

## **Self-assessment of word knowledge with graded readers: A preliminary study**

Udorn Wan-a-rom  
Mahasarakham University  
Thailand

### **Abstract**

The study investigated how second language (L2) learners self-assessed word knowledge on a page of text taken from a graded reader. The case study subjects were five Thai high school learners of English. They were asked to assess their word knowledge using a page of continuous text. Data gained through observation, interviews, self-assessment and a translation test showed that such self-assessment of word knowledge resulted in learners using various reading techniques from simple translation to more complicated guessing from context. The results provide some insight into how self-assessment of word knowledge with graded readers is carried out and provides evidence to support the value of self-assessment as an easy procedure to direct learners to an appropriate reading level as suggested by the scholars in the field (Bamford & Day, 2004; Day & Bamford, 1998; Waring, 1997). Suggestions for pedagogical practice are given.

**Keywords:** self-assessment, graded readers, text-based self-assessment, lexical knowledge, extensive reading

### **Introduction**

For several decades second language learners have had access to graded readers which allow them to read at a level which matches their proficiency level. In graded reading schemes, the number of vocabulary headwords and various grammatical features are controlled at each level of a series. The controlled grading is believed to assist learners in managing their reading successfully. Thus an important issue in graded reading is ensuring that learners' vocabulary size to some degree matches the vocabulary level of the text they intend to read. One way which has been suggested for checking this is to get learners to find the unknown words on a page of a graded reader at a certain level (Bamford & Day, 2004; Day & Bamford, 1998; Waring, 1997). However, although using a graded reader text and self-assessment seems a feasible method, whether learners are able to make a meaningful assessment needs to be proven, since varying results from studies on self-assessment have made both teachers and researchers skeptical about implementing self-assessment of second language ability (Bachman, 2000; Boud, 1995; Brantmeier, 2006; Oscarson, 1989; Tan, 2002).

In ESL/EFL language learning, self-assessment is considered one of the more practical tools in assessing learners' language learning. Blanche (1988) provides a picture of the outcomes of learners' self-assessment of foreign language skills by examining eighteen pieces of research conducted during the 1980s. Most self-assessment relied on questionnaires, and it was found that the accuracy of most learners' self-estimates varied, depending on their linguistic skills and the materials involved in the evaluations. Blanche also proposes that the cultural background of the learners could be another problem.

This was confirmed in a study by Laufer and Yano (2001). They used self-rating to investigate how accurately learners can assess their understanding of words. The subjects were 106 university students of English in China, Israel, and Japan. Two tools were prepared: self-assessment and translation. Learners were asked to read the text and state their degree of understanding of twenty target words in a text by rating their understanding on a scale: (1) *do not understand*; (2) *approximately understand*; and (3) *fully understand* the target words. Learners then translated or explained the target words. After that, they self-assessed their understanding of the target words again. Scores gained from the three tasks were compared.

Laufer and Yano found that learners over-estimated their understanding of words, with the amount of overestimation strongly related to the country they come from. Israeli learners gave the largest mismatch between self-perceived and real lexical understanding. The Japanese learners also over-estimated their understanding, although they exhibited the lowest mismatch between perceived and objective lexical understanding. Learners' over-estimates were also found in research by Barrow et al. (1999) who employed a self-checking survey with Japanese learners in determining vocabulary familiarity.

It is clear that the issues of reliability and validity remain a primary concern for self-assessment and many studies have focused on how to improve self-assessment as a valid and reliable supplement to traditional second language assessment. Ross (1998) after analyzing the validity of a self-assessment instrument with 236 *just-instructed* English as foreign language learners argues that differential validities for self-assessment depend on the extent of learners' experience with the language skill self-assessed. Horst (2000) investigated adult learners' self-ratings and found that the participants were able to provide accurate translation equivalents of about 80% of the words they rated *known*. Horst argues that self-assessment of this kind is a reasonably reliable indicator of word knowledge. Although there remain serious concerns about learners' objectivity and capacity to view their achievements, the use of self-assessment for the purpose of the performance-oriented self-assessment has various advantages (LeBlanc & Painchaud, 1985; Strong-Klaue, 2000). For example, a number of empirical studies indicate the presence of increased productivity and autonomy, higher motivation, less frustration, and higher retention rates among learners when self-assessment is utilized (Dickinson, 1987; Ellis, 1994; Gardner & McIntyre, 1991; McNamara & Deane, 1995; O'Malley & Pierce, 1996; Oscarson, 1989; Peirce, Swain & Hart, 1993; Rivers, 2001). Despite the unresolved reliability and validity issues, the use of learners' self-assessment is becoming increasingly common in teaching, learning and assessment activities (Tan, 2002).

There are however difficulties in providing a comprehensive definition of self-assessment

(Bachman, 2000; Haughton & Dickinson, 1988; Oscarson, 1989). According to Boud (1995, p. 12), the defining characteristic of self-assessment is “the involvement of students in identifying standards and/or criteria to apply to their work and making judgments about the extent to which they have met these criteria and standards.” From this definition, it can be seen that the underlying concept of self-assessment reflects the two elements of any assessment process: (1) the identification of standards with specific criteria related to these; and (2) the making of judgments based on the criteria.

To investigate learners’ self-assessment, this study worked within a narrow focus, dealing with lexical knowledge in a particular text—a graded reader—to investigate how self-assessment was performed by learners and to see whether it could be a feasible procedure for determining the unknown words in a graded reading text and thus the suitability of the text for graded reading.

In doing so, the study attempted to draw upon the suggestions given in previous studies. The study employed the concept of learners as active participants in evaluation matters and involved a form of self-report or self-assessment which can assess foreign language skills and can be perceived as an internal or self-directed activity. In the study, a graded reading text was chosen since it was specially designed with very careful control of grammar, vocabulary and supportive coverage<sup>1</sup> which are believed to help learners move through various difficulty levels by reading meaningful, enjoyable and engaging material as if they were reading in their first language (Susser & Robb, 1990; Hill, 2001; Waring, 1997). Thus the materials used in the self-assessment were ones which were likely to be close to the learners’ proficiency level.

## Method

The study involved learners using self-assessment with graded readers to answer the research question: How do L2 learners self-assess word knowledge in a graded reading text? Materials used in the study were a 308 word text taken from a Level 4 Oxford Bookworms graded reader called *Silas Marner* (see Appendix A) and a translation test (see Appendix C). The learners read the text and did text-based self-assessment of vocabulary in the text. To make sure that the materials used with the learners were appropriate in terms of practicality, a trial of the reading text and a translation test was carried out with 96 learners with the same educational level as the learners in the main study. These learners were selected to represent learners at Mattayomsuksa 5 (Grade 11) in Thailand.

### *Preparation of the Text and the Test*

A good text for successful reading must be the one which provides suitable conditions for comprehension and for guessing some unknown words from context (Liu & Nation, 1985; Laufer & Sim, 1985; Hu & Nation, 2000). This requires 95% (Laufer, 1992) and preferably 98% (Hu & Nation, 2000) coverage of the running words in the text.

First the chosen section of the Level 4 Oxford Bookworms text, *Silas Marner*, was analyzed to look at the words in previous levels (Levels 1-3), the current vocabulary (Level 4), and the words at higher levels including the off-list words (Levels 5-6 and words not in any of the lists). This

was done by using the RANGE program<sup>2</sup> with baseword lists made from the Oxford Bookworms list. The words at levels 1 to 3 including proper nouns gave 97.85% coverage of the 308 word long text. The 94 content word families in the text were used in a checklist test which had three options to choose from YES, NS (not sure) and NO. Here is part of the checklist test.

1. AFRAID	YES	NS	NO
2. BAG	YES	NS	NO
3. BOY	YES	NS	NO
4. COME	YES	NS	NO
5. COULD	YES	NS	NO

*Note.* The instructions for the checklist test and a few of the 94 items are in Appendix B.

YES and NO were expected to yield a precise answer while NS could be an option that would help learners avoid overestimating their vocabulary knowledge if they were not sure about the word. Learners were asked to assess their lexical knowledge by choosing one of the three options. If they knew or understood the word, they would choose YES. If they neither knew nor understood it, they could choose NO. If they felt like they knew or understood it, but they were not sure, they would be able to choose NS.

The checklist test was administered to 96 learners in the trial stage to get them to estimate their knowledge of the 94 content words. The words receiving the answers NS and NO were chosen to go into the translation test. These consisted of 23 words including 6 words from Levels 1-3, and 17 words from Levels 4-6 and not in any of the lists. The checklist test was not used in the main study with the five learners.

The same 96 learners were asked whether the length of a reading text was appropriate. Most of them agreed that the length of text used for reading was not long and was suitable for reading at one sitting.

The results of the trial provided a useful basis for preparing the materials used in the main study, that is, a 308-word-reading text and a 23-item-translation test.

### *Subjects*

Five Thai learners of English, all 18 years of age, consisting of three female and two male learners, agreed to participate in the study. All the target learners were studying at the same educational level—Matthayomsuksa 5 (Grade 11) and had been studying English as a compulsory course in school for 11 years. They had been taught English through the grammar-translation method. On the basis of the grading system in Thai high schools which ranges from A to E, the five learners were chosen by the grade they earned in the previous English course and were considered to be good representatives of Thai learners of English of different language proficiency levels. It was considered that different levels of language proficiency would affect how self-assessment was done (Boud, 1995). The data on the five learners in the study is given in Table 1.

Table 1. *Data on the five learners*

Learners	Age (year)	Education level	Years spent studying English	Grade earned in the English course in last semester
S1	18	Mattayomsuksa 5	11	A
S2	18	Mattayomsuksa 5	11	B
S3	18	Mattayomsuksa 5	11	D
S4	18	Mattayomsuksa 5	11	A
S5	18	Mattayomsuksa 5	11	C

### *Identifying the Unknown Words*

Each of the five learners was asked to read the text to understand it and identify the unknown words. There was no time limit because each learner was required to complete the task.

*Observation* was used to see how the learners performed self-assessment with the text and how they completed the task. The researcher took notes while the learners engaged in the task. This provided the researcher with some useful data to form specific questions for an interview after the self-assessment task.

*An interview* was employed after each learner had finished the self-assessment of word knowledge in order to gain more understanding of how they did the self-assessment with the text. This encouraged the learners to recall what they did with the text and to comment on problems they encountered while reading. The interview was conducted in Thai.

*A translation test* was used to check the accuracy of the self-assessment task each learner performed. It consisted of 23 content words.

### *Procedure*

- *Stage one – Text-based self-assessment*

Each learner did the self-assessment at a different time. Each learner was asked to read the text and underline the unknown words. Before each learner started doing the task, the instructions and an explanation of the task were given. The time was recorded. While the learner was doing the task, the experimenter observed the learners to obtain more information about how each learner self-assessed word meaning in the text. After the learner finished doing the task, an interview was conducted in Thai to obtain more information about how they worked on the text when asked to look for the unknown words and what they thought about the completed task. The learners were also asked to give an oral translation of the words they claimed they knew initially. The conversation was recorded and then transcribed into English. The following questions were used in the interview:

1. Tell me how you looked for the words you did not understand in the text.
2. Did you read the text or just scan through the text?
3. How did you find the words you thought you did not understand?
4. Have you read a story like this in Thai before?

5. Could you tell me what you understood in the text?
6. Did you make use of the words or sentences around to help you better understand the unknown words? If yes, how?
7. Was there any word you were not sure about and you did not choose to be one of your unknown words?
8. How accurate do you think your assessment is?

- *Stage two – Translation test*

After the interview, each learner was asked to do the 23-word-translation test (Appendix C). Each learner was told to translate the words into Thai. The results of the translation test were compared with the self-assessment and used to check learners' accuracy in self-assessment.

### *Data Analysis*

There were two sets of data for each learner. The data gained from observations and interviews were presented in the form of descriptive analysis while the data obtained from the self-assessment task and translation were compared and analyzed using simple statistics. The researcher himself, a native speaker of Thai, checked the translation against the meaning given in a bilingual dictionary when ambiguity of the Thai translation occurred. When the translation was precise or approximate (i.e., contained some of the semantic features, but not all), it was accepted as a correct answer. It was marked as an incorrect answer when no translation was given, or when the translation was totally incorrect. Percentage scores were employed to present the results.

### *Observational Data*

Self-assessment in the study is viewed as performance-orientated assessment. Whether self-assessment accurately samples the learners' language ability depends on how learners perform the required self-assessment task. To study the nature of self-assessment, the data gained from observations of the five Thai learners' responses and transcripts of interviews with them were analyzed in order to provide detailed explanations of self-assessment.

The following are excerpts from the notes of the observations, detailing how individual learners performed the self-assessment task.

He read along the line and used his pen to point to each word while reading. He moved the pen backward and forward along the line. Sometimes he nodded. He checked the words he underlined by pointing his pen to the words and counted them before he said he was done. (Learner 1)

She nodded when she paused as if she made her decision. She read until the end of the text and then went back to the beginning. She reread it and underlined the words. (Learner 2)

He paused sometimes and moved his lips while pointing a pen at the word and pronouncing it softly. He slowly read and underlined the words until the end of the text and went back to the beginning again. (Learner 3)

She looked back to the sentences she finished before underlining the words. She often paused and also looked up and down the text as if she tried to skip through the sentences to check the words before handing in the task. (Learner 4)

She started at the beginning of the text again and underlined the words. She sometimes paused, keeping still as if she thought about the word. (Learner 5)

The observational data of individual learners showed that they tried hard to succeed in locating the unknown words as well as in gaining an understanding of the text. As noted, Learner 1 used the pen to point at the words in the sentences and moved the pen along the lines, whereas Learner 2 looked, nodded, and paused while reading. In a similar manner, Learner 3 pointed to the word and softly pronounced it. For Learners 4 and 5, they performed the task by reading through the text and pausing when finding the words which were likely to be unknown to them. It was clear all five learners took the task seriously and gave a great deal of deliberate and thoughtful effort to the task.

### *Interview Data*

The actions in relation to self-assessment of word meaning with graded readers need to be interpreted with caution and thus interviews would help sort them out. Initially, it could be assumed that most of the learners actually read the text while looking for the words they did not understand. What was observed partly solved the question of whether learners read the text or just scanned for the words when asked to read and assess their word knowledge on a page.

Nonetheless, those actions may be misinterpreted without information from the learners' recall of what they did and why they behaved like that. To this end, interview transcripts are a source of in-depth data which can contribute detailed explanations of how the five learners responded to the task and why they did that when locating the unknown words in the text. Before being translated, the interview transcripts were given to the five learners for their review and none of them asked to make any changes in the transcripts. The interview transcripts were re-read and coded within the context of the original research question for analysis. The main interview themes included (1) how L2 learners self-assessed word knowledge, (2) prior knowledge/guessing from context and reading comprehension, and (3) precision of learners' self-assessment.

According to the observational data, for most learners, various observed actions seemed to help them understand both words and sentences. When the five learners were asked in the interview to explain about their observable reading performances such as pausing, nodding, moving their lips, pointing to the words and re-reading, they explained that they thought it was an easy and simple technique to encourage them to concentrate on what they were reading and looking for. As for the learner who moved his lips while reading the text, he gave the reason that pronouncing the words was a helpful way to understand words and sentences better since this aided him in recognizing word meaning which helped gain an overall understanding of the sentence where it was located. Through observable actions explained by individual learners, it could be said that individual learners read the text seriously and deliberately looked for the unknown words. The following excerpts are from the interview transcripts.

I read through the text and tried to understand what the text was saying. I also used my sense to identify the meaning of the words so as to gain an understanding of both words and sentences. (Learner 1)

I read the text and tried to find the words I have never seen before. There were words I have seen or known, but when reading the text, the meaning could not fit the sentences. However, translating every word sometimes helped me to understand what the word meant in the sentence. (Learner 2)

First I tried to translate each word as I read it carefully. If I did not understand it, I guessed the meaning. Yes, sometimes I pronounced the words. Pronouncing the word could help me. (Learner 3)

I read the words in the sentences—almost every word to make sure that I could understand it. I looked at every word and sometimes I had to look back and forth in order to gain more understanding of the sentences. (Learner 4)

At first I read to make sure that I found the words which were hard to understand. Then I came back to see the sentences and re-read them to make sure that I really did not understand the words. (Learner 5)

When asked, no learners reported having read the text before.

Data from the interviews revealed that individual learners attempted to apply their own reading strategies to attain an understanding of the words and text when engaging in locating the unknown words. These strategies included translating the words and guessing word meaning from context.

...when I met the words I had never seen before I used the sentences around to help guess the meaning for an understanding...(Learner 1)

...I looked at the sentences or words around. It might help. If not, I had to come to my decision that the word was unknown or really difficult for me...(Learner 4)

...I did [guessed] if I understood the sentences around...(Learner 5)

The interview excerpts clearly showed that learners made use of guessing from context when encountering difficult words. However, for some learners, the easiest way to gain the best understanding of the word and text was translation as we can see in the following interview excerpts.

...I tried to understand and translate the sentences in Thai for a better understanding of the text...(Learner 1)

...I tried to translate each word as I read it carefully...I translated most of the words. I did

not understand many words...(Learner 3)

...I tried to understand the sentences as well. I thought if I could not translate the word, I would not understand it and the sentences...(Learner 5)

The data gained from interviews with the five learners in the study provided useful answers to the question whether learners, when asked to self-assess their word knowledge, carefully read the text or just skip it or even scan for the words. In retrospect, the five learners gave similar detailed explanations when asked to describe how they looked for the words unfamiliar to them in the text. It was evident that individual learners tried to not only understand the words but also gain more understanding of the sentences and text while distinguishing between the words they were unable to understand and the words they had just gained knowledge of from context.

Careful reading began in association with word checking through translation. Guessing from context was employed when learners lacked previous lexical knowledge of the unfamiliar word but could translate and understand the surrounding words and sentences. Thus, how learners self-assessed word knowledge on a graded reader page showed how well they manipulated reading techniques involving both top-down and bottom-up processing in order to obtain both a meaning and an understanding of words and sentences.

The researcher checked the learners' accuracy in judging the words they claimed they knew before they sat the translation test. In the interview with each learner, the researcher randomly chose some of the words individual learners said they understood and asked them to translate the words into Thai. Most of the learners gave acceptable translations for the chosen words. When asked to evaluate their self-assessment as a whole, the five learners were not confident about their assessment. According to the interview data, most of the learners thought that there would be about 80% accuracy in doing text-based self-assessment. Nevertheless, individual learners gave satisfactory reasons for why they could not guarantee their self-assessment. The following interview excerpts explained why they were not 100% sure about their self-assessment.

...because there were some words I was not sure about and I did not choose them. I might know the meaning that was not used in the sentence. I felt like I knew it, but I was not sure. I felt that way. It might be right or wrong. That's why I was not 100% sure about the words I did not choose...(Learner 1)

...I have got some words in the text whose meaning I was not sure about. They were likely to be known to me, but I was not sure of them and I did not choose them as the unknown words. So, I could not say I was 100% sure about the words I thought I understood. I might be right or wrong...(Learner 2)

...I don't dare to say much because there were some words I was not sure about and I did not identify them as the unknown words. Moreover, many words I thought I understood but I might be wrong. I might be mistaken. I think it is the most 80%...(Learner3)

...I don't know all the meanings of the words. I felt like I knew some meanings. What I thought I knew might be wrong. So, I don't think it could be 100%. There were many

words I was not sure of and it could be an error. I can be sure of what I said about them at some level...(Learner 4)

...There were many words I did not understand I thought. I thought I know one of the meanings and sometimes it did not fit the sentence. I felt that it could be possible when I translated it but not 100%. So, it could be right or wrong. I know it can be a mistake...(Learner 5)

Most learners acknowledged that they had problems with the words they felt they knew, but they were not sure of. They usually did not identify these as unknown words.

### *Self-assessment and the Translation Test*

Clearly, making a decision about unknown words in a text is not a simple act. The quantitative data gained from comparisons of learners' self-assessment and translation test results supports this.

Table 2. *Results of self-assessment and the outcomes of the translation test for five learners*

Participant	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5
Unknown words identified by self-assessment	3	7	8	6	7
Overlap of the unknown words and the tested words	3	7	8	6	7
Tested words left to be translated	20	16	15	17	16
Tested words receiving correct translation	18	14	12	15	13
Tested words receiving incorrect translation	2	2	3	2	3
Accuracy of self-assessment	90.00%	87.50%	80.00%	88.23%	81.25%

In Table 2, we can see Learner 1 located 3 unknown words in the text (row 2) and all of the 3 unknown words he identified were included in the words to be tested in the translation test (row 3). From the 23-item-translation test, the three words were then excluded and he translated only the 20 words remaining (row 4). He could provide acceptable translations for 18 words out of those 20 words (row 5), leaving 2 incorrectly translated (row 6). Eighteen out of 20 is an accuracy rate of 90% (row 7). The results of the other four learners' self-assessment were calculated in a similar manner.

Table 2 shows that all the five learners overestimated their vocabulary knowledge when text-based self-assessment was performed. The precision of self-assessment ranged from 80% to 90% and the average percentage was 85.39%. If teachers and researchers are prepared to accept this level of precision, self-assessment may be used as a procedure for helping the learners find the graded reading level at which unassisted reading could be done.

## Conclusion and Implications

In this study, five Thai learners were asked to assess their knowledge of the vocabulary in a short text. Each learner was given a 308-word-text and did text-based self-assessment. Observation and interviews were carried out to study how L2 learners performed the self-assessment. A translation test was also used to check the accuracy of the self-assessment.

The results of observational and interview data provided by the five learners showed that the learners as individual case studies self-assessed their vocabulary knowledge on a graded reading text seriously and systematically. Undoubtedly, this was affected by the fact that each learner did this under the careful eyes of the researcher. It was found that while self-assessment was being done, translation was an essential method to reinforce reading techniques employed for gaining better understanding of the words and sentences. Guessing from context was another helpful technique when learners already had knowledge of the surrounding words and those surrounding words could be translated. In some ways, guessing complicated the self-assessment in that it involved the ability to deal with the word in context rather than assessment of prior knowledge.

Statistical data gained from the five learners' self-assessment tasks supported the idea that self-assessment of lexical knowledge with graded readers was practicable even though there was a moderate margin of error in self-assessment with learners overestimating their word knowledge. This agrees with the studies of Horst (2000) and Laufer and Yano (2001) as well as other studies of self-assessment. Waring (1997) suggests having learners read a page in a limited time and check the unknown words when directing learners to their current level of graded readers. Schmitt suggests that learners indicate unknown words on sampled pages of graded readers to see if a text is suitable (Bamford & Day, 2004, p. 31). Day and Bamford (1998) also recommend checking the unknown words on a graded reader page as an estimate of vocabulary size for graded reading.

There are however limitations on using self-assessment with graded reader texts. As found in the interview data, partial knowledge is clearly problematic, especially where the sense the learner is familiar with differs from the sense used in the context of the text. In addition, vocabulary self-assessment in a text is clearly more than a simple vocabulary test as it includes knowledge gained from guessing from context and this needs to be remembered when the results of self-assessment are interpreted.

Some care needs to be taken when choosing a text for self-assessment. Choosing any page of a graded reader may not provide a good representation for that level since the words at the current level may not be found in some pages, as was found during the stage of text preparation for self-assessment in this study. Ideally, the teacher should check to see that some vocabulary at the current graded reader level occurs on the sampled page.

The present study involved only Thai learners of English and this limits the application of the results to other learners of English as a second or foreign language. However, the major pedagogical implication is that self-assessment of word knowledge using graded readers is a practical way to assign learners to a suitable reading level when a rough estimate of the unknown

words is allowed. In practice, given that 95%-98% coverage is desirable for graded readers (Wan-a-rom, 2008), the number of unknown words should not exceed 15 words on a 300-word page.

## Acknowledgments

I am very grateful to Professor Nation, my PhD supervisor at Victoria University of Wellington, for his thoughtful comments on an earlier version of this article. I would also like to thank the Research Unit of Maharakham University Thailand for awarding me the grant that made this study possible.

## Notes

1. This refers to the percentage of the tokens in a text or corpus covered by a particular word list. Favorable text coverage helps readers guess from context and build fluency in reading. Ninety-eight percent coverage of text is needed to gain adequate comprehension (Hu & Nation, 2000). See Schmitt and McCarthy (1997, pp. 6–19).

2. The RANGE program is a Windows based program. It compares the word forms in texts with the baseword lists accompanying the program (Nation & Heatley, 2002). The program is downloadable from <http://www.vuw.ac.nz/lals/staff/paul-nation/nation.aspx>. The original version of the RANGE program uses three word lists, called Baseword lists. These are the first and second thousand words from West's General Service List (West, 1953), and Averil Coxhead's Academic Word List (2000). This program has been used in numerous text based studies. See for example Hirsh and Nation (1992), Laufer and Nation (1995), Coxhead (2000), Nation (2006), Wan-a-rom (2008) and Webb and Rodgers (2009). The program classifies and counts the vocabulary in the input text according to the lists and identifies and counts the words outside the three lists. The baseword lists can be altered depending on requirements, and fourteen 1000 word family lists based on the British National Corpus are also available. In the present study, baseword lists were made based on the Oxford Bookworms levels.

## References

- Bachman, L. F. (2000). Learner-directed assessment in ESL. In G. Ekbatani & H. Pierson (Eds.), *Learner-directed assessment in ESL* (pp. ix-xii). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Bamford, J., & Day, R. R. (2004). *Extensive reading: Activities for teaching language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barrow, J., Nakanishi, Y., & Ishino, H. (1999). Assessing Japanese college students' vocabulary knowledge with a self-checking familiarity survey. *System*, 27, 223–247.
- Blanche, P. (1988). Self-assessment of foreign language skills: Implications for teachers and researchers. *RELC Journal*, 19(1), 75–93.
- Boud, D. J. (1995). *Enhancing learning through self-assessment*. London, Philadelphia: Kogan Page.

- Brantmeier, C. (2006). Advanced L2 learners and reading placement: Self-assessment, computer-based testing, and subsequent performance. *System*, 34(1), 15–35.
- Coxhead, A. (2000). A new academic word list. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 213–238.
- Day, R. R., & Bamford, J. (1998). *Extensive reading in the second language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dickinson, L. (1987). *Self-instruction in language learning*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gardner, R. C., & MacIntyre, P. (1991). Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13, 57–72.
- Houghton, G., & Dickinson, L. (1988). Collaborative assessment by master's candidates in a tutor based system. *Language Testing*, 5, 233–246.
- Hill, D. (2001). Graded readers. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 55(3), 300–324.
- Hirsh, D., & Nation, I. S. P. (1992). What vocabulary size is needed to read unsimplified texts for pleasure? *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 8, 689–696.
- Horst, M. (2000). *Text encounters of the frequent kind: Learning L2 vocabulary through reading*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wales, Swansea, UK.
- Hu, M., & Nation, I. S. P. (2000). Unknown vocabulary density and reading comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 13(1), 403–430.
- Laufer, B., & Sim, D. D. (1985). Measuring and explaining the reading threshold needed for English for academic purposes texts. *Foreign Language Annals*, 18, 405–411.
- Laufer, B., & Nation, I. S. P. (1995). Vocabulary size and use: Lexical richness in L2 written production. *Applied Linguistics*, 16, 307–322.
- Laufer, B., & Yano, Y. (2001). Understanding unfamiliar words in a text: Do L2 learners understand how much they don't understand? *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 13(2), 549–566.
- LeBlanc, R., & Painchaud, G. (1985). Self-assessment as a second language placement instrument. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 673–687.
- Liu, N., & Nation, I. S. P. (1985). Factors affecting guessing vocabulary in context. *RELC Journal*, 16, 33–42.
- McNamara, M., & Deane, D. (1995). Self-assessment activities toward autonomy in language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 5, 18–23.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2006). How large a vocabulary is needed for reading and listening? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 63(1), 59–82.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Pierce, L. V. (1996). *Authentic assessment for English language learners*. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Oscarson, M. (1989). Self-assessment of language proficiency: Rationale and applications. *Language Testing*, 6, 1–13.
- Peirce, B. M., Swain, M., & Hart, D. (1993). Self-assessment, French immersion, and locus of control. *Applied Linguistics*, 14, 25–42.
- Rivers, W. P. (2001). Autonomy at all costs: An ethnography of metacognitive self-assessment and self-management among experienced language learners. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85, 279–290.
- Ross, S. (1998). Self-assessment in second language testing: A meta-analysis and analysis of experiential factors. *Language Testing*, 15(1), 1–21.
- Schmitt, N., & McCarthy, M. (Eds.). (1997). *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy*.

- Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Strong-Klaus, D. (2000). Exploring the effectiveness of self-assessment strategies in ESL placement. In G. Ekbatani & H. Pierson (Eds.), *Learner-directed assessment in ESL* (pp. 49–73). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Susser, B., & Robb, T. (1990). EFL extensive reading instruction: Research and procedure. *JALT Journal*, 12(2), 161–185.
- Tan, K. (2002). *Different ways of understanding the quality of student self-assessment*. Retrieved 24 November, 2005, from [www.ecu.edu.au/conferences/herdsa/main/papers/nonref/pdf/KenvilTan.pdf](http://www.ecu.edu.au/conferences/herdsa/main/papers/nonref/pdf/KenvilTan.pdf)
- Wan-a-rom, U. (2008). Comparing the vocabulary of different graded-reading schemes. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 20(1), 43–69.
- Waring, R. (1997). Graded and extensive reading—questions and answers. *The Language Teacher*, 21(5), 9–12.
- Webb, S., & Rodgers, M. P. H. (2009). The lexical coverage of movies. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(3), 407–427.

## Appendix A

*The level 4 Oxford Bookwords text for self-assessment (from Silas Marner)*

### คำชี้แจง

ให้นักเรียนอ่านเนื้อเรื่องอย่างละเอียดแล้วหาคำศัพท์ที่นักเรียนไม่รู้หรือไม่เข้าใจโดยให้ทำเครื่องหมายกากบาท (X) ทับคำศัพท์ที่นักเรียนบ่งชี้ว่าเป็นคำศัพท์ที่นักเรียนไม่รู้หรือไม่เข้าใจควมหมาย

But where was Silas while this was happening? In the evenings he sometimes used to open his door and look out. He had some idea that his money would come back, or that someone would come with information about the thief. Tonight was New Year's Eve, and the villagers had told him to stay awake until midnight, because it would bring him good luck if he saw the beginning of the new year. So tonight he was more restless than usual. He opened his door several times during the evening, and stared out, but he saw and heard nothing in the silent, freezing night. The last time, as he was standing at the door, he had one of his Fits, and stood there completely unconscious, holding the door open. When he became conscious again, he closed the door and turned back to the Fire. But when his shortsighted eyes looked at the floor in front of the Fire, he seemed to see gold there! Gold, his own gold, taken and then brought back to him in the same strange way! His heart beat excitedly, and for a few moments he was unable to move. At last he reached out his hand to touch the gold, but instead of hard, metal coins his Fingers felt soft, warm curls. With great surprise Silas fell on his knees to look at this wonderful thing. It was a sleeping child. Was he dreaming? Could it be his little sister, who had died when he was a child himself? If it wasn't a dream, how had the child entered the cottage? But thinking of his sister made him remember the past, and his life at the Light Street chapel. He wondered if this child was some kind of message from his past, sent perhaps by the God he had once trusted.

308 words

**Appendix B***A checklist test for the survey of the unknown words*

คำสั่ง:

อ่านคำศัพท์ต่อไปนี้แล้วให้นักเรียนบอกว่า

ศัพท์คำใดที่นักเรียนรู้และเข้าใจความหมายและศัพท์คำใดที่นักเรียนไม่รู้ โดยให้ตอบดังนี้

ถ้าศัพท์คำใดที่นักเรียนรู้และเข้าใจความหมาย ให้ / ที่คำตอบ YES (YES)

ถ้าศัพท์คำใดที่นักเรียนมีความรู้สึกเหมือนจะรู้แต่ไม่แน่ใจ ให้ / ที่คำตอบ NS (NOT SURE)

ถ้าศัพท์คำใดที่นักเรียนไม่รู้หรือไม่เข้าใจความหมาย ให้ / ที่คำตอบ NO (NO)

ตัวอย่างเช่น

ข้อ 0 READ /YES NS NO

ข้อ 00 BIRD YES /NS NO

ข้อทดสอบ

1. AFRAID YES NS NO

2. BAG YES NS NO

3. BOY YES NS NO

4. COME YES NS NO

5. COULD YES NS NO

6. COUNTRY YES NS NO

7. DAY YES NS NO

**Appendix C***Translation/Explanation*

คำสั่ง

ให้ความหมายหรืออธิบายความหมายของคำต่อไปนี้เป็นภาษาไทย อ่านศัพท์ต่อไปนี้ในเนื้อเรื่องแล้ว  
ให้ความหมายตามที่เรื่องต้องการเพียงความหมายเดียวเท่านั้น

ตัวอย่าง

Word

Word understanding

0. Cat

แมว \_\_\_\_\_

00. Eat

กิน \_\_\_\_\_

WORD

WORD UNDERSTANDING

1. Foreign

\_\_\_\_\_

2. Frighten

\_\_\_\_\_

3. Century

\_\_\_\_\_

4. Terrible

\_\_\_\_\_

5. Scream

\_\_\_\_\_

6. Notice

\_\_\_\_\_

7. Believe

\_\_\_\_\_

8. Bend

\_\_\_\_\_

9. Consider \_\_\_\_\_
10. Harm \_\_\_\_\_
11. Opinion \_\_\_\_\_
12. Quite \_\_\_\_\_
13. Result \_\_\_\_\_
14. Devil \_\_\_\_\_
15. Devilish \_\_\_\_\_
16. Cottage \_\_\_\_\_
17. Important \_\_\_\_\_
18. Linen \_\_\_\_\_
19. Weavers \_\_\_\_\_
20. Loom \_\_\_\_\_
21. Shortsighted \_\_\_\_\_
22. Suspicious \_\_\_\_\_
23. Woven \_\_\_\_\_

### **About the Author**

Udorn Wan-a-rom is an assistant professor and a full-time lecturer at the Department of Western Languages and Linguistics, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Mahasarakham University, Thailand. He received his MA and PhD in applied linguistics from Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand. His main research is in second language (L2) reading, L2 pedagogy, L2 testing, and L2 vocabulary acquisition. E-mail: romud2505@yahoo.com or Udorn.w@msu.ac.th