

()

』, 1999. 4, 79-102.

가 가
(8) (6)

/ 60 (20) , 3

(, ,) , - -
가

I.

1.

(Lerner, 1997),

가

가 가

20

가

가

(Ackerman & Dykman, 1993; Blachman, 1984; Spear-Swerling & Sternberg, 1994; Wagner & Torgesen, 1987).

가.

(phonetic level)

(Mauer & Kamhi, 1996; Wagner & Torgesen, 1987).

(Blachman, 1984; Wagner & Torgesen, 1987).

(Calfée et al., 1973;

Fox & Routh, 1976; Perfetti, 1985),

가 가 (Kamhi et al., 1988).

(Wagner & Torgesen, 1987).

가
(Garthercole et al., 1991; Mann & Liberman, 1984; Shankweiler & Crain, 1986).

·
() (Wagner & Torgesen, 1987).

(LaBerge & Samuels, 1974).

가
(Perfetti, 1985),
(Kamhi et al., 1988).

가

(Wagner & Torgesen, 1987).

3가

가
(Kamhi et al., 1988; Katz, 1986).

가

가 (Bowers & Swanson, 1991; Kamhi et al., 1988).

2.

가 가 (Bruck, 1990).

(Perfetti, 1985).

, 4

가 (Bruck, 1990; Felton & Wood, 1992).

(Felton & Wood, 1992).

가 (Ackerman & Dykman, 1993; Badian, 1996; Felton & Wood, 1992; Watson & Willows, 1995).

가

1.

3 가
(, 1994) (, ,)
가
(, 1989) 10 %ile

KEDI-WISC (, 1987) IQ 80
 (, 1992)가 15 20 .
 1
 3 10 %ile
 , 1 6 () 80 ,
 6 3
 80 가 3

< - 1 >

								F	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
		8.6	0.32	6.5	0.27	8.6	0.26	355.05***	2<1=3
IQ		95.7	7.62	119.1	9.41	118.7	10.35	42.21***	1<2=3
		87.3	7.07	119.9	9.83	118.5	13.56	29.18***	1<2=3
		94.3	11.09	114.0	13.02	114.9	12.15	18.47***	1<2=3
		1.3	0.44	1.5	0.13	3.8	0.81	136.96***	1=2<3

*** $p < .001$

2.

가.

Mauer and Kamhi (1996)가
 가 , (,
 ,), () (-
 - ,) .
 18 (ㄱ, ㄴ, ㄷ, ㄹ, ㅁ, ㅂ, ㅅ, ㅆ, ㅈ,
 ㅊ, ㅋ, ㆁ, ㆁ, ㆁ, ㆁ, ㆁ, ㆁ), 7 (ㄱ, ㄴ, ㄷ, ㄹ, ㅁ, ㅂ, ㅅ,
 ㅆ) 8 (ㅈ, ㅊ,

ㅊ, ㅌ, ㅍ, ㅑ, ㅓ, ㅕ) . 8 (, 1996),
 10 (ㅊ, ㅌ) , ‘ㅊ’ ‘ㅌ’ (1981) 6 10
 %

6 .
 1 ,
 (1972) . . (1973) (1981) 6
 75 % 3 (, ,) .

(1)

4 16 . 3
 , 4 , 4
 2 , 2 .

(2)

1 2 ,
 4 , 20 . (ㅊ ,
 ㅓ , ㅕ , ㅑ , ㅓ) (ㅓ , ㅕ , ㅑ , ㅓ) CV 1 5
 (, , , ,) (ㅑ , ㅓ , ㅕ , ㅑ , ㅓ) , (ㅊ , ㅌ ,
 ㅌ , ㅑ , ㅓ) CVC 1 5 (, , , ,) .
 (ㅑ , ㅓ , ㅕ , ㅑ , ㅓ) (ㅓ , ㅕ , ㅑ , ㅓ , ㅕ)
 CVC 1 5 (, , , ,) CVCVC 2
 5 (, , , ,) .

(3)

1 3 가
 . ,
 3 15 .

‘ , , ’ ‘ㅑ’ ‘ㅓ’
 .

가 ,
가

CVC 3 10
가 . 18 7 (ㄱ, ㅋ,
ㄴ, ㅌ, ㄷ, ㅊ), 7 (ㄹ, ㄴ, ㄷ, ㄹ, ㅁ, ㅂ, ㅇ)
(: , ,).

(rapid naming)

(1) - -
(ㄱ, ㄷ, ㅇ, ㅅ, ㅈ)
(2, 4, 6, 7, 9), (,
, , ,) A-B-C-A-B-C 50 10 5
(ㄱ), (ㄷ), (ㅇ) (ㅅ), (ㅈ)
가 .
. 2 5 가

2 6 7

(2)
5 (, , , ,) A-B-C-D-E-A-B-C-D-E 50
10 5 가 1
6 'ㄱ', 'ㅋ', 'ㅇ',
'ㄴ', 'ㄷ', 'ㄹ', 'ㅁ', 'ㅂ'

·
6 1 3 1
1 3 3
3 1
가 50 15 × 10 cm

1 3 50
Mauer and Kamhi (1996)
가 가 3

3.

1997 3 20 4 27
10 가 1 40 , 3
30 , , , ,
- - , , ,
1 , SAS
Pearson

가 , , , IQ 가 ,
 , 6가 IQ 가 ,
 IQ가, - - 가

1.

가.

(1)

< - 2> < - 3> . < - 3> ,
 (IQ,) 가
 ($F = 5.97, p < .01$).

< - 2>

	M	SD
	12.6	2.25
	14.0	1.41
	15.6	0.99

Scheffé

, < - 4> 5 % 가 .
 1 .

(2)

, 가 가
 ($F = 14.89, p < .001$). , 가
 , 3 .

< - 3>

				<i>F</i>
IQ	24.938	1	24.937	11.84**
	6.698	1	6.698	3.18
	25.171	2	12.585	5.97**
	115.880	55	2.107	
272.583		59		

** $p < .01$

< - 4>

	IQ,		
	14.11	*	*
	11.72		*
	15.92		

* $p < .05$

(3)

IQ , 가
 $(F = 13.68, p < .001).$
 , 가
 가 .
 , 가
 가 . ()
 가 ,
 . () ,
 가 3 .

.

IQ

, ($F = 9.52, p < .001$)가 , IQ

1
가

.

6> , < - 5>, < - 6> . < -
- - 가 ($F = 24.68, p < .001$).
IQ 가

2.

IQ

가 ($F = 6.27, p < .01$).

가 ,
3

($F = 16.24, p < .001$)

가 , IQ

1

3

< - 5>

	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
- -	75.9	24.43	60.1	9.30	46.1	8.07
	3.7	2.30	1.3	0.97	1.1	1.11
	62.4	12.40	62.4	15.45	48.3	9.08
	2.9	2.11	0.9	1.33	1.3	1.08

< - 6> - -

				<i>F</i>
	2042.70	1	2042.70	9.39**
	10731.25	2	5365.62	24.68***
	12176.70	56	217.44	
	23110.60	59		

** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

3.

Pearson
 가
 , < - 7> 가
 (, ,) (r = .57 .64, $p < .001$).
 가
 (r = -.60 -.68, $p < .001$).
 , 가 (r = .59, $p < .001$) 가
 (r = -.28, $p < .05$).
 ,
 , (r = -.75,

$p < .001$; $r = -.72$, $p < .001$).

($r = -.32$, $p < .05$; $r = -.34$, $p < .01$).

($r = .86$, $p < .001$).

< - 7 >

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

4.

, < - 8 >

0.1 %

64 %

< - 8 >

				R^2	F
	2292.68	6	382.11	.6435	15.94***
	1270.30	56	23.97		
	3562.98	59			

*** $p < .001$

가 57 % < - 9> , - -
 가 ,
 . 61 % .

< - 9>

()			R ²	F
- -	-.2954	.0340	.5661	75.66***
	.4035	.1517	.6140	45.33***

*** $p < .001$

가 , < - 10>
 0.1 % 69 %

< - 10>

			R ²	F
6621.60	6	1103.60	.6920	19.85***
2946.98	53	55.60		
9568.58	59			

*** $p < .001$

가
 < - 11> , 가 56 %
 , - - 가
 .
 64 % .

		()	R ²	F	
		1.656	.191	.564	75.13***
-	-	-.246	.070	.642	51.14***

*** $p < .001$

1.

1 , IQ
, 1
가
IQ IQ
가 (Ackerman & Dykman,
1993; Mauer & Kamhi, 1996; Watson & Willows, 1995). 1

, 가 가
,
,
(Blachmam, 1984; Calfee et al., 1973; Fox &
Routh, 1975)

IQ

3

1

3

1 3

Ackerman and

Dykman (1993), 2

2

Mauer and Kamhi (1996)

가

(,) ()

(Ackerman, & Dykman, 1993; Badian, 1996; Blachman, 1984; Bowers & Swanson, 1991; Katz, 1986; Watson & Willows, 1995).

가

가

, 1

가 ,

Mauer and Kamhi (1996)

Wagner and Torgesen (1987)

가

6

Badian (1996)

2.

Bruck (1992)

Snowling et al. (1996) ,

가

가

. Snowling et al. (1996)

,

50 7 (14 %) 1

가 , 3

1

3

, Bruck (1990)

-

,

1 ,

(Ackerman & Dykman, 1993; Badian, 1996; Felton & Wood, 1992; Snowling et al., 1996; Watson & Willows, 1995)

, 가 Snowling et al. (1996) , Ackerman and Dykman (1993), Badian (1996), Felton and Wood (1992), Watson and Willows (1995)

(Rosner & Simon, 1971; Treiman & Hirsh-Pasek, 1985)

,

(: , , , , ,)

, () 가

(Pennington et al., 1987; Szeszulski & Mannis, 1987)

3.

(
)
.64
.56
.43 .59 , - - -48, -.28
가 .86
가 가 , , , , , 가 ,
, - - , , , , 가
, () (,) 가
가 가 (53 .75),
가

(-.32 -.75),

(,) 가

, ()

Balchman(1984)

1

.42 .56

1 .49

Balchman (1984)

가

4.

64 %,

69 %

가

가

가

가

가

가

가

(

)

가

가

가

가

가

(1981). 『*Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 16(1), 1-10.』

(1994). 『*Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 29(1), 102-112.』

(1989). 『*Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 24(1), 1-10.』

(1989). 『KEDI-WISC』. 『*Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 24(1), 1-10.』

(1992). 『*Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 27(3), 195-219.』

(1996). 『*Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 31(3), 195-219.』

(1972). 『*Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 7(3), 195-219.』

(1973). 『*Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 8(2), 1-10.』

- Ackerman, P. T. & Dykman, R. A. (1993). Phonological processes, confrontational naming, and immediate memory in dyslexia. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 26, 597-609.
- Badian, N. A. (1996). Dyslexia: a validation of the concept at two age levels. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 29(1), 102-112
- Blachman, B. A. (1984). Relationship of rapid naming ability and language analysis skills to kindergarten and first-grade reading achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(4), 610-622.
- Bowers, P. G. & Swanson, L. B. (1991). Naming speed deficits in reading disability: multiple measures of a singular process. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 51, 195-219.
- Bruck, M. (1990). Word-recognition skills of adults with childhood diagnosis of dyslexia. *Developmental Psychology*, 26(3), 439-454.
- _____ (1992). Persistence of dyslexics' phonological awareness deficits. *Developmental Psychology*, 28(5), 874-886.
- Calfee, R. C., Lindamood, P. & Lindamood, C. (1973). Acoustic-phonetic skills and reading- kindergarten through 12th grade. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 64(3), 293-298.
- Felton, R. H. & Wood, F. B. (1992). A reading level match study of nonword reading skills in poor readers with varying IQ. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 25(5), 318-326.
- Fox, B. & Routh, D. K. (1976). Phonemic analysis and syntheses as word-attack skills. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 68(1), 70-74.

- Gathercole, S. E., Willis, C. & Baddeley, A. D. (1991). Differentiating phonological memory and awareness of rhyme: reading and vocabulary development in children. *British Journal of Psychology*, 82, 387-406.
- Kamhi, A. G., Catts, H. W., Mauer, D., Apel, K. & Gentry, B. F. (1988). Phonological and spatial processing abilities in language and reading impaired children. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 53, 316-327.
- Katz, R. B. (1986). Phonological deficiencies in children with reading disability: evidence from an object-naming task. *Cognition*, 22, 225-257.
- La Berge, D. & Samuels, S. J. (1974). Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading. *Cognitive Psychology*, 6, 293-323.
- Lerner, J. W. (1997). *Learning disabilities: Theories, diagnosis, and teaching strategies* (7th Ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Mann, V. A. & Liberman, I. Y. (1984). Phonological awareness and verbal short-term memory. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 17(10), 592-599.
- Mauer, D. M. & Kamhi, A. G. (1996). Factors that influence phoneme grapheme correspondence learning. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 29(3), 259-270.
- Pennington, B. F., Lefly, D. L., Van Orden, G. C., Bookman, M. O. & Smith, S. D. (1987). Is phonology bypassed in normal or dyslexic development? *Annals of Dyslexia*, 37, 62-89.
- Perfetti, C. A. (1985). *Reading ability*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rosner, J. & Simon, D. (1971). The auditory analysis test: an initial report. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 4, 40-48.
- Shankweiler, D. & Crain, S. (1986). Language mechanisms and reading disorder: A modular approach. *Cognition*, 24, 139-168.
- Snowling, M. J., Defty, N. & Goulandris, N. G. (1996). A Longitudinal study of reading development in dyslexic children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 88(4), 653-669.
- Spear-Swerling, L. & Sternberg, R. J. (1994). The road not taken: an integrative theoretical model of reading disability. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 27(2), 91-103.
- Szeszulski, P. A. & Mannis, F. R. (1987). A comparison of word recognition processes in dyslexic and normal readers at two reading-age levels. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 44, 364-376.
- Treiman, R. & Hirsh-Pasek, K. (1985). Are there qualitative differences in reading behavior between dyslexic and normal readers? *Memory and Cognition*, 13, 357-364.
- Wagner, R. K. & Torgesen, J. K. (1987). The nature of phonological processing and its causal role in the acquisition of reading skills. *Psychological Bulletin*, 101(2), 192-212.

Watson, C. & Willows, D. M. (1995). Information-processing patterns in specific reading disability.
Journal of Learning Disabilities, 28(4), 216-231.

ABSTRACT

A Comparison Study of Phonological Processing and Word Recognition in Reading Disabled, Reading Level Matched and Age Matched Children

Hye Sook Lee (Erooda Child Development Institute)

Hyun Sook Park*(Ewha Womans University)

The purposes of the present study are to identify whether there are differences among three groups (reading disabled, reading level matched, and age matched children) in the abilities of phonological processing and reading real and nonsense words, and whether specific reading disabilities are related to the deficit in those abilities. This information could be utilized for assessing specific reading disabilities and for planning educational programs for them. For these purposes, 20 third-grade students with reading disabilities were matched to 20 normal 6-year-old first-graders on word recognition skills and 20 normal third-graders on chronological age. Phonological processing abilities were measured by testing phonological awareness (syllable deletion, phoneme deletion, & sound categorization), phonetic recoding, and phonological recoding (rapid letter-number-color naming & rapid object naming) tasks, and word recognition skills by both real and nonsense words. The collected data were analyzed by the ANCOVA with IQ and age as covariates, Pearson's simple product-moment correlation coefficient, and stepwise multiple regression analysis using the SAS software package. The results indicated that children with reading disabilities were significantly more impaired than age matched normal readers on all measures except for the rapid object naming and than reading level matched younger readers on phoneme deletion, sound categorizations, and phonetic recoding

*e-mail: hspark@mm.ewha.ac.kr

measures. However, the students with reading disabilities performed significantly better than reading level match younger readers on syllable deletion, phonological recoding, and word recognition tasks. There were no significant differences among groups on rapid object naming skill. A significantly high correlation appeared to exist between word recognition and phonological processing. Phonological processing abilities could predict 64 % of real word reading skill and 69 % of nonsense word decoding skill. Among the phonological processing subskill factors, phoneme deletion and letter-number-color naming were identified as major significant predictors, yielding 61 % for real word read recognition and 64 % for nonsense word decoding.