the text. The mean fixation duration on the images was .63 seconds for all students and 1.46 seconds for the seven students in the preview group who fixated on images. The mean number of images fixated on was just 1.42 out of six images (see Table 2). Of the previewers who fixated on images, the mean number was 2.71.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title &amp; Subtitle Fixations</th>
<th>Image Fixations</th>
<th>Text Fixations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>0 – 32</td>
<td>0 – 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Just thirteen of the students (34.2%) fixated on the body text (including subheadings) before reading. Just nine of them previewed subheadings and topic sentences, and none of the previewers fixated on more than one subheading or topic sentence before beginning to linearly read the body text.

Summary Protocol and Previewing Behavior (Eye-tracking)

Most students struggled to recall the main points of the text. The mean score was 10.24 out of 35 points ($SD = 6.27$; Median = 11; Range = 0 - 29). This was the case regardless of their proficiency level; the correlation between the participants’ TOEIC scores and their summary protocol was not significant, $r(36) = .19$, $p = .13$.

Omitting the two participants in the text scanner group, there was no significant correlation between the total previewing time and the protocol score $r(34) = .25$, $p = .07$. However, there was a moderate significant correlation between the total fixation duration on the body text while previewing and the protocol score $r(34) = .31$, $p = .03$. There was no significant correlation among the other individual eye-tracking measures and the summary protocol score. As shown in Table 3, the previewers outscored those in the other groups, but the difference between previewers and non-previewers was not significant, $t(34) = 1.04$, $p = .30$, based on an unpaired $t$-test.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Mean Summary Protocol Scores of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previewers (N = 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Protocol Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Results and Previewing Behavior (Eye-tracking)

There was little or no relationship between the target SORS items related to previewing and the participants’ pre-reading eye-movements.

**Item 4: I take an overall view of the text to see what it is about before reading it.**

There was no significant correlation between this item and the time participants spent before reading the text $r(34) = .01$, $p = .48$, or any of the other eye-tracking measures. The students
in the previewer group agreed with this item somewhat more \((M= 4.41; SD=1.47)\) than non-
previewers \((M= 3.47; SD=1.54)\), but this difference was not quite significant, \(t(34) = 1.89,\)
\(p=.07\), based on a \(t\)-test.

**Item 8: I review the text first by noting its characteristics like length and organization.** There was not a significant correlation between this item and the time participants spent before linear reading of the text \(r(34)= -.09, p = .30\), or any of the other eye tracking measures. Those in the previewers group agreed with this item slightly more \((M= 3.88; SD=1.69)\) than the non-previewers \((M= 3.58; SD=1.12)\), but the \(t\)-test results did not show significance.

**Item 12: When reading, I decide what to read closely and what to ignore.** There was no statistical difference between this item and any of the eye-tracking measures. The previewers group had slightly higher levels of agreement with this item \((M= 4.06; SD=1.43)\) and non-previewers \((M= 3.84; SD=1.68)\), but the \(t\)-test analysis did not show significance.

**Item 15: I use tables, figures, and pictures in text to increase my understanding.** There was no significant correlation between this item and the number of fixations on the images before reading the text, \(r(36) = .19, p = .13\), or any other previewing measures relating to images. The participants who fixated on images while pre-reading agreed slightly more with this item \((M= 5.00; SD=1.12)\) compared to other participants \((M= 4.79; SD=1.24)\), but the difference was not significant based on a \(t\)-test.

**DISCUSSION**

**Eye Movements while Pre-reading**

Overall, the participants displayed very little previewing behavior, and this was surprising to the researchers. A handful of students did not even read the title or subtitle. Half of the students did not look at the body of the text before linear reading of the text, and most students did not fixate on the images before reading. It may be possible that some of the text’s features, like length and the content of some images, could have been assessed parafoveally, and this should be examined in follow-up research. Finally, the students tended not to preview the headings or topic sentences, which may have helped them focus on the organization and key points, which is essential for summary writing. None of the students fixated on more than one section heading or topic sentence.
Follow-up research is needed to confirm if the reading behaviors observed in this study are the norm among Japanese L2 readers. If so, possible reasons for this should be examined through qualitative measures, such as follow-up interviews. As noted in the literature, much of the reading students do in Japan is based on grammar-translation and for test taking, and such reading activities do not focus on reading for main points. Moreover, entrance exams in Japan often remove the title and images, and the text source is only written at the end. Therefore, previous conditioning may have led the participants to read linearly.

Another possible reason for the lack of previewing could be related to the context. For example, the participants had a time limit, and they may have felt that they had little time to preview. However, if they perceived a lack of time, it could also be presumed that the previewing behavior could have been increased in order to plan the reading more effectively. In future studies, the time allotted to reading should be varied to see whether time is a factor.

**Summary Protocol and Previewing Behavior**

The participants struggled in their summary writing. As mentioned above, reading for main points and summary writing tends to be ignored in English education in Japan.

The correlation between eye movement data while pre-reading and the summary scores tended to have little or no correlation. This was not surprising considering success in reading comprehension and the summary task involves a number of other factors, such as the learners’ proficiency level, task-familiarity, working memory, and the use of other reading strategies while reading. Despite this, one previewing measure (fixation duration on the body text) had a significant correlation and another measure (total pre-reading time) approached significance. More research, especially studies that involve more participants who preview the text thoroughly, is necessary before any firm conclusions can be made on the effect of previewing.

**Survey Results and Previewing Behavior**

The results from the targeted SORS items did not correlate with the readers’ behavior. While the researchers did not expect a strong correlation based on concerns described in the literature, at least a moderate correlation was expected. Although more research is necessary, this may highlight the importance of utilizing more than one research method rather than relying solely on survey data.

**Limitations**

The main limitation in this study related to the accuracy of the eye tracking. Oily skin, sparkly makeup, and glasses sometimes caused detection issues with the tracking, resulting in seventeen participants being excluded from the analysis. Other issues may have been caused by eye shape or characteristics of the participants’ pupils, as is described by Hansen and Ji.
Participants whose tracking was lost at any point before linear reading began were excluded from the study.

Task familiarity with summarizing may also have been an issue. Summarizing is a fairly familiar classroom task, but it may have been unfamiliar to some participants. Multiple choice type questions could be used in addition to the summary task as this would provide a more receptive and cognitively less challenging task for participants.

**CONCLUSION**

Given the task of summary writing, this exploratory study examined the previewing strategies of Japanese university L2 readers, as measured by eye-tracking and a reading survey (SORS). Half the participants showed little if any previewing behavior, and several students did not even read the title or subtitle. Those that did have pre-reading eye movements previewed very quickly, and none of the participants referred to more than one of the subheadings or topic sentences. Most participants did not fixate on the images while pre-reading, and those that did viewed only one or two.

The summaries written by the participants were generally poor and failed to mention two-thirds of the key points in the text on average. There was a significant, but weak correlation between the participants’ summary scores and their fixation duration of the body text while previewing. Other measures did not have a significant effect, but the total pre-reading time approached significance. More research is necessary before it can be confidently concluded that pre-reading enhances L2 readers’ ability to summarize.

The participants also took the SORS on their general reading behavior in English, but the items concerning previewing did not correlate significantly with the relevant eye-tracking data. While one possible reason may have been that the context of the task differed greatly from what the participants were used to, this further calls into question research on strategy use that relies solely on survey instruments. In contrast, the use of eye tracking yielded valid and insightful data on the learners’ actual reading strategy use in context. While there were some issues with the eye tracking and some data needed to be discarded, follow-up studies are planned using eye tracking and qualitative measures to gather more data on learners’ global reading strategies.

This study did not investigate reasons for the participants’ lack of previewing behavior and summarizing skills. However, the literature suggests that this may be partially the result of the Japanese students’ prior English studies, which likely did not prioritize reading for main points. In addition to getting more experience reading for authentic purposes, the learners might benefit from strategy training on pre-reading and other global reading strategies. Future studies are planned which evaluate the efficacy of strategy training on learners’ reading strategy use and summary writing.
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