



## TOOL MEASUREMENT – ‘UTILIZATION OF DICTIONARY’

**P. Padma Ganga\* & Dr. A. Blessing Mary\*\***

\* Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of Education, Mother Teresa Women's University, Kodaikannal, Tamilnadu

\*\* Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Mother Teresa Women's University, Kodaikannal, Tamilnadu

**Cite This Article:** P. Padma Ganga & Dr. A. Blessing Mary, “Tool Measurement – Utilization of Dictionary”, *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Modern Education*, Volume 3, Issue 1, Page Number 59-61, 2017.

**Copy Right:** © IJMRME, R&D Modern Research Publication, 2017 (All Rights Reserved). This is an Open Access Article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

### **Abstract:**

The researcher aimed to construct a tool to assess the Utilization of Dictionary among the students of Higher Secondary. The main purpose of the paper is to assess the utilization of dictionary and well structured questionnaire by using Cronbach Value and Kolmogrov Smirnov value. So this is an attempt to fulfil the aforesaid.

### **Introduction:**

Higher secondary is the most promising tenure of any student which anticipates the gamut of understanding of the subjects. The process of understanding can't be achieved by the words of teacher alone sometimes it needs another vantage point and this could be achieved by referring a dictionary for some considerable extend of comprehending. Hence the researcher understands that a research is the need of the hour on the reference skills of students and opts for the present research on utilization of dictionary.

### **Review of Related Studies:**

Mueller, Charles M.; Jacobsen, Natalia D. (2016) has conducted a study on “A Comparison of the Effectiveness of EFL Students' Use of Dictionaries and an Online Corpus for the Enhancement of Revision Skills” and found that the feasibility and effectiveness of online corpus consultation for learners at a basic level of L2 proficiency have been relatively unexplored. The current study of Japanese-L1 (first language) learners in an EFL (English as a foreign language) context (N = 117) addresses these gaps in research. A preliminary investigation (Experiment 1) examined EFL learners (n = 78) as they used the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA: Davies, 2008) to revise essays. Experiment 2 (n = 39) used a within-subjects comparison to determine whether participants attained greater accuracy in supplying the missing word in a gap-fill test when using an electronic dictionary or COCA. The survey results from the two experiments revealed that participants generally found using an online corpus difficult. In Experiment 2, a paired-samples t-test showed that participants, at an alpha of  $p = 0.05$  two-tailed, were marginally better able to answer test questions when using the online corpus than they were when using an electronic dictionary,  $p = 0.030$ .

Lai, Shu-Li; Chen, Hao-Jan Howard (2015) has conducted a study on “Dictionaries vs Concordancers: Actual Practice of the Two Different Tools in EFL Writing” study investigated a class of non-English-major college students (N = 14) over a semester. Four online corpus tools, including monolingual and bilingual concordancers and collocation retrieval systems, were provided, along with two online dictionaries. After two tool-training sessions, students performed three timed-writing tasks online during three consecutive months and received individual stimulus recall interviews after each writing task. The recall interviews served as the main source of data; other data included the video clips of the writing process, student writing samples, and the researchers' notes. The result showed that students used corpus tools and the bilingual dictionary for different purposes. They tended to use a bilingual dictionary when information on word form and word meaning was needed. When searching for information related to word usage, collocation information, and grammar patterns, they chose corpus tools more often than a bilingual dictionary. However, they also turned to corpus tools for meaning and form when the bilingual dictionary failed to provide clear word meanings, when they needed to search for word strings, and when they needed to just confirm an intuition regarding either word form or word meaning.

Nesi, Hilary (2014) has conducted a study on “Research Timeline: Dictionary Use by English Language Learners” and found that the history of research into dictionary use tends to be characterized by small-scale studies undertaken in a variety of different contexts, rather than larger-scale, longer-term funded projects. The research conducted by dictionary publishers is not generally made public, because of its commercial sensitivity, yet because dictionary production is largely a commercial venture, academic research in this area has rarely attracted public funding. Findings from multiple small studies are often difficult to compare because of variations in the types of user, dictionary material, and experimental method. Research into dictionary use has gradually become more subtle and more complex, however. Researchers have tried to control

for lexicographical variables by using specially created "mini-dictionaries", rather than original dictionaries produced by different publishers, and new computer-based research tools and the synthesis of findings from different types of data set are helping to resolve the apparent contradictions noted in earlier studies.

Hulstijn & Atkins (1998: 10) concerns research which aims at "bringing the dictionary to the user (how can the dictionary best serve its users' needs?)" and "bringing the user to the dictionary (how can people be made better dictionary users?)". Only empirical research and overviews of empirical research are included. The author's selection represents five recurring themes: (1) English language learners' preferences and attitudes regarding dictionary use; (2) The influence of dictionaries on English language learners' text comprehension; (3) The influence of dictionaries on English language learners' text production; (4) The role of dictionaries as an aid to English language learning; and (5) English language learners' dictionary consultation behaviour.

**Key Definition:**

**Dictionary:**

A book that gives a list of the words of a language in alphabetical order and explains what they mean, or give a word for them in a foreign language.

**Utilization of Dictionary:**

Using the dictionary for academic and non-academic purposes like, to search meaning, antonyms, abbreviations, thesaurus and etc.

**Description of the Tool:**

The researcher constructed Likert type five-point scale to measure the utilization of the dictionary which consists of thirty statements encompassed with five dimensions with positive statements and sixth dimension with negative statements. A sample could get a maximum of 150 marks and a minimum of 0.

**Methodology:**

The researcher initiated the construction of the tool named "A tool to measure Utilization of Dictionary among the Higher Secondary School Students" by searching the journals, e-journals, books, and sought expert advice and suggestions. Finally the researcher composed thirty statements to assess the utilization of dictionary. The tool was a five-point Likert type scale with options like Most often, Often, Occasionally, Rarely, Never for the positive statements. For negative statements options like Yes, Probably Yes, Neutral, Probably Not, and No. Utilization of dictionary questionnaire consists of six dimensions namely; i) Type of dictionary used, ii) When dictionary used, iii) Frequency of usage, iv) Purpose of Usage, v) Reason for looking up, vi) Satisfactory of using. All the other five dimensions are positive except "Reason for using". The tool was administered to the sample size of 100 higher secondary students and carefully scored. The questionnaires are assembled according to the highest marks to the lowest. Top 27% of the highest scorers are considered as upper group and the lowest 27% of achievers are considered as lower group and these two groups alone considered for the item analysis procedure. In order to validate the questionnaire the researcher used the following statistical analysis,

- ✓ t Test
- ✓ Cronbach Alpha Test and
- ✓ Kolmogrov Smirnov Test

Item No	't' Test Score	Cronbach Alpha Value	Kolmogrov Smirnov Value	Result
1	2.802	0.783	1.879	Selected
2	1.954	0.660	1.625	Selected
3	3.018	0.882	1.516	Selected
4	5.165	0.604	1.647	Selected
5	4.917	0.787	2.948	Selected
6	3.080	0.515	1.879	Selected
7	1.010	0.768	2.139	Selected
8	5.968	0.933	1.816	Selected
9	4.183	0.778	2.158	Selected
10	2.046	0.823	1.995	Selected
11	4.045	0.545	2.153	Selected
12	5.098	0.642	1.865	Selected
13	2.028	0.707	1.655	Selected
14	3.896	0.608	1.870	Selected
15	5.112	0.556	2.740	Selected
16	6.089	0.555	1.942	Selected
17	3.096	0.778	1.218	Selected
18	2.568	0.583	2.03	Selected
19	1.040	0.505	1.848	Selected

20	3.400	0.686	1.639	Selected
21	5.303	0.868	1.619	Selected
22	2.077	0.955	2.605	Selected
23	3.688	0.826	2.883	Selected
24	5.570	0.654	2.520	Selected
25	2.035	0.777	1.659	Selected
26	3.244	0.805	1.836	Selected
27	6.687	0.935	2.095	Selected
28	4.748	0.548	1.935	Selected
29	5.755	0.525	1.809	Selected
30	6.140	0.923	2.397	Selected

Quality of mean scores was calculated by using Kolmogorov Smirnov test at 0.05 significant level the corresponding value which is greater than 1.36 was considered. Using the Kolmogorov Smirnov Test the quality of mean scores was tested, the mean scores that differed significantly were retained (Guilford, J.P. 1965). Cronbach Alpha value was calculated for the two sets of scores for each statement. Alpha value greater than 0.5 were retained and less than 0.5 were not considered. To establish the significance of the test items t value was calculated and the value of the item which is greater than the table value at 0.05 level has been taken for the final study. All the statistical values and results are depicted in the above table.

**Reliability and Validity:**

Reliability of the tool was found to be 0.82 and was achieved by split-half method. Face validity was achieved by making suggested corrections by the field experts.

**Educational Implication:**

The tool which aims to measure the Utilization of Dictionary will be useful for the school education sector in future.

**Recommendation:**

In future the tool may be modified and validated according to the anticipation and it could be modified to access the other aspects of school education sector like primary, high, secondary level.

**Conclusion:**

The tool aims to measure the utilization of dictionary among the higher secondary school students and will help and serve the educational institutions to assess the students' utilization of dictionary.

**References:**

1. Guilford, J. P. (1954). *Psychometric methods* (2nd ed). NY: McGraw-Hill.
2. Krathwohl, D.R. (1993). *Methods of educational and social research: an integrated approach*. New York: Longman.
3. Levy, J. (2004). *The knowledge warriors*. 58(2), 46-51.
4. Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
5. Charles M. Mueller and Natalia D. Jacobsen (2016). A comparison of the effectiveness of EFL students' use of dictionaries and an online corpus for the enhancement of revision skills. *Recall*, 28, pp 3-21. Doi: 10.1017/S0958344015000142.
6. Shu-Li Lai, Hao-Jan Howard Chen (2013, Oct). Dictionaries vs concordancers: actual practice of the two different tools in EFL writing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning (SSCI & AHCI)*.
7. Nesi, Hilary. "Dictionary use by English language learners." *Language Teaching* 47.1 (2014): 38.
8. Hulstijn, J.H., & Atkins, B.T.S. (1998). Empirical research on dictionary use in foreign-language learning: Survey and discussion. In: B.T.S. Atkins (Ed.), *Using L2 dictionaries: Studies of dictionary use by language learners and translators* (pp.7-19). Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer Verlag, Series Maior of Lexicographica.