

PILOT STUDY OF THE WORD ATTACK, ORAL VOCABULARY AND READING VOCABULARY

Zeinab Mihandoost

Department of Psychology, Ilam Branch, Islamic Azad University, ILAM, IRAN

E-mail: xozns2006@yahoo.com

Abstract

The aims of this study determined reliability of Persian version of word attack, reading vocabulary and oral vocabulary scales. The researcher randomly assigned 30 students to two groups in Ilam, Iran. They included of 15 males and 15 females. The pilot study started on February 8th, 2014 and ended on February 15th. The Persian version of word attack, reading vocabulary and oral vocabulary scales were administered for these students. The reliability was conducted on research scales with Cronbach's alpha to determine the inter-item reliability. Reliability coefficient for word attack, reading vocabulary and oral vocabulary scales were obtained. This study Cronbach's alpha for word attack, reading vocabulary and oral vocabulary scales were obtained .96, .98, and .95 respectively. The outcomes of this study show that, high reliability. The researcher recommended that, employed these scales in the main.

Key word: pilot study, word attack, reading vocabulary, oral vocabulary

Introduction

Reading is supposed as a multifarious performs of communication in which a numeral of text, and reader related to construct comprehension (Roe, Smith, & Burns, 2005). Additional expressly, it has been recognized that word identification, vocabulary, and text structure awareness. Vocabulary is a strong interpreter of academic achievement, and generally intellectual skill, it is essential to study training strategies that develop word acquisition in student and to examine these in relation to critical student personality. At the same time as direct training may be the most salient way to support the learning of new words, most vocabulary consciousness is probably obtained through incidental learning based on oral context (Ewers & Brownson, 2010).

Poor readers generally read less and therefore could be hampered in vocabulary progress by less contact to issue (Hayes, 1988). Additionally, students with poor vocabularies find it more problem to understand and recall passage (Aguiar & Brady, 1991; Beck, Perfetti, & McKeown, 1982), which may in turn make it more complex to include words encountered in text into the mental lexicon (Daneman & Green, 1986). Vocabulary deficits in students with learning disability are not likely to be only the outcome of less reading ability. Differences in vocabulary knowledge have been observed in students' poor readers (Aguiar & Brady, 1991; Mihandoost, 2012). Learning a new word needs perfect perception, storage, and recovery of the word. Since poor readers have been found to have phonological problems in each of these areas of processing (Aguiar & Brady, 1991; Liberman & Shankweiler, 1989; Mihandoost, Habibah, Sharifah, & Rosnaini, 2012). Students who primarily had poor phonological recall scores demonstrated lower vocabulary when the analysis statistically controlled for original vocabulary skills.

Method

In this pilot study 30 students in Ilam, Iran participated. These students include 15 males and 15 females. They were first to twelve graders and study in public schools. The pilot study started on

February 8th, 2014 and ended on February 15th. The Persian version of word attack, reading vocabulary and subscales synonyms, antonyms, analogies, also oral vocabulary and subscales synonyms, antonyms, verbal analog were administered. The reliability was conducted on study scales with alpha to determine the inter-item reliability. The Cronbach's alpha reliabilities of word attack, reading vocabulary (also subscales synonyms, antonyms, analogies) and oral vocabulary (furthermore subscales synonyms, antonyms, verbal analog) were found to be .96, .98 (.95, .95, .90), and .95 (.91, .90, .73), respectively. These outcomes illustrated that that high reliability for scales but subscale oral vocabulary verbal analogies show that median reliability, recommending that these scales were considered as suitable to be used in the main study.

Instruments

1. Word attack: This scale measures a subject's ability to apply phonic and structural analysis skills in pronouncing phonetically regular pseudowords. The task requires an ability to recall the phoneme associated with each grapheme and then blend or synthesize the phonemes into a word. Knowledge of word structure needed for the multisyllabic pseudowords. Score each correct response 1 and each incorrect response 0. Do not penalize the subject for mispronunciations resulting from articulation errors, dialect variations, or regional speech patterns (Woodcock, Mather, & Schrank, 2004).

2. Reading vocabulary: This scale measures an aspect of reading comprehension at the isolated word level. It allows an examiner to evaluate word comprehension skill apart from passage comprehension skill. The task requires the ability to read words and supply words similar in meaning in part A: Synonyms, in part B: Antonyms, in part C: Verbal Analogies. Performance on reading vocabulary is related to basic reading skills. Score each correct response 1 and each incorrect response 0. For each subscale, scale by complete pages until the four lowest-numbered items administered are correct (Woodcock et al., 2004).

3. Oral vocabulary: This scale measures listening ability and language development, aspects of comprehension-knowledge. The task requires the use of previously acquired knowledge and the ability to conclude or predict a word based on the information presented. Low performance may be a function of limited semantic or synaptic knowledge or poor attention. All three subscales of the scale (synonyms, antonyms, and verbal analogies) must be administered to obtain derived scores for this test (Woodcock et al., 2004).

Results

Table 1 shows that high reliability for word attack, reading vocabulary (also subscales synonyms, antonyms, analogies) and oral vocabulary (furthermore subscales synonyms, antonyms) but this result shows that median reliability for subscale verbal analog, suggesting that these instruments were considered as appropriate to be employed in the main study.

Discussion

Present study employed Persian Version of word attack, reading vocabulary (also subscales synonyms, antonyms, analogies) and oral vocabulary (furthermore subscales synonyms, antonyms, and verbal analogies) scales for 30 regular students in Ilam, Iran from public schools. Based on table 1, reliability coefficient for word attack, reading vocabulary (also subscales synonyms, antonyms, analogies) and oral vocabulary (furthermore subscales synonyms, antonyms) scales were high also table 1 shows that median reliability for subscale verbal analogies. The researcher recommended that used these scales in the main of study. The Cronbach's alpha reliabilities of the word attack, reading

vocabulary (RV), RV synonyms, RV antonyms, RV analogies, oral vocabulary (OV), OV synonyms, OV antonyms, and OV verbal analog were found to be .96, .98, .95, .95, .90, .95, .91, .90, and .73, respectively. These results indicated that high reliability for the scales, recommending that these scales were considered as suitable to be used in the main study.

Conclusion

The researcher suggested that employ these scales in the main of study. This pilot study, found that high reliability for Persian version of word attack, reading vocabulary (RV), RV synonyms, RV antonyms, RV analogies, oral vocabulary (OV), OV synonyms, OV antonyms, and OV verbal analog scales.

Acknowledgment

Support this study, Department of Psychology, Ilam Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ilam, Iran. This study was extracted from research program that will be do in Ilam provence.

Table1. Reliability coefficient for word attack, reading vocabulary and oral vocabulary

Scales	Cronbach's Alpha
Word attack	.96
Reading vocabulary (RV)	.98
RV Synonyms	.95
RV Antonyms	.95
RV Analogies	.90
Oral vocabulary (OV)	.95
OV Synonyms	.91
OV Antonyms	.90
OV Verbal Analogies	.73

Table above indicated that word attack, reading vocabulary (also subscales synonyms, antonyms, analogies) and oral vocabulary (furthermore subscales synonyms, antonyms, and verbal analogies). Based table 1 subscale verbal analogies were indicated median reliability and other scales and subscales were showed that high reliability.

Reference

1. Aguiar, L., & Brady, S. (1991). Vocabulary acquisition and reading ability. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 3, 413-425.
2. Beck, I., Perfetti, C., & McKeown, M. (1982). The effects of long-term vocabulary instruction on lexical access and reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74, 506-552.
3. Daneman, M., & Green, I. (1986). Individual differences in comprehending and producing words in context. *Journal of Memory and Cognition*, 2(5), 1-18.
4. Ewers, C. A., & Brownson, S. M. (2010). Kindergarteners' vocabulary acquisition as a function of active vs. passive storybook reading, prior vocabulary, and working memory. *Memory, Reading Psychology*, 20(10), 11-20. doi: 10.1020/027027/199278484
5. Hayes, D. P. (1988). Speaking and writing: Distinct patterns of word choice. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 27.
6. Liberman, I. Y., & Shankweiler, D. P. (1989). Phonology and the beginning reader: A tutorial. In L. Rieben & C. A. Perfetti (Eds.), *L'Apprenti lecteur - Apports experimentaux et implications*. Pedagogiques, Neuchatel: Delachaux et Niestle.
7. Mihandoost, Z. (2012). *Intervention Program for Dyslexia Students*. LPA LAMBERT: Academic Publishing.
8. Mihandoost, Z., Habibah, E., Sharifah, M. N., & Rosnaini, M. (2012). The effectiveness of the Barton Intervention Programe on reading skills of dyslexic students. *Pertanika Journal Social Sciences & Humanities*, 20(2).
9. Roe, B. D., Smith, S. H., & Burns, P. C. (2005). *Teaching reading in today's elementary schools* (Vol. 9). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
10. Woodcock, R. W., Mather, N., & Schrank, F. A. (2004). *Woodcock-Johnson III Diagnostic Reading Battery*. Rolling Meadows, IL: Riverside Publishing.

Article received: 2014-04-01