

## **Chapter 5**

### **Conclusion and Suggestion**

There are two parts in this chapter. Conclusion of the study is presented in the first part. Afterward, the suggestion for future research is provided.

#### **Conclusion**

Vocabulary size was discovered to have a significantly positive and strong correlation with literal reading comprehension ( $r = .761$ ,  $p < .001$ ). As literal reading comprehension is the lower level skill of reading, vocabulary is indeed highly related to it. The larger the vocabulary size that readers acquire, the better the literal reading comprehension that they achieve.

Furthermore, the correlation between vocabulary size and inferential reading comprehension was also found to be significantly positive and strong ( $r = .822$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The correlation coefficient was slightly higher than the correlation coefficient between vocabulary size and literal comprehension. It indicates that as a higher level of reading, inferential reading comprehension is beyond literal. Vocabulary size influences the

readers' ability to understand the implied meaning of the text, which also included thinking process. This higher correlation coefficient supports verbal efficiency theory claimed by Perfetti (1985) as cited in Chen (2011) that becoming efficient in processing lower level reading skills such as vocabulary knowledge and word recognition would facilitate readers in the processing of higher level reading skills in order to help them attain reading comprehension.

Afterward, the research disclosed that the correlation between vocabulary size and critical reading comprehension was also significantly positive and strong. The correlation coefficient is .839,  $p < .001$ , higher than the correlation coefficient between vocabulary size and literal comprehension or vocabulary size and inferential comprehension. The finding suggests that literal and inferential comprehension both support critical comprehension. When readers attain literal and inferential comprehension, they would progress to critical comprehension, which is the understanding of both explicit and implicit meanings of a text and the ability to make judgments and evaluation.

The findings reveal that vocabulary size has a significant positive and strong correlation with the three levels of reading comprehension namely literal, inferential, and critical

comprehension. This correlation plausibly supports many researchers' acknowledgment about the correlation between vocabulary and reading. Koda (1989) and Qian (1999) as cited in Chen (2011) mention that vocabulary knowledge heavily relates to reading comprehension more so than other factors such as grammar knowledge. In this research, the correlation between vocabulary size and overall reading is also measured to affirm this stance. The result of Pearson correlation coefficient is .873,  $p < 0.001$ , indicating a positive and strong correlation.

Vocabulary size is apparently also a good predictor to the three levels of reading comprehension as well as to the overall reading comprehension since the variation in vocabulary size could predict the variation in literal, inferential, and critical reading comprehension with respectively 57.9%, 67.6%, and 70.4%, and 76.2% accuracy.

Hence, it is crucial for readers to continually increase their vocabulary size in order to facilitate their reading comprehension especially in the three levels which are literal, inferential, and critical reading comprehension.

### **Suggestion**

In exploring the correlation between vocabulary size and the three levels of reading comprehension, the researcher limits the research only to investigate what the correlation is between vocabulary size and the three levels of reading comprehension (literal, inferential, and critical comprehension) in terms of the the direction and magnitude. Further study is necessarily recommended to discover the effects of vocabulary size on literal, inferential, and critical reading comprehension.

Furthermore, having observed that the research subjects with vocabulary size on the average of 7,203 word families only obtained overall reading score on the average of 55, the researcher suspects that insufficient time allocation might be the probable cause of the reading low score. Despite its disassociation with the correlation result, a further research is recommended to affirm this supposition.

## References

- Alderson, C. (2000). *Assessing reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Anderson, R. C. & Freebody, P. (1981). Vocabulary knowledge. In J. T. Guthrie (Ed.), *Comprehension and teaching: Research reviews*, pp. 77-81. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) example problem.  
Retrieved 7 May, 2014 from  
<http://cba.ualr.edu/smartstat/topics/anova/example.pdf>
- Ardoin, S. P., Eckert, T. L., Christ, T. J., White, M. J., Morena, L. S., January, S. A., Jeffrey, F. (2013). Examining variance in reading comprehension among developing readers: Words in context (curriculum-based measurement in reading) versus words out of context (word list). *School of Psychology Review*, 42(3).
- Baleghizadeh, S. (2010). The effect of vocabulary size on reading comprehension of Iranian EFL learners. *Linguistic and Literary Broad Research and Innovation*, 1(2), 33-46.
- Brown, J.D. (1996). *Testing in Language Programs*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Chen, K.Y. (2011). The impact of EFL students' vocabulary breadth of knowledge on literal reading comprehension. *Asian English Foreign Language Journal*, 51, 30-40.

- Chou, P. (2011). The effects of vocabulary knowledge and background knowledge on reading comprehension of Taiwanese EFL students. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 8(1), 108-115.
- Creswell, J. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. New Jersey: Pearson: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Eyckmans, J. (2004). *Measuring receptive vocabulary size*. Utrecht, Netherlands: LOT Company. Retrieved from <https://www.dare.ubn.kun.nl/bitstream/2066/19469/1/.pdf>
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (Forth Edition). Malaysia: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hirsh, D., & Nation, I. S. P. (1992). What vocabulary size is needed to read unsimplified texts for pleasure? *Reading in a Foreign Language*. 8(2), 689-696.
- Hsu, B. (2009). *The correlation between senior high school students' vocabulary size and reading performance*. Retrieved from <http://podcast.klsh.kl.edu.tw>
- Hussein, B.A. (2012). Analysis of the real situation of teaching reading comprehension to first year students at the department of English language and literature at Al Zaytoonah Private University of Jordan. *Asian Social Science*, 8(4), 237-251.
- Kezhavarz, M.H., & Mohammadi, V. (2009). The effect of unknown vocabulary density on EFL learners' reading comprehension of nonfiction general English texts. *JELS*, 1(1), 1-22.

- Konza, D. (2011). Understanding the reading process. Retrieved from [www.decs.sa.gov.au/literacy](http://www.decs.sa.gov.au/literacy).
- McMillan, J.H. (2008). *Educational Research*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Mehrpour, M., Razmjoo, S.A., & Kian, P. (2011). The relationship between depth and breadth of vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension among Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 53(22), 97-127.
- Mohamad, A. (1999). What do we test when we test reading comprehension? *Journal of Teaching English as Second Language*, 5(12). Retrieved from [iteslj.org/Techniques/Mohamad-TestingReading.html](http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Mohamad-TestingReading.html)
- Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nation, I. S. P. & Beglar, D. (2007). A vocabulary size test. *The Language Teacher*, 31(7), 9-13.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2012). The vocabulary size test. Retrieved from <http://www.victoria.ac.nz>
- Nation, I. S. P. & Anthony, L. (2013). Mid-frequency readers. *Journal of Extensive Reading*, 1, 5-16.
- Nation, I. S. P., & Webb, S. (2011). *Researching and Analyzing Vocabulary*. Boston: Heinle Cengage Learning.

- Roehl, K. M., & Shiue, C. (2003). Developing reading comprehension skills in EFL university level students. *Foreign Language Learning and Teaching Conference, 1*(2).
- Sanchez, A., & Manchon, R.M. (2007). Research on second language vocabulary acquisition and learning: An introduction. *International Journal of English Studies, 7*(2), 7-16.
- Schmitt, N. (2008). Review article instructed second language vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching Research, 12*(3), 329-363.
- Siegle, D. (2009). Using a critical value table for Pearson's correlation coefficient. Retrieved from <http://www.gifted.uconn.edu>
- Skudiene, V. (2002). A comparison of reading models, their application to the classroom and their impact on comprehension. *Studies about Languages, 2*.
- Smith, L.C., & Mare, N.N. (2003). *Issues for Today, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition*. Boston: Thomson Heinle.
- Stahl, S. A. (1990). Beyond the instrumentalist hypothesis: some relationships between word meanings and comprehension. *Center for the Study of Reading, 505*.
- Tamah, S.M., Widjaja E.Y., Anggraini L., & Susanto O. R. L. (2007). *The implementation of jigsaw technique in reading class of young learners (A research)*. Widya Mandala Catholic University, Surabaya.

Treiman, R. (2001). Reading. In M. Aronoff and J. Rees-Miller (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of linguistics* (pp. 664-672). Oxford, England: Blackwell.

University of Oxford. (2005). *British national corpus*. Retrieved from [bnc-queries@rt.oucs.ox.ac.uk](mailto:bnc-queries@rt.oucs.ox.ac.uk)