

Outcome Measure	The Word Test 2 (TWT-2)
Sensitivity to Change	Unknown
Population	Paediatrics
Domain	Language and Communication
Type of Measure	Objective test
ICF-Code/s	D3
Description	<p>The <u>Word Test 2 Elementary</u> (Bowers et al., 2005) assesses a child's ability to recognize and express semantic attributes critical to vocabulary growth and language competency. Knowledge of a child's strengths and weaknesses in semantic organization helps you understand how the child attaches meaning to words and why she struggles in the classroom. The six subtests measure skills that correlate with word mastery and academic success. Test items are from the curriculum, including language arts, social studies, arithmetic, health, and science. There are fifteen tasks in each subtest. The subtests include: (1) Associations—choose one semantically-unrelated word from among four and explain the choice in relation to the common category of the other three words; (2) Synonyms—give a one-word synonym for each stimulus word; (3) Semantic Absurdities—identify and repair an absurd statement; (4) Antonyms—give a one-word opposite for each stimulus word; (5) Definitions—define words; (6) Flexible Word Use—give multiple meanings for words.</p> <p>Each response receives a 1 for a correct response or a 0 for an incorrect response Allowable prompts and acceptable responses are listed on the test form Correct and incorrect response examples are listed in the test manual Raw scores for each subtest and the total test can be converted to: Age Equivalents; Percentile Ranks; Standard Scores</p> <p>The <u>Word Test 2 Adolescent</u> helps you identify the semantic weaknesses that hinder academic, social, and vocational success. Test results show you why your students struggle with words and meanings of language, fail to adequately interpret new content, and use nondescriptive language. It measures a student's facility with language and word meaning using common and unique contexts. The test surveys six semantic and vocabulary skill areas reflective of curriculum vocabulary and everyday language usage. Each of the six subtests is comprised of 15 items. Subtests include: (1) Associations—choose one semantically-unrelated word from among four and explain the choice in relation to the common category of the other three words; (2) Synonyms—give a one-word synonym for each stimulus word; (3) Semantic Absurdities—identify and repair an absurd statement; (4) Antonyms—give a one-word opposite for each stimulus word; (5) Definitions—define words' (6) Flexible Word Use—give multiple meanings for words.</p> <p>A score of 1 is given for a correct word choice and a correct reason; A</p>

	<p>score of 0 is given for a correct word choice followed by an incorrect reason; A score of 0 is given for an incorrect word choice; Allowable prompts and acceptable responses are listed on the test form; Raw scores for each subtest and the total test can be converted to: Age Equivalents Percentile Ranks; Standard Scores.</p> <p>Both tests take 30 mins to administer.</p>
<p>Properties</p>	<p><i>The Word Test 2 Adolescent</i> was standardized on 1,692 subjects. Demographics reflect the national school population from the 2000 National Census for race, gender, age, and educational placement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliability—established by the use of test-retest and internal consistency methods. Reliability coefficient for the total test was highly satisfactory at .89. SEM for the total test was strong at 5.50. Internal consistency (KR20 reliability coefficients) was highly satisfactory for all tasks and the total test. • Validity—established by the use of content validity and internal consistency analyses. Contrasted groups analysis shows the test clearly discriminates subjects with typical language development from subjects with language disorders for every task and the total test at all age levels. Task intercorrelations and average correlations between the tasks and the total test ranged from .89 to .93 across all age levels. • Race/Socioeconomic Group Difference Analyses—conducted at the item and subtest levels. Differences at the item level were analyzed utilizing z-tests for racial differences. Differences at the subtest level were analyzed utilizing Chi Square Analysis and Analysis of Variance F-tests. There were no consistent differences in racial performance. <p><i>The Word Test 2 Elementary</i> was standardized on 1,940 subjects. Demographics reflect the national school population from the 2000 National Census (the most recent census data at the time of publication) for race, gender, age, and educational placement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliability—established by the use of test-retest and internal consistency methods. Reliability coefficient for the total test was .93. SEM for the total test was 3.46. Internal consistency (KR20 reliability coefficients and test-retest) was highly satisfactory for all tasks and the total test at all age levels. • Validity—established by the use of content validity and internal consistency analyses. Contrasted groups analysis shows the test clearly discriminates subjects with typical language development from subjects with language disorders. In point biserial correlations 90% of the individual items showed statistically significant average correlations with task scores. Task intercorrelations and correlations of individual tasks with the total test show the tasks assess separate language functions, but also measure a common general dimension. Overall, internal

	<p>consistency estimates are clearly satisfactory.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Race/Socioeconomic Group Difference Analyses—conducted at the item and subtest levels. Differences at the item level were analyzed utilizing z-tests for racial differences. Differences at the subtest level were analyzed utilizing Chi Square Analysis and Analysis of Variance F-tests. There were some minimal ethnic/racial differences in student performance with the most pronounced differences in the Associations, Antonyms, and Flexible Word Use tasks.
Advantages	Useful if really delving into language e.g. outcomes related to language following TBI.
Disadvantages	
Additional Information	
Reviewers	Angela Morgan Vicki Anderson Cathy Catroppa

References

- Bowers, L., Huisingsh, R., LoGiudice, C., & Orman, J. (2004). The Word Test-2: Elementary. East Moine, IL: LinguiSystems, Inc.
- Bowers, L., Huisingsh, R., LoGiudice, C., & Orman, J. (2005). The Word Test-2: Adolescent. East Moine, IL: LinguiSystems, Inc.