

THEORY AND RESEARCH INTO PRACTICE

Vocabulary: Questions from the classroom

CAMILLE L.Z. BLACHOWICZ
PETER J.L. FISHER
DONNA OGLE

National-Louis University, Chicago, Illinois, USA

SUSAN WATTS-TAFFE

Educational Researcher and Consultant, Cincinnati, Ohio, USA

Both interest in and research on vocabulary knowledge and vocabulary instruction have waxed and waned over the years (Cassidy & Cassidy, 2005/2006), often in relation to other issues at the forefront of reading instruction. When instructional foci were skills based, an instrumental view of vocabulary, which focuses on the importance of learning discrete words, stimulated individual word-learning studies (Beck & McKeown, 1991). When the focus shifted to prior knowledge in reading, learning vocabulary through wide reading and context received more emphasis (Anderson, Wilson, & Fielding, 1988). Currently, interest stimulated by attention to at-risk readers and the “vocabulary gap” between groups of children that emerges in early childhood (Hart & Risley, 1995) and persists over the school years (Becker, 1977) has focused considerable concern on vocabulary development for at-risk readers (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development [NICHD], 2000).

Across this shifting landscape, two things have remained constant: the depth of the research emphasizing the importance of vocabulary to school performance, and the stability of the ways in which teachers have attempted to interpret and apply the research in their classrooms. Examinations of vocabulary instruction have revealed little change in classroom practice, or in the emphasis on vocabulary in commercial programs, over the years (Beck, McCaslin, & McKeown, 1980; Blachowicz, Watts-Taffe, & Fisher, 2006; Durkin, 1978–1979; Ryder & Graves, 1994; Scott, Jamieson-Noel, & Asselin, 2003; Walsh, 2003). The current burgeoning interest in vocabulary, coupled with documentation of less-than-robust classroom practice, has left conscientious teachers with many questions about how to design and implement effective instruction. This review of theory into practice rests on our belief that the dialogue between researchers and classroom teachers is an important and fertile one, both for instruction and for research. Therefore, we use the questions that teachers ask every day in their work to examine the theory and research on vocabulary learning and instruction. We begin by surveying the landscape of important

historical work in vocabulary. We then move to the central focus of the article, the questions that teachers have about vocabulary and vocabulary instruction and the related lessons learned from research that can be applied to practice. We conclude the article with a reflection on how we might move forward, as a community of researchers and teachers, in our understanding of vocabulary instruction.

Historical perspectives on vocabulary knowledge and instruction

One of the longest, most clearly articulated lines of research in literacy education describes the strong connection between readers' vocabulary *knowledge* and their ability to understand what they read (Davis, 1944, 1968; Terman, 1916). This relationship makes good, intuitive sense not only to a noneducator who might suggest, "You certainly will understand what you read better if you know the words!" but also to teachers and researchers who observe and study the ways in which complex, unfamiliar, or technical vocabulary makes reading difficult.

The history of research on vocabulary *instruction* is less straightforward. A topic of great interest in the early decades of educational research, it waned as a subject of investigation in the 1950s. Surveys of teaching practice (Dale, Razik, & Petty, 1973; Petty, Herold, & Stohl, 1967) suggested that vocabulary instruction through the early 1970s was little informed by prior research. In the mid-1970s, a review of reading research (Calfée & Drum, 1978) called vocabulary research a vanishing species. Indeed, the first *Handbook of Reading Research* (Pearson, Kamil, Mosenthal, & Barr, 1984) devoted only a few pages to research on vocabulary.

However, the 1970s and 1980s saw a remarkable resurgence in this area of work. In a seminal article, published in the *Harvard Educational Review*, Becker (1977) posed the notion that a major factor in the school failure of disadvantaged children was inadequate vocabulary knowledge. His argument stimulated a dialogue with formulations and counterformulations of vocabulary size and subsequent theorization about vocabulary development, its growth, and appropriate instruction. This well-documented dialogue continues as a rich debate today about the number of words students learn over the course of their school years (Cunningham & Stanovich, 1998; Nagy & Anderson, 1984; Zechmeister, Chronis, Cull, D'Anna, & Healy, 1995) and whether or not examining the generative

roots that underlie school vocabulary narrows the task to a more manageable one (Biemiller, 2004; Hiebert, 2005).

During the previous 25 years, numerous instructional investigations have taken place and rich summaries of research have been written. The second *Handbook of Reading Research* (Barr, Kamil, Mosenthal, & Pearson, 1991) contained two chapters on vocabulary, one dealing with vocabulary processes (Anderson & Nagy, 1991) and a second with vocabulary development (Beck & McKeown, 1991). These same topics were also addressed in the third *Handbook of Reading Research* (Blachowicz & Fisher, 2000; Nagy & Scott, 2000), in the *Handbook of Research on Teaching the English Language Arts* (Baumann & Kame'enui, 1991), in the revised *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (Calfée & Drum, 1986), and in other comprehensive reviews (Baker, Simmons, & Kame'enui, 1995; Graves, 1986; McKeown & Curtis, 1987; Ruddell, 1994) and meta-analyses (Mezynski, 1983; Stahl & Fairbanks, 1986). Further, several educators have surveyed this landscape of research and attempted to interpret it for practitioners in application volumes focused on instruction (Baumann & Kame'enui, 2004; Beck, McKeown, & Kucan, 2002; Blachowicz & Fisher, 2006; Dale & O'Rourke, 1976; Graves, 2006; Irvin, 1990; Johnson, 2000; Johnson & Pearson, 1984; Kamil & Hiebert, 2005; Nagy, 1988; Nation, 1990). Many articles on vocabulary have been published in instructional journals, and more than 400 dissertations with relation to vocabulary have been abstracted in *Dissertation Abstracts* (see <http://library.dialogue.com/bluesheets/html/bl0035.html>) since the 1960s. From this wealth of knowledge, often rich but sometimes confusing, we have teased out eight strands that address recurring questions from the classroom:

1. What do we know about vocabulary knowledge?
2. What do we know about good vocabulary instruction?
3. Which words should be taught?
4. Who should choose the words to be taught?
5. What approaches can bridge the early learning "vocabulary gap"?
6. What specific strategies or approaches can help English-language learners (ELLs)?
7. Can technology be used to enhance vocabulary learning?
8. What do we know about assessment and other little-researched issues?

What do we know about vocabulary knowledge?

There are several facts about the development of vocabulary knowledge that are well grounded in research:

- Vocabulary knowledge is one of the most significant predictors of reading comprehension (Davis, 1944, 1972). One of the many ways to view this connection is to regard vocabulary knowledge as a measure of general verbal ability that underlies all learning (Terman, 1916). From another perspective, the ability to make inferences is a critical component both in reading comprehension and in learning the meaning of new words (Sternberg & Powell, 1983). Both viewpoints have strong support in the research literature.
- There is a gap in vocabulary knowledge between economically disadvantaged and economically advantaged children that begins in preschool and persists through the school years and is an important correlate of poor school performance (Becker, 1977; Coyne, Simmons, & Kame'enui, 2004; Hart & Risley, 1995; Templin, 1957; White, Graves, & Slater, 1990). Given the importance of vocabulary knowledge to overall learning, word knowledge disparities among children have long been a concern of researchers (Chall, Jacobs, & Baldwin, 1990; Graves, Brunetti, & Slater, 1982; Hart & Risley). Whereas children with average or above-average verbal ability enter kindergarten with a receptive vocabulary of approximately 5,000–10,000 words, others enter school with knowledge of far fewer words, thus beginning their school careers at a disadvantage. Hart and Risley's long-term study of vocabulary development in children during the first three years of life revealed these significant differences as strongly related to parental income and welfare status. Children in economically disadvantaged households were exposed to significantly fewer words, which was related to their own vocabulary use as well as their rate of vocabulary growth during these formative years. To further emphasize the importance of early experiences with vocabulary, knowledge of vocabulary appears to be a critical correlate to the development of phonemic awareness in young children, an important emergent literacy skill (Goswami, 2001).
- Vocabulary knowledge is a critical factor in the school success of English-language learners (Carlo, August, & Snow, 2005; Folse, 2004; Nation, 2001). Research indicates that knowledge of English vocabulary is one of the strongest correlates of the discrepancy be-

tween the reading performance of native English speakers and that of ELLs. This correlation remains despite the fact that many ELLs possess a large vocabulary in their native language (Garcia, 1991; Goldenberg, Rezaei, & Fletcher, 2005; Verhoeven, 1990).

- Vocabulary knowledge also differentially affects comprehension in school reading and learning, depending on the nature of what is being read. Stories and literature are much less dependent on specific terms used by authors than informational texts used in science, social studies, and mathematics. Academic vocabularies consist of words with precise meanings that are often central to content area understanding and differ from general meanings of even the same terms, (e.g., *operation* has a very specific meaning in mathematics; Marzano, 2004). These academic terms and their specialized meanings often pose the greatest challenges for learners of English (Graves, 2006).

All of the points listed here suggest that attention to vocabulary is paramount. Yet many commercial vocabulary programs have been unsuccessful or limited in producing documented growth in word knowledge. The cost–benefit tradeoff of vocabulary programs has also been questioned, especially when programs have used considerable instructional time for what some consider a low return on the investment of time that could be used for reading or study (Nagy, 2005). On the other hand, working on their own to integrate research-based findings with their classroom practice, teachers have often constructed piecemeal approaches to instruction. Although one of the most durable findings of research is that some vocabulary instruction is usually better than no vocabulary instruction (Dale et al., 1973), teachers have begun to ask, “How can we make the most of vocabulary instruction?”

What do we know about good vocabulary instruction?

Although individual teachers may be successful in using a variety of strategies for vocabulary instruction, what is needed is a comprehensive, integrated, schoolwide approach to vocabulary in reading and learning. By *integrated*, we mean that vocabulary is a core consideration in all grades across the school and

in all subject areas across the school day. This perspective is especially important as content area teachers are faced with new vocabulary and new concepts on a daily basis. By *comprehensive*, we mean that vocabulary instruction encompasses much more than a list of words to teach at the beginning of the week. Rather, it involves a common philosophy and shared practices among teachers in a school or district based on a solid understanding of the knowledge base on vocabulary development and word learning. This shared vocabulary and understanding need to be supported by curricular considerations as well as by appropriate classroom and school organization. We believe that a consensus has emerged from research about the components of such a comprehensive and integrated program of instruction (Blachowicz, Watts-Taffe, & Fisher, 2006; Graves, 2006; Nagy, 2005). These formulations emphasize characteristics of good vocabulary instruction:

- It takes place in a language- and word-rich environment that fosters what has been referred to as “word consciousness” (see Blachowicz & Fisher, 2006; Graves, 2006).
- It includes intentional teaching of selected words, providing multiple types of information about each new word as well as opportunities for repeated exposure, use, and practice.
- It includes teaching generative elements of words and word-learning strategies in ways that give students the ability to learn new words independently.

In the following sections, we address each of these characteristics of strong vocabulary instruction in turn.

Creating language- and word-rich environments

A language- and word-rich environment is one in which children’s opportunities to read, hear, use, and talk about new vocabulary are many and varied. Naturally, these environments contain books and other reading materials, both narrative and expository, on a variety of topics appropriate for a variety of reading levels. Read-alouds contain rich vocabulary, and the teacher spends time discussing with students the words encountered in these selections. Teachers make a point of reinforcing new vocabulary in discussions with students and design instruction to promote students’ use of new vocabulary as they speak

and write. Teachers also model the use of new and sophisticated words and, along with their students, create a classroom environment filled with curiosity and excitement about new words and opportunities to have fun with words. These elements of a language- and word-rich environment promote both incidental and intentional word learning and, importantly, motivate students to develop new word knowledge on their own.

Incidental word learning, through listening or reading, is important to students’ general vocabulary development. Although the extent and nature of this learning are debated, the fact that it occurs is undisputed, and the importance of a word-rich environment has been often demonstrated. Reading to children has been shown to have an effect not only on their recognition knowledge of new words but also on their ability to use these words in their own retellings (Elley, 1988; Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998). Studies of students learning vocabulary from listening to storybook reading (Brett, Rothlein, & Hurley, 1996; Eller, Pappas, & Brown, 1988; Elley, Sénéchal, & Cornell, 1993; Stahl, Richek, & Vandevier, 1991), studies of family literacy (Beals & De Temple, 1993; Snow, 1991), studies of wide, independent reading (Jenkins, Stein, & Wysocki, 1984; Krashen, 1989), and more focused studies of incidental word learning from context (Nagy, Herman, & Anderson, 1985; Parry, 1991; Shu, Anderson, & Zhang, 1995) all support the importance of exposing students to rich language environments.

Wide reading is a hallmark of word learning, with many studies suggesting that word learning occurs normally and incidentally during normal reading (Herman, Anderson, Pearson, & Nagy, 1987; Nagy et al., 1985). Much controversy has surrounded the conclusion of the National Reading Panel (NICHD, 2000) that there is no research base to support wide reading. Cunningham (2005) addressed this issue compellingly when she argued that the differential volume of reading students do out of school is a powerful source of vocabulary learning. In her summary of a series of studies investigating the importance of encounters with words in written language carried out by Cunningham and Stanovich (1998), the volume of reading was found to be a powerful predictor of differences in both vocabulary and subject knowledge.

Scott (2005) and others (Blachowicz & Fisher, 2006; Graves, 2006) have defined *word consciousness* as an awareness of words and their meanings, an awareness of the ways in which meanings change and grow, and an interest in and motivation to develop new word knowledge, all of which support

both incidental and intentional word learning. Research studies in diverse contexts, and with learners of varying ages, all confirm that environments where language and word use are celebrated and noted encourage the development of word consciousness and attendant vocabulary learning.

Scott and her colleagues conducted a series of studies (Scott, Asselin, Henry, & Butler, 1997; Scott & Butler, 1994a, 1994b; Scott, Butler, Asselin, & Henry, 1996) examining the word learning of students in word-rich intermediate-grade classrooms. Special attention was given to encouraging interest in and the learning of new words, wordplay, playful word practice, and other techniques for motivating interest in vocabulary and word learning. Qualitative data overwhelmingly supported the effectiveness of such rich environments on students' use of interesting words in their writing and on students' awareness of, interest in, and attitude toward words. Lubliner and Smetana (2005) also investigated the effect of comprehensive metacognitive vocabulary instruction with fifth-grade Title I (federally funded U.S. program for disadvantaged learners) students and found a positive effect on vocabulary learning and reading comprehension. Further, discussion, both in the classroom (Stahl & Vancil, 1986) and around the dinner table (Snow, 1991), is another correlate of incidental word learning. Finally, in their study of 30 exemplary fourth-grade teachers across five states, Allington and Johnston (2002) found that these exceptional teachers treated language itself as a curriculum material, devoting attention to acquiring word meaning and interest in words.

Just as teachers use the phrase *flood of books* to talk about situations where students have many and varied opportunities to read, *flood of words* appears to be an important concept for general vocabulary development (Scott et al., 1997). Cumulatively, there is strong research evidence that students benefit from word-rich classrooms in which time is taken to stop and discuss new words and in which words, dictionaries, puzzles and word games, word calendars, books on riddles and rhymes, and, of course, a wide assortment of books form the environment for enthusiastic word learning (Blachowicz & Fisher, 2004).

Intentional teaching of selected vocabulary

Reviews of research investigating strategies for teaching individual words are many and varied (see, e.g., Baumann & Kame'enui, 1991; Beck & McKeown, 1991; Blachowicz & Fisher, 2000). These reviews clearly suggest that there is no single mode of

instruction that is uniformly effective. Because the context for learning even one new word meaning varies greatly depending upon factors such as the amount and type of prior knowledge students bring to the word-learning task, the depth of word knowledge needed for students to meet the goals for instruction, and the complexity of the word itself, effective vocabulary instruction requires a repertoire of teaching activities and instructional strategies coupled with the teacher's ability to choose appropriately within this repertoire. Fortunately, there are certain characteristics of effective instruction that are applicable across teaching contexts, as described in what follows.

- Learners are actively involved in the generation of word meanings rather than as passive receptors of information. This includes the integration of their prior knowledge with new information as well as building semantically related categories of words and concepts (Bransford, Brown, & Corking, 1999).
- Instruction provides both definitional and contextual information about the words to be learned as well as multiple exposures and opportunities to use them.

Active engagement and semantic relatedness

Active student engagement in learning is a hallmark of good instruction and a characteristic of competent readers (Bransford et al., 1999; Pearson & Fielding, 1991; Wittrock, Marks, & Doctorow, 1975). We see this active engagement as being important in relation to two aspects of vocabulary instruction: Active engagement plays an important role in learning the meanings of specific words—where it is important to make connections between and among words and concepts—and in learning strategies to become independent word learners. The major focus of studies in the first area is on techniques that encourage students to see how the words and concepts being studied are conceptually related, what we refer to as an emphasis on semantic relatedness.

Both semantic mapping and semantic feature analysis illustrate semantic relations among words. In semantic mapping, the relations among words are shown graphically, for example, in a clustered map of synonyms for a central concept. Where semantic mapping requires students to identify and to understand the relations between words, semantic feature analysis provides a graphic display that focuses on the features that distinguish words in a particular category from one another, such as various types of homes. Research from the 1980s (Pittelman, Levin,

& Johnson, 1985; Schewel, 1989) is conclusive on the benefit of semantic mapping and semantic feature analysis for vocabulary learning and has been supported by later research in a variety of classroom settings (Englert & Mariage, 1991; Finesilver, 1994).

Another form of instruction highlighting the relations among words and their meanings is the Concept of Definition map (Schwartz & Raphael, 1985) in which hierarchical, categorical, and semantic information related to a word's definition are displayed along with examples and nonexamples. MacKinnon (1993), working with ninth-grade students, found a Concept of Definition mapping approach to be superior to other methods of instruction stressing learning from definitions. Bos and Anders (1989, 1990, 1992) compared the effectiveness of three semantic relatedness techniques (mapping, semantic feature analysis, and semantic/syntactic feature analysis) with studying definitions among students of various ages and abilities. All three interactive techniques were more effective for these students than studying definitions.

Some studies that focused on presenting words for instruction in related groups as opposed to presenting them in alphabetical or random lists provided evidence that it is not just the relatedness of the words that is important but activities requiring students to verbalize the relations (Stahl, Burdge, Machuga, & Stecyk, 1992). Drum and Madison (1985) found mixed results when teachers of third- and fourth-grade students grouped words for presentation in semantically related sets but chose their own method of instruction using these sets. However, Durso and Coggins (1991) found that although a semantic organization of words for vocabulary instruction improved performance on comprehension tasks over use of an unorganized list, students' expressive vocabulary benefited only when they articulated the common theme linking the words; that is, they became more active in their learning. Overall, then, the available research in this area suggests that having students make semantic connections among words, and verbalizing or explaining those connections, supports learning the meanings of the targeted words.

Providing multiple sources of information, exposures, and practice

Numerous studies comparing instruction that provides students with definitional information with incidental learning from context or with no instruction control conditions support the notion that providing definitional information results in greater

learning (Kame'enui, Carnine, & Freschi, 1982; Pany & Jenkins, 1978; Stahl, 1983). However, instruction that combines definitional information with other active processing, such as adding contextual information (Stahl), writing (Duin & Graves, 1987), or rich manipulation of words (Beck & McKeown, 1983; Lansdown, 1991), is consistently more effective than definitional instruction alone. (See Blachowicz & Fisher, 2000, for a review of research in this area.) On the basis of a meta-analysis of studies that compared different types of instruction, Stahl and Fairbanks (1986) concluded that methods involving multiple sources of information led to superior word learning in studies that used both multiple-choice and oral or written reports. In effective classrooms, students worked to create or understand appropriate definitions, synonyms, and other word relations, and also encountered words in context.

In addition to providing multiple sources of information, repeated exposure is an important component of word learning. Stanley and Ginther (1991), working with sixth-grade students, supported earlier findings (Gipe, 1979–1980; McKeown, 1985) that exposing students to a word in differing contexts facilitates word learning. Results from a study of word frequency and word knowledge (Ryder & Slater, 1988) also supported the importance of repeated exposures. As indicated previously, a word-rich environment supports general vocabulary development, but it also may provide a vehicle by which a student can build knowledge of a particular word through repeated exposures and from multiple sources of information. For example, when teachers choose words for instruction related to text that is to be comprehended, highlight vocabulary before reading, question students after reading, or discuss the reading in ways that call on them to use the designated words meaningfully, and then engage the students with follow-up activities with the words, they ensure a repetition of vocabulary (Beck & McKeown, 1983; Blachowicz & Obrochta, 2005; Duke, Bennett-Armistead, & Roberts, 2003). This type of instruction, along with thematic instruction, ensures that students will see, hear, analyze, and use words in speech and writing, providing multiple, meaningful exposures over time.

Developing word-learning strategies

Students need to develop independent strategies for dealing with the new words they will meet in school, in work, and in other areas of life. When encountering an unknown word, the reader can examine the context for general clues, look at the

structure and morphology of the word itself (the internal context) for clues, or consult a reference. Unfortunately, the research on instruction to develop independent strategies for word learning is one of the most limited and inconclusive areas in the overall research on learning and teaching vocabulary.

Consider learning from context. Although there is research indicating that exposure to new words in written contexts results in some development of general vocabulary, it is difficult to predict what words can be learned through an examination of the context. Context does not always reveal meaning; indeed, it is sometimes misleading (Baldwin & Schatz, 1985; Schatz & Baldwin, 1986). Research on teaching contextual analysis is similarly complicated and is not always implemented in the classroom. Several studies have provided intensive instruction in contextual analysis (Jenkins, Matlock, & Slocum, 1989; Patberg, Graves, & Stibbe, 1984; Sternberg, 1987) with mixed results. Instructional studies (Blachowicz & Zabroske, 1990; Buikema & Graves, 1993) suggest that teaching contextual analysis using scaffolded explicit instruction leads to more student responsibility and that a metacognitive focus can help students become conscious learners from context. Similarly, research focusing on structural analysis or morphology, the learning of word parts, suggests that such instruction can be generative in learning new words (Baumann, 2005; Baumann et al., 2002; Baumann, Edwards, Boland, Olejnik, & Kame'enui, 2003; Nicol & Graves, 1990; White, Sowell, & Yanagihara, 1989), though not all teaching studies have been successful (Otterman, 1955; Wysocki & Jenkins, 1987).

We suspect that the lack of attention to word-learning strategy instruction in the classroom, relative to methods such as defining a list of words and semantic mapping, has to do, at least in part, with the instructional time and effort needed for the multifaceted, long-term requirements of robust strategy instruction. Teachers intent on preparing students for content reading may find more immediate benefits from teaching individual words directly related to lessons or units of instruction. Assuming that teaching a word-learning strategy is related to teaching a comprehension strategy and requires a model akin to the comprehension strategy instruction model described by Duke and Pearson (2002), teachers need to be skilled in providing an explicit description of the strategy including when and how to use it, modeling use of the strategy in action, structuring opportunities for students to use the strategy in collaboration with others, guiding student practice in strategy use with increasing levels of independence

and, finally, encouraging and providing opportunities for independent strategy use.

Knowledge of generative word elements, including affixes, roots that can combine to make and explain the meaning of new word forms, and word origins, is often a hallmark of students who have extensive vocabularies (Freyd & Baron, 1982) and develops significantly between fourth grade and high school (Nagy, Diakidoy, & Anderson, 1993). Studies of teaching word parts suggest that teaching in a systematic way significantly improves students' abilities to infer the meanings of words composed of these elements (Graves & Hammond, 1980; White et al., 1989). When used with instruction in context clues (Baumann et al., 2002, 2003), the effect is even more powerful.

Strategic use of outside references, such as dictionaries, thesauruses, and online resources, is another avenue to independence. With respect to dictionary use, every teacher who has watched a student struggle to look up a word knows that using a dictionary can be a complex and difficult task. Research suggests that students are able to select correct definitions for unknown words from a dictionary, but they have difficulty then using these words in production tasks such as writing sentences using the new words (Miller & Gildea, 1987; Nist & Olejnik, 1995; Scott & Nagy, 1997). Revised definitions intended to be more readily accessible to readers result in increased ability to glean meanings (McKeown, 1985), prompting suggestions that classrooms make use of dictionaries or other references, including online resources, with more accessible, functional definitions. Though research in this area is thin, it appears that instruction in extracting information from references and using that information should be part of the word-study curriculum and may be especially amenable to technological enhancement, something we will note in a subsequent section on technology.

Which words should be taught?

There are several approaches that a teacher can use to choose appropriate words for study by his or her class. Suggested approaches include picking the words that are not well established in students' vocabularies and will be encountered frequently in the future (Beck et al., 2002), selecting words that are important to what is being read, and choosing words based on generativity (i.e., the ability to use this word or word parts to learn other words; Blachowicz & Fisher, 2006; Graves, 2006). Most educators would

suggest that the words encountered most frequently in English are good candidates for learning and that various word lists can help teachers select words appropriate to various grade levels and content areas.

Research on word frequency in speech and text has produced many lists that can be informative to teachers. The Fry Instant Words List (Fry, Kress, & Fountoukidis, 2004) contains 75% of the words that students will encounter in their reading material. Although these words are often firmly established in the students' oral vocabularies, this may not be the case for English-language learners or for students with small vocabularies. For oral vocabulary, The Living Word Vocabulary (Dale & O'Rourke, 1976) gives estimates of words known by school-age students, and it is a resource whose predictions seem, for the most part, valid today (Biemiller, 2004). For older students and English-language learners, lists constructed in England for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), notably The General Service List of English Words (West, 1953), have had great utility. The overlap in vocabulary across content areas representing social studies, science, and mathematics curricula suggests that content area words comprise an important vocabulary set to choose for instruction. Recently, older word lists of vocabulary relevant to content area subjects (Harris & Jacobson, 1982) have been updated (Marzano, Kendall, & Paynter, 2005), and lists representing important content areas (Hirsch, 1988) and word families have been created (Marzano, 2004). Further, research looking at early word learning suggests that thematic instruction in the content areas may be an important source of content word learning (Blachowicz & Obrochta, 2005; Duke, Bennett-Armistead, & Roberts, 2003).

Who should choose the words to be taught?

Commercial literacy texts typically combine many genres of literature and highlight vocabulary from these selections to represent frequency, decodability, central selection content, and words needed for instruction in a particular skill or strategy (Ryder & Graves, 1994). Thus, with the exception of early literacy, when it is logical to focus on high-frequency vocabulary, the words selected for instruction may be highly variable from literature anthology to anthology, requiring a systematic appraisal by teachers to select the words most appropriate for their students (Beck et al., 2002). In the academic content areas, by contrast, the considerations of each domain require that certain words should be taught. Beyersdorfer

(1991) reviewed studies of word choice, indicating that content area teachers produced word-study lists with a high degree of overlap across teachers.

There is also considerable evidence that student selection can be productive not only in determining vocabulary to study but also in building motivation and study skills. Harmon, Hedrick, Wood, and Gress (2005) found that eighth-grade students and adults were equally effective in choosing appropriate vocabulary from expository texts to study, although they varied in their reasons for choosing the words. Also, several studies have continued the work of Haggard (1982, 1985) in demonstrating the effectiveness of allowing students to select their own words to learn as part of classroom vocabulary instruction. For example, Fisher, Blachowicz, and Smith (1991) examined the effects of allowing fourth-grade students in literature circles to select their own words for study. The students not only chose words that were at or above their grade level but also retained knowledge of their meanings. A partial replication of this study at seventh grade (Blachowicz, Fisher, Costa, & Pozzi, 1993) found similar results. When students in fourth grade were allowed to choose their own words for vocabulary and spelling instruction, they demonstrated more effective and longer-lasting word learning than they did for words chosen by the teacher (Fisher & Danielsen, 1998).

Dole, Sloan, and Trathen (1995) also found that allowing 10th-grade students in literature groups to select their own words was effective. Further, the students who received instruction in a process showing them how to select words that were important for the reading selection learned more than those who did not. Later, Harmon (1998a, 1998b, 1999, 2000, 2002) confirmed these results in a series of studies with seventh-grade students. Undoubtedly, having students choose their own words for study appears effective in relation to reading literature, where the number of unknown words in a novel can be large, and the importance of any particular word is likely to be minimal. In addition, Jiménez, Garcia, and Pearson (1996) cited self-choice as a powerful motivator for word learning.

Reciprocal teaching is an instructional technique in which students may learn vocabulary that they select themselves. One of the four components of reciprocal teaching involves students helping one another to clarify parts of the text that they do not understand. This may involve the selection of vocabulary to study. Rosenshine and Meister (1994) reviewed the research in this area and came to positive conclusions about the effectiveness of the strategy for

developing comprehension. Yet they did not reach any conclusions in relation to vocabulary learning. It may be that students' control of their own learning in this situation is one part of its effectiveness. Further examination of instructional situations wherein students retain control over their learning, in group settings, may be productive in refining our understanding of how and why student choice affects word learning.

What approaches can bridge the early learning vocabulary gap?

As we noted earlier, by age 3 preschool children exhibit wide differences in vocabulary knowledge, a difference sometimes referred to as the vocabulary gap (Hart & Risley, 1995). Reading aloud to children, also referred to as shared storybook reading, is a productive means for giving students opportunities to develop new meaning vocabulary. Because children's books present more advanced, less familiar vocabulary than everyday speech (Cunningham & Stanovich, 1998), listening to books read aloud can help students go beyond their existing oral vocabularies and introduce them to new concepts and higher order word knowledge. Conversation after shared storybook reading also gives students opportunities to use new vocabulary in the more decontextualized setting of a book discussion (Snow, 1991).

Numerous studies have documented the fact that young students can learn word meanings incidentally from read-aloud experiences (Eller et al., 1988; Elley, 1988; Robbins & Ehri, 1994). Involving students in discussions during and after listening to a book has also produced significant word learning, especially when the teacher scaffolded this learning by asking questions, adding information, or prompting students to describe what they heard. Whitehurst and his associates (Whitehurst, Arnold, et al., 1994; Whitehurst, Epstein, et al., 1994; Whitehurst et al., 1999) have called this process "dialogic reading."

Research also suggests that this type of scaffolding may be particularly important to those students who are less likely to learn new vocabulary easily. Specifically, children with smaller initial vocabularies are less likely to learn new vocabulary incidentally and need a thoughtful, well-designed, scaffolded approach to maximize learning from shared storybook reading (Robbins & Ehri, 1994; Sénéchal, Thomas, & Monker, 1995). Collins's (2004) recent study illus-

trated that preschoolers in ELL programs can benefit significantly from a scaffolded approach to storybook reading in which sophisticated, as opposed to common, words are highlighted for instruction. Along with these read-aloud studies, recent studies using systematic, scaffolded reading in first grade (Blachowicz & Obrochta, 2005) and combinations of explicit and implicit instruction in preschool (Schwanenflugel et al., 2005) have forged new and appropriate ways to pay systematic attention to early vocabulary development.

What specific strategies or approaches can help ELLs?

Although students with strong heritage-language skills can use these skills in reading English (Moll, 1988; Slavin & Cheung, 2003), English-language vocabulary is still a significant stumbling block for students in ELL programs (Garcia, 1991). Research reviews suggest that the principles of sound vocabulary instruction summarized earlier in this paper also apply to the word learning of ELL students (Fitzgerald, 1995; Slavin & Cheung). Further, there are important implications from research that relate directly to ELL students.

First, a command of the basic, most frequent words in English is essential for starting to learn (Cummins, 2003; Nation, 2001). A general TESOL vocabulary list (West, 1953) forms the basis for many other lists that suggest 2,000–2,500 words as a basic vocabulary (Folse, 2004). This list can help students get started but does not provide "school" words that help them, particularly older students, advance academically (Cummins). As noted earlier, academic vocabulary is challenging for both English-language learners and native English speakers. For ELL students, one way to draw upon first-language skills is to use cognate-related instruction. Cognates are words that are similar in their native languages to English forms of words (Garcia, 1991; Jiménez et al., 1996; Nagy et al., 1993). Garcia (1996) found that middle-grade Spanish-speaking students were able to learn how to use Spanish cognates to figure out English words.

Studies have also suggested that enriching vocabulary instruction, through oral language and the use of written semantic analyses and cloze techniques, can improve the vocabulary of ELL students (Bos, Allen, & Scanlon, 1989). In a recent study, Carlo et al. (2005) used a long-term approach that incorporated seeing, hearing, spelling, and using strategies to

analyze word structure and meaning. Words were encountered in multiple content area contexts, and Spanish-language texts were used to support the English-language texts. Cognate as well as non-cognate words were learned, and the researchers focused on creating relational sets of words by looking at synonyms, antonyms, and multiple meanings. There were significant effects for both a more comprehensive and a less comprehensive approach to word learning. Therefore, it appears that comprehensiveness of instruction coupled with use of the native language, in support text and cognates, are powerful tools for increasing the vocabulary of ELL students.

Can technology be used to enhance vocabulary learning?

In his thoughtful review of the potential of electronic texts for transforming early reading instruction, McKenna (1998) noted that the use of electronic texts for literacy learning makes great intuitive sense and has a research foundation. Although many areas of literacy research can be identified to support the National Reading Panel's (NICHD, 2000) contention that technology enhances vocabulary learning (Blachowicz, Beyersdorfer, & Fisher, 2006), one area in particular informs our understanding of how electronic text may influence word knowledge. As we noted earlier, a primary way in which young readers are exposed to new vocabulary is within the context of supported storybook reading, which calls on the listener to interact with the text. For example, many electronic books for school use have animation cues that provide a rich context for word learning. Storybooks made available through computers and videodiscs, with built-in mediation and support, have generated provocative research.

Though the research has been somewhat equivocal on the use of electronic texts without mediation (Higgins & Hess, 1999; Matthew, 1997; Moore & Smith, 1996), studies found that this technology is more effective for learning when adult facilitation is provided. Natural questions arise from this research: What types of mediation are most effective in facilitating vocabulary learning from electronic texts? Can this type of mediation be provided within the text itself?

One early study addressing these questions used videodisc technology within which elementary students could access mediation in the form of definitions and illustrative sentences (Gildea, Miller, & Wurtenberg, 1990). The study suggested that learners knew when to ask for help but were not able to judge

whether definitions or illustrative sentences would be most helpful in expanding their word knowledge. Students tended to ask for definitions, which helped them less than illustrative sentences or information-rich pictures, both of which facilitated greater learning than did definitions. Because these were older students, the researchers suggested that looking for definitions was a result of prior instruction. This conclusion highlights the fact that in-text facilitation does not exist in a vacuum and leads to yet another question for researchers: What are the connections between learning from technology and the type of classroom instruction on reference use that precedes it?

Four other studies looked at the issue of facilitation from another angle. Koren (1999), working with second-language learners, found that facilitation that called for active inferencing on the part of the learner was one key to word learning from electronic text. Students learned more from tasks that required inferencing from context than they did from glossed texts, where students have the ability to call up definitions, graphics, or video explanations. Reinking and Rickman (1990) compared the comprehension performance of two groups of middle-grade students reading science texts. Both groups were allowed to request context-specific definitions of difficult words during reading; one group used technology, and the other used conventional dictionary and thesaurus resources. Students with the technology available investigated more word meanings, recalled the meanings of more words, and comprehended more of the experimental text than the comparison students. Pawling's (1999) case studies of high school students found that metacognitive reflection was an important part of learning and that the students welcomed working on, and responding to, electronic text when they would have the privacy to answer without having others make fun of their replies. Last, a carefully designed study by Xin and Rieth (2001) used video to anchor text by presenting a prior-knowledge video followed by interactive text that highlighted new vocabulary words. These anchor presentations were then mediated by instructional sentence comprehension and cloze tasks and resulted in greater learning than the anchored text alone, an effect that was strongest for students with learning disabilities.

In all, considering what we know about word learning generally, electronic texts can be both motivating and effective for word learning when they provide or couple their presentations with facilitation that calls on the students to actively engage with the words. Questions raised by recent studies about the type and placement of the mediating instruction

provide fertile ground for future research. Further, the current studies are all of short and limited duration so that longer term, richer studies will extend our understanding of the possibilities of electronic texts for developing meaningful vocabularies.

What do we know about assessment and other little-researched issues?

Despite the strong and persistent relationship between vocabulary and comprehension, programs designed to teach vocabulary, while improving comprehension of individual texts, have often had surprisingly little effect on reading performance as measured by standardized tests (Dale et al., 1973; Mezynski, 1983; Petty et al., 1967; Stahl & Fairbanks, 1986). Certainly this issue can be explained by the limitations of conventional approaches to assessing vocabulary. Standardized tests with their limited measurements of word knowledge may not capture the gradual accretion of meaning that is word learning.

Even though we know more about the incremental and metacognitive aspects of word learning than we did 75 years ago, the typical measures for vocabulary are still the same gross assessments of our childhood. A cursory review of the indexes of books on vocabulary instruction also reveals that few, if any, pages are devoted to assessment, particularly assessments that use items scored as correct or incorrect. This limitation points to a clear vacuum in the research and one that should be addressed in a more sensitive way. Perhaps the renewed interest in content learning and its related academic vocabulary development will provide a context to assess more clearly students' word learning and its relation to comprehension, because the corpus of academic terms in a particular discipline is more constrained than the measures of general vocabulary that are characteristic of standardized reading assessments.

Conclusion

As we reflect on the intersection of research, theory, and practice pertaining to vocabulary development and instruction, we are struck both by the need to actively transfer what we have learned from research into the daily practice of classroom teachers

and by the need for continued research to address questions that teachers often ask, but for which the existing research provides few answers. A third consideration, which is linked to each of these two concerns, is the need for greater emphasis on and understanding of metacognition in relation to vocabulary learning and instruction.

Watts (1995) concluded that little had changed in vocabulary instruction from earlier classroom studies. Historically, vocabulary instruction has been overshadowed by instruction in word recognition and comprehension; however, it is clearly an area of concern in its own right and, therefore, needs to become a priority in the instructional preparation and inservice professional development of classroom *and* content area teachers. It is important that teacher education at both the preservice and inservice levels include experiences that will provide teachers with a strong understanding of the underpinnings of vocabulary development, an array of strategies for teaching individual words and for teaching word-learning strategies for independence, and an appreciation for the role of word consciousness in vocabulary development and ways in which word consciousness can be fostered.

We firmly believe that the most effective approaches to vocabulary instruction are ones that are integrated with the curriculum and include attention to word learning throughout the day and across subject areas. These approaches need to be undergirded by a comprehensive knowledge base and theoretical perspective that reflect an understanding of how words work to make meaning and how to make this apparent to children. Further, these approaches must fit or be differentiated for a range of teaching styles and classroom organizations, be easily understood and relatively easy to implement, and let both teachers and students see concrete results.

Although this is a tall order for research, it is no more challenging than many of the tasks teachers must address. Every day in their classrooms, as teachers are faced with teaching vocabulary in a multiplicity of ways for a variety of purposes, they are also faced with persistent and immediate questions: Which words are the best words to teach today? How much time should I spend on vocabulary instruction? How can I link what I am doing today to my students' overall vocabulary development?

It seems to us that what underlies effective teacher decision making to answer such classroom questions about vocabulary instruction is an understanding of the metacognitive aspects of vocabulary learning. Specifically, when teachers understand that words are learned gradually, and when they know the principles underlying how words make meaning,

then the answers to frequently asked questions of word selection, time spent teaching, and the development of depth of word learning can be addressed more readily in the context of a lesson and a curriculum. A teacher in such a situation has the tools to decide, for example, whether knowing a synonym for a word is enough, or whether students need to know what characteristics differentiate a synonym from the target word.

For researchers the challenge is to begin to look at the ways in which various aspects of vocabulary acquisition and instruction are interrelated. For example, researchers have shown the effectiveness of drawing students' attention to morphemes and how they combine to make meaning. They have articulated frameworks for how definitions work for various parts of speech. They have suggested the importance of developing word awareness. They have investigated the role of context in word learning. They have emphasized the importance of acquiring both depth and breadth of word knowledge. We believe more clearly articulated considerations of metacognition in relation to vocabulary development will help us to assemble individual components, such as these, into a coherent whole and provide a stronger research and theory base for answering classroom questions about vocabulary instruction.

CAMILLE L.Z. BLACHOWICZ is professor of education at National College of Education of National-Louis University in Illinois, where she directs the reading program and teaches courses related to diagnosis and remediation of reading difficulties and reading research. Along with her research, writing, and staff development, she is codirector of Literacy Partners, a literacy improvement project funded by The Chicago Community Trust and the Chicago Public Schools, and director of the Early Literacy Technology Project, funded by the Spencer Foundation. She can be contacted at National-Louis University, 5202 Old Orchard Road, Skokie, IL 60077, USA, or by e-mail at cblachowicz@nl.edu.

PETER J.L. FISHER is professor of education at National College of Education of National-Louis University, where he teaches courses in reading methods, research, and storytelling. He can be contacted at National-Louis University, 1000 Capitol Drive, Wheeling, IL 60090, USA, or by e-mail at pfisher@nl.edu.

DONNA OGLE is professor of education at National College of Education, of National-Louis University. She teaches courses and works with doctoral students in the areas of reading comprehension, content literacy, and professional development. She currently directs two urban literacy projects: Project ALL (Advancing Literacy for Learning), funded by The Chicago Community Trust to develop content literacy approaches for English-language learners and struggling readers in grades 4–8, and The McDougal Family Foundation Transitional Literacy Project, which focuses on developing articulation between middle and high school literacy teams and encouraging minority family support for adolescent students. She is also the senior consultant for the newly funded Striving Readers Grant to the Chicago

Public Schools. She can be contacted at National-Louis University, 5202 Old Orchard Road, Skokie, IL 60077, USA, or by e-mail at dogle@nl.edu.

SUSAN WATTS-TAFFE is an educational researcher and consultant. Her research interests include vocabulary development, students experiencing difficulty with reading, and teacher professional development, particularly in culturally and linguistically diverse settings. She can be contacted at 6154 Woodlawn Drive, Cincinnati, OH 45230, USA, or by e-mail at wattstaffe@zoomtown.com.

REFERENCES

- ALLINGTON, R.L., & JOHNSTON, P.H. (2002). *Reading to learn: Lessons from exemplary 4th grade classrooms*. New York: Guilford.
- ANDERSON, R.C., & NAGY, W.E. (1991). Word meanings. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*, (Vol. 2, pp. 690–724). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- ANDERSON, R.C., WILSON, P., & FIELDING, L. (1988). Growth in reading and how children spend their time outside of school. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 23, 285–303.
- BAKER, S.K., SIMMONS, D.C., & KAME'ENUI, E.J. (1995). *Vocabulary acquisition: Synthesis of the research* (Rep. No. 13). Eugene, OR: National Center to Improve the Tools of Educators, University of Oregon.
- BALDWIN, R.S., & SCHATZ, E.I. (1985). Context clues are ineffective with low frequency words in naturally occurring prose. In J.A. Niles & R.V. Lalik (Eds.), *Issues in literacy: A research perspective* (34th yearbook of the National Reading Conference, pp. 132–135). Rochester, NY: National Reading Conference.
- BARR, R., KAMIL, M., MOSENTHAL, P., & PEARSON, P.D. (Eds.). (1991). *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 2). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- BAUMANN, J.F. (2005). Vocabulary-comprehension relationships. In B. Maloch, J.V. Hoffman, D.L. Schallert, C.M. Fairbanks, & J. Worthy (Eds.), *54th yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 117–131). Oak Creek, WI: National Reading Conference.
- BAUMANN, J.F., EDWARDS, E.C., BOLAND E., OLEJNIK, S., & KAME'ENUI, E.J. (2003). Vocabulary tricks: Effects of instruction in morphology and context on fifth grade students' ability to derive and infer word meaning. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40, 447–494.
- BAUMANN, J.F., EDWARDS, E.C., FONT, G., TERESHINSKI, C.A., KAME'ENUI, E.J., & OLEJNIK, S. (2002). Teaching morphemic and contextual analysis to fifth-grade students. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 37, 150–176.
- BAUMANN, J.F., & KAME'ENUI, E.J. (1991). Research on vocabulary instruction: Ode to Voltaire. In J. Flood, D. Lapp, & J.R. Squire (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts* (pp. 604–632). New York: Macmillan.
- BAUMANN, J.F., & KAME'ENUI, E.J. (Eds.). (2004). *Vocabulary instruction: Research to practice*. New York: Guilford.
- BEALS, D.E., & DE TEMPLE, J.M. (1993). Home contributions to early language and literacy development. In D.J. Leu & C.K. Kinzer (Eds.), *Examining central issues in literacy research, theory, and practice* (42nd yearbook of the National Reading Conference, pp. 207–215). Chicago: National Reading Conference.
- BECK, I.L., MCCASLIN, E.S., & MCKEOWN, M.G. (1980). *The rationale and design of a program to teach vocabulary to fourth-grade students* (LRDC No. 1980/25). Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Learning Research and Development Center.
- BECK, I.L., & MCKEOWN, M.G. (1983). Learning words well—A program to enhance vocabulary and comprehension. *The Reading Teacher*, 36, 622–625.
- BECK, I.L., & MCKEOWN, M.G. (1991). Conditions of vocabulary acquisition. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 2, pp. 789–814). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- BECK, I.L., MCKEOWN, M.G., & KUCAN, L. (2002). *Bringing words to life: Robust vocabulary instruction*. New York: Guilford.
- BECKER, W.C. (1977). Teaching reading and language to the disadvantaged—What we have learned from field research. *Harvard Educational Review*, 47, 518–543.
- BEYERSDORFER, J.M. (1991). *Middle school students' strategies for*

selection of vocabulary in science texts. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, National-Louis University, Evanston, IL.

BIEMILLER, A. (2004). Teaching vocabulary in the primary grades: Vocabulary instruction needed. In J.F. Baumann & E.J. Kame'enui (Eds.), *Vocabulary instruction: Research to practice* (pp. 28–40). New York: Guilford.

BLACHOWICZ, C.L.Z., BEYERSDORFER, J., & FISHER, P. (2006). Vocabulary development and technology: Teaching and transformation. In M.C. McKenna, L.D. Labbo, R. Kieffer, & D. Reinking (Eds.), *International handbook of literacy and technology* (Vol. 2, pp. 341–348). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

BLACHOWICZ, C.L.Z., & FISHER, P.J.L. (2000). Vocabulary instruction. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, pp. 503–523). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

BLACHOWICZ, C.L.Z., & FISHER, P. (2004). Putting the “fun” back in fundamental. In J.F. Baumann & E.J. Kame'enui (Eds.), *Vocabulary instruction: Research to practice* (pp. 210–238). New York: Guilford.

BLACHOWICZ, C.L.Z., & FISHER, P. (2006). *Teaching vocabulary in all classrooms* (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: Prentice-Hall.

BLACHOWICZ, C.L.Z., FISHER, P.J.L., COSTA, M., & POZZI, M. (1993, November). *Researching vocabulary learning in middle school cooperative reading groups: A teacher-researcher collaboration.* Paper presented at the 10th Great Lakes Regional Reading Conference, Chicago.

BLACHOWICZ, C.L.Z., & ÖBROCHTA, C. (2005). Vocabulary visits: Developing content vocabulary in the primary grades. *The Reading Teacher*, 59, 262–269.

BLACHOWICZ, C.L.Z., WATTS-TAFFE, S., & FISHER, P. (2006). *Integrated vocabulary instruction: Meeting the needs of diverse learners in grades 1–5.* Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates.

BLACHOWICZ, C.L.Z., & ZABROSKE, B. (1990). Context instruction: A metacognitive approach for at-risk readers. *Journal of Reading*, 33, 504–508.

BOS, C.S., ALLEN, A.A., & SCANLON, D. (1989). Vocabulary instruction and reading comprehension with bilingual learning disabled students. In S. McCormick & J. Zutell (Eds.), *Cognitive and social perspectives for literacy research and instruction* (pp. 173–178). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

BOS, C.S., & ANDERS, P.L. (1989). *The effectiveness of interactive instructional practices on content area reading comprehension.* Washington, DC: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 329 935)

BOS, C.S., & ANDERS, P.L. (1990). Effects of interactive vocabulary instruction on the vocabulary learning and reading comprehension of junior-high learning-disabled students. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 13, 31–42.

BOS, C.S., & ANDERS, P.L. (1992). Using interactive teaching and learning strategies to promote text comprehension and content learning for students with learning disabilities. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 39, 225–238.

BRANSFORD, J., BROWN, A., & CORKING, R. (1999). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience and school.* Washington, DC: National Research Council.

BRETT, A., ROTHLEIN, L., & HURLEY, M. (1996). Vocabulary acquisition from listening to stories and explanations of target words. *Elementary School Journal*, 96, 415–422.

BUIKEMA, J.L., & GRAVES, M.F. (1993). Teaching students to use context clues to infer word meanings. *Journal of Reading*, 36, 450–457.

CALFEE, R., & DRUM, P. (1978). Learning to read: Theory, research and practice. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 8, 183–294.

CALFEE, R., & DRUM, P. (1986). Research on teaching reading. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 804–849). New York: Macmillan.

CARLO, M.S., AUGUST, D., & SNOW, C.E. (2005). Sustained vocabulary-learning strategies for English language learners. In E.H. Hiebert & M. Kamil (Eds.), *Teaching and learning vocabulary: Bringing research to practice* (pp. 137–153). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

CASSIDY, J., & CASSIDY, D. (2005/2006, December/January). What's hot, what's not. *Reading Today*, 23, 1, 8, 9.

CHALL, J.S., JACOBS, V.A., & BALDWIN, L.E. (1990). *The reading crisis: Why poor children fall behind.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

COLLINS, M.F. (2004, May). *The contribution of storybook reading to second language acquisition.* Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Reading Association, Reno, NV.

COYNE, M.D., SIMMONS, D.C., & KAME'ENUI, E.J. (2004).

Vocabulary instruction for young children at risk of experiencing reading difficulties: Teaching word meanings during shared storybook reading. In J.F. Baumann & E.J. Kame'enui (Eds.), *Vocabulary instruction: Research to practice* (pp. 41–58). New York: Guilford.

CUMMINS, J. (2003). Reading and the bilingual student: Fact and friction. In G.G. Garcia (Ed.), *English learners: Reaching the highest level of English literacy* (pp. 2–33). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

CUNNINGHAM, A.E. (2005). Vocabulary growth through independent reading and reading aloud to children. In E.H. Hiebert & M. Kamil (Eds.), *Teaching and learning vocabulary: Bringing research to practice* (pp. 45–68). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

CUNNINGHAM, A.E., & STANOVICH, K.E. (1998). What reading does for the mind. *American Educator*, 2, 8–17.

DALE, E., & O'ROURKE, J.P. (1976). *The living word vocabulary.* Chicago: Field Enterprises.

DALE, E., RAZIK, T., & PETTY, W. (1973). *Bibliography of vocabulary studies.* Columbus: Ohio State University.

DAVIS, F.B. (1944). Fundamental factors of comprehension in reading. *Psychometrika*, 9, 185–197.

DAVIS, F.B. (1972). Research on comprehension in reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 7, 628–678.

DOLE, J.A., SLOAN, C., & TRATHEN, W. (1995). Teaching vocabulary within the context of literature. *Journal of Reading*, 38, 452–460.

DRUM, P., & MADISON, J. (1985). Vocabulary instruction: A conversational format. In J.A. Niles & R.V. Lalik (Eds.), *Issues in literacy: A research perspective* (34th yearbook of the National Reading Conference, pp. 59–64). Rochester, NY: National Reading Conference.

DUIN, A.H., & GRAVES, M.F. (1987). Intensive vocabulary instruction as a prewriting technique. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 22, 311–330.

DUKE, N.K., BENNETT-ARMISTEAD, V.S., & ROBERTS, E.M. (2003). Bridging the gap between learning to read and reading to learn. In D.M. Barone & L.M. Morrow (Eds.), *Literacy and young children: Research-based practices* (pp. 226–242). New York: Guilford.

DUKE, N.K., & PEARSON, P.D. (2002). Effective practices for developing reading comprehension. In A.E. Farstrup & S.J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 204–242). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

DURKIN, D. (1978–1979). What classroom observations reveal about reading comprehension instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 14, 481–533.

DURSO, F.T., & COGGINS, K.A. (1991). Organized instruction for the improvement of word knowledge skills. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83, 108–112.

ELLER, G., PAPPAS, C., & BROWN, E. (1988). The lexical development of kindergartners: Learning from written context. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 20, 5–24.

ELLEY, W.B. (1988). Vocabulary acquisition from listening to stories. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 24, 174–187.

ENGLERT, C.S., & MARIAGE, T.V. (1991). Making students partners in the comprehension process: Organizing the reading (POSSE). *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 14, 123–137.

FINESILVER, M. (1994). *An investigation of three methods to improve vocabulary learning at the middle school level.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, National-Louis University, Evanston, IL.

FISHER, P.J.L., BLACHOWICZ, C.L.Z., & SMITH, J.C. (1991). Vocabulary learning in literature discussion groups. In J. Zutell & S. McCormick (Eds.), *Learner factors/teacher factors: Issues in literacy research and instruction* (40th yearbook of the National Reading Conference, pp. 201–209). Chicago: National Reading Conference.

FISHER, P.J.L., & DANIELSEN, D. (1998). When fourth-graders select their own words for spelling and vocabulary. In L. Wedwick & R.K. Moss (Eds.), *Conversations: Teacher research in literacy learning* (pp. 23–27). Bloomington, IL: Illinois Reading Council.

FITZGERALD, J. (1995). English as a second language instruction in the United States: A research review. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 27, 115–152.

FOLSE, K.S. (2004). *Vocabulary myths: Applying second language research to classroom teaching.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

FREYD, P., & BARON, J. (1982). Individual differences in acquisition of derivational morphology. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 21, 282–295.

FRY, E., KRESS, J., & FOUNTOUKIDIS, D. (2004). *The reading teacher's book of lists.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

GARCIA, G.E. (1991). Factors influencing the English reading test

- performance of Spanish-speaking Hispanic children. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 26, 371–392.
- GARCIA, G.E. (1996, December). *Improving the English reading of Mexican-American bilingual students through the use of cognate recognition strategies*. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Charleston, SC.
- GILDEA, P.M., MILLER, G.A., & WURTENBERG, C.L. (1990). Contextual enrichment by videodisk. In D.B. Nix & R. Spiro (Eds.), *Multimedia: Exploring ideas in high technology* (pp. 1–29). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- GIPE, J.P. (1979–1980). Investigating techniques for teaching word meanings. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 14, 624–645.
- GOLDENBERG, C., REZAEI, A., & FLETCHER, J. (2005, May). *Home use of English and Spanish and Spanish-speaking children's oral language and literacy achievement*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Reading Association, San Antonio, TX.
- GOSWAMI, U. (2001). Early phonological development and the acquisition of literacy. In S.B. Neuman & D.K. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook of early literacy research* (pp. 111–125). New York: Guilford.
- GRAVES, M.F. (1986). Vocabulary learning and instruction. In E.Z. Rothkopf (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (Vol. 13, pp. 49–89). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- GRAVES, M.F. (2006). *The vocabulary book*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- GRAVES, M.F., BRUNETTI, G.J., & SLATER, W.H. (1982). The reading vocabularies of primary grade children of varying geographic and social backgrounds. In J.A. Niles & L.A. Harris (Eds.), *New inquiries in reading research and instruction* (pp. 99–104). Rochester, NY: National Reading Conference.
- GRAVES, M.F., & HAMMOND, H.K. (1980). A validated procedure for teaching prefixes and its effect on students' ability to assign meanings to novel words. In M. Kamil & A. Moe (Eds.), *Perspectives on reading research and instruction* (pp. 184–188). Washington, DC: National Reading Conference.
- HAGGARD, M.R. (1982). The vocabulary self-selection strategy: An active approach to word learning. *Journal of Reading*, 26, 634–642.
- HAGGARD, M.R. (1985). An interactive strategies approach to content reading. *Journal of Reading*, 29, 204–210.
- HARMON, J. (1998a). Constructing word meanings: Strategies and perceptions of four middle-school learners. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 30, 561–599.
- HARMON, J. (1998b). Vocabulary teaching and learning in a seventh-grade literature-based classroom. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 41, 518–529.
- HARMON, J. (1999). Initial encounters with unfamiliar words in independent reading. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 33, 304–338.
- HARMON, J. (2000). Assessing and supporting independent word-learning strategies of middle school students. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 43, 518–527.
- HARMON, J. (2002). Teaching independent word-learning strategies to struggling readers. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 45, 606–615.
- HARMON, J., HEDRICK, W., WOOD, K., & GRESS, M. (2005). Vocabulary self-selection: A study of middle-school students' word selections from expository texts. *Reading Psychology*, 26, 313–333.
- HARRIS, A.J., & JACOBSON, M.D. (1982). *Basic reading vocabularies*. New York: Macmillan.
- HART, B., & RISLEY, T.R. (1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of young American children*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- HERMAN, P.A., ANDERSON, R.C., PEARSON, P.D., & NAGY, W.E. (1987). Incidental acquisition of word meaning from expositions with varied text features. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 22, 263–284.
- HIEBERT, E.H. (2005). In pursuit of an effective, efficient vocabulary curriculum for elementary students. In E.H. Hiebert & M.L. Kamil (Eds.), *Teaching and learning vocabulary: Bringing research to practice* (pp. 243–264). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- HIGGINS, N., & HESS, L. (1999). Using electronic books to promote vocabulary development. *Journal of Research in Computing in Education*, 31, 425–430.
- HIRSCH, E.D. (1988). *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know*. New York: Vintage Press.
- IRVIN, J.L. (1990). *Vocabulary knowledge: Guidelines for instruction*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- JENKINS, J.R., MATLOCK, B., & SLOCUM, T.A. (1989). Approaches to vocabulary instruction: The teaching of individual word meanings and practice in deriving word meaning from context. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 24, 215–235.
- JENKINS, J.R., STEIN, M.L., & WYSOCKI, K. (1984). Learning vocabulary through reading. *American Educational Research Journal*, 21, 767–787.
- JIMÉNEZ, R.T., GARCIA, G.E., & PEARSON, P.D. (1996). The reading strategies of bilingual Latina/o students who are successful English readers: Opportunities and obstacles. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 31, 90–112.
- JOHNSON, D.D. (2000). *Vocabulary in the elementary and middle school*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- JOHNSON, D.D., & PEARSON, P.D. (1984). *Teaching reading vocabulary* (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- KAME'ENUI, E.J., CARNINE, D.W., & FRESCHI, R. (1982). Effects of text construction and instructional procedures for teaching word meanings on comprehension and recall. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 17, 367–388.
- KAMIL, M.L., & HIEBERT, E.H. (2005). The teaching and learning of vocabulary: Perspectives and persistent issues. In E.H. Hiebert & M.L. Kamil (Eds.), *Teaching and learning vocabulary: Bringing research to practice* (pp. 1–23). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- KOREN, S. (1999). Vocabulary instruction through hypertext: Are there advantages over conventional methods of teaching? *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 4, 1–13.
- KRASHEN, S. (1989). We acquire vocabulary and spelling by reading: Additional evidence for the input hypothesis. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73, 440–464.
- LANSDOWN, S.H. (1991). Improving vocabulary knowledge using direct instruction, cooperative grouping, and reading in the junior high. *Illinois Reading Council Journal*, 19(4), 15–21.
- LUBLINER, S., & SMETANA, L. (2005). The effects of comprehensive vocabulary instruction on Title 1 students' metacognitive word-learning skills and reading comprehension. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 37, 163–199.
- MACKINNON, J. (1993). A comparison of three schema-based methods of vocabulary instruction (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1993). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 54, 07A.
- MARZANO, R.J. (2004). *Building background knowledge for academic achievement: Research on what works in schools*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.
- MARZANO, R.J., KENDALL, J.S., & PAYNTER, D.E. (2005). A list of essential words by grade level. In S. Paynter, E. Bodrova, & J. Doty (Eds.), *For the love of words: Vocabulary instruction that works* (pp. 127–202). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- MATTHEW, K.A. (1997). A comparison of the influence of interactive CD-ROM storybooks and traditional print storybooks on reading comprehension. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*, 29, 263–275.
- MCKENNA, M.C. (1998). Electronic texts and the transformation of beginning reading. In D. Reinking, M.C. McKenna, L.D. Labbo, & R.D. Kieffer (Eds.), *Handbook of literacy and technology: Transformations in a post-typographic world* (pp. 45–59). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- MCKEOWN, M.G. (1985). The acquisition of word meaning from context by children of high and low ability. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 20, 482–496.
- MCKEOWN, M.G. (1990). *Making dictionary definitions more effective*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.
- MCKEOWN, M.G., & CURTIS, M.E. (Eds.). (1987). *The nature of vocabulary acquisition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- MEZYSKI, K. (1983). Issues concerning the acquisition of knowledge: Effects of vocabulary training on reading comprehension. *Review of Educational Research*, 53, 263–279.
- MILLER, G.A., & GILDEA, P.M. (1987). How children learn words. *Scientific American*, 257, 94–99.
- MOLL, L.C. (1988). Some key issues in teaching Latino students. *Language Arts*, 65, 465–472.
- MOORE, M., & SMITH, L. (1996). Interactive computer software: The effects on young children's reading achievement. *Reading Psychology*, 17, 43–64.
- NAGY, W.E. (1988). *Teaching vocabulary to improve reading comprehension*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- NAGY, W.E. (2005). Why vocabulary instruction needs to be long-term and comprehensive. In E.H. Hiebert & M.L. Kamil (Eds.), *Teaching and learning vocabulary: Bringing research to practice* (pp. 27–44). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- NAGY, W.E., & ANDERSON, R.C. (1984). How many words are there in printed school English? *Reading Research Quarterly*, 19, 303–330.
- NAGY, W.E., DIAKIDOY, I.N., & ANDERSON, R.C. (1993). The acquisition of morphology: Learning the contributions of suffixes to the meanings of derivatives. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 25, 241–259.
- NAGY, W.E., HERMAN, P.A., & ANDERSON, R.C. (1985). Learning words from context. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 20, 233–253.
- NAGY, W., & SCOTT, J. (2000). Vocabulary processes. In M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr. (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, pp. 269–283). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- NATION, I.S.P. (1990). *Teaching and learning vocabulary*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- NATION, I.S.P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT. (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel: Reports of the subgroups*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- NICOL, J.E., & GRAVES, M.F. (1990). *Building vocabulary through prefix instruction*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
- NIST, S.L., & OLEJNIK, S. (1995). The role of context and dictionary definitions on varying levels of word knowledge. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30, 172–193.
- OTTERMAN, I.M. (1955). The value of teaching prefixes and word-roots. *Journal of Educational Research*, 48, 611–616.
- PANY, D., & JENKINS, J.R. (1978). Learning word meanings: A comparison of instructional procedures and effects on measures of reading comprehension with learning disabled students. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 1, 21–32.
- PARRY, K. (1991). Building a vocabulary through academic reading. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25, 629–653.
- PATBERG, J.P., GRAVES, M.F., & STIBBE, M.A. (1984). *Effects of active teaching and practice in facilitating students' use of context cues: Changing perspectives on research in reading/language processing and instruction* (33rd yearbook of the National Reading Conference, pp. 146–151). Rochester, NY: National Reading Conference.
- PAWLING, E. (1999). Modern languages and CD-ROM based learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 30, 163–176.
- PEARSON, P.D., & FIELDING, L. (1991). Comprehension instruction. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 2, pp. 815–860). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- PEARSON, P.D., KAMIL, M., MOSENTHAL, P., & BARR, R. (1984). *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 1). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- PETTY, W., HEROLD, C., & STOHL, E. (1967). *The state of the knowledge about the teaching of vocabulary* (Cooperative Research Project No. 3128). Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 012 395)
- PITTELMAN, S.D., LEVIN, K.M., & JOHNSON, D.D. (1985). *An investigation of two instructional settings in the use of semantic mapping with poor readers* (Program Report No. 854). Madison: University of Wisconsin, Center for Educational Research.
- REINKING, D., & RICKMAN, S.S. (1990). The effects of computer-mediated texts on the vocabulary learning and comprehension of intermediate-grade readers. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 22, 395–411.
- ROBBINS, C., & EHRI, L.C. (1994). Reading storybooks to kindergartners helps them learn new vocabulary words. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 86, 54–64.
- ROSENSHINE, B., & MEISTER, C. (1994). Reciprocal teaching: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 64, 478–530.
- RUDDLELL, M.R. (1994). Vocabulary knowledge and comprehension: A comprehension-process view of complex literacy relationships. In R.B. Ruddell, M.R. Ruddell, & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (4th ed., pp. 414–447). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- RYDER, R.J., & GRAVES, M.F. (1994). Vocabulary instruction presented prior to reading in two basal readers. *The Elementary School Journal*, 95, 139–153.
- RYDER, R.J., & SLATER, W.H. (1988). The relationship between word frequency and word knowledge. *Journal of Educational Research*, 81, 312–317.
- SCHATZ, E.I., & BALDWIN, R.S. (1986). Context clues are unreliable predictors of word meanings. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 21, 439–453.
- SCHEWEL, R. (1989, March). Semantic mapping: A study skills strategy. *Academic Therapy*, 24, 439–447.
- SCHWANENFLUGEL, P.J., HAMILTON, C.E., BRADLEY, B.A., RUSTON, H.P., NEUHARTH-PRITCHETT, S., & RESTREPO, M.A. (2005). Classroom practices for vocabulary enhancement in prekindergarten: Lesson plans from PAVED for success. In E.H. Hiebert & M.L. Kamil (Eds.), *Teaching and learning vocabulary: Bringing research to practice* (pp. 155–178). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- SCHWARTZ, R., & RAPHAEL, T. (1985). Concept of definition: A key to improving students' vocabulary. *The Reading Teacher*, 30, 198–205.
- SCOTT, J.A. (2005, May). *The development of word consciousness and general principles for teaching vocabulary*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Reading Association, San Antonio, TX.
- SCOTT, J.A., ASSELIN, M., HENRY, S.K., & BUTLER, C.E. (1997). *Making rich language visible: Reports from a multi-dimensional study on word learning*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, St. John's, Newfoundland.
- SCOTT, J.A., & BUTLER, C.E. (1994a). *Language arts in the 1990s: A survey of general practices with an emphasis on the teaching of vocabulary in literature-based classrooms*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- SCOTT, J.A., & BUTLER, C.E. (1994b, June). *Patterns in language arts instruction: A survey of intermediate teachers*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Calgary, AB.
- SCOTT, J.A., BUTLER, C.E., ASSELIN, M.M., & HENRY, S.K. (1996, December). *The effect of mediated assistance in word learning*. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Charleston, SC.
- SCOTT, J.A., JAMIESON-NOEL, D., & ASSELIN, M. (2003). Vocabulary instruction throughout the day in twenty-three Canadian upper-elementary classrooms. *The Elementary School Journal*, 103, 269–286.
- SCOTT, J.A., & NAGY, W.E. (1997). Understanding the definitions of unfamiliar verbs. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 32, 184–200.
- SÉNÉCHAL, M., & CORNELL, E.H. (1993). Vocabulary acquisition through shared reading experiences. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 28, 361–374.
- SÉNÉCHAL, M., THOMAS, E., & MONKER, J. (1995). Individual differences in 5 year olds' acquisition of vocabulary during storybook reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87, 218–229.
- SHU, H., ANDERSON, R.C., & ZHANG, H. (1995). Incidental word learning of word meanings while reading: A Chinese and American cross-cultural study. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30, 79–95.
- SLAVIN, R.E., & CHEUNG, A. (2003). *Effective reading programs for English language learners: A best-evidence synthesis*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, Center for the Education of Students Placed at Risk.
- SNOW, C. (1991). The theoretical basis of the home-school study of language and literacy development. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 6, 5–10.
- SNOW, C.E., BURNS, M.S., & GRIFFIN, P. (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. Retrieved December 31, 2003, from <http://books.nap.edu/html/prdyc>
- STAHL, S. (1983). Differential knowledge and reading comprehension. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 15, 33–50.
- STAHL, S., & FAIRBANKS, M. (1986). The effects of vocabulary instruction: A model-based meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 56, 72–110.
- STAHL, S., & VANCIL, S. (1986). Discussion is what makes semantic maps work in vocabulary instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 40, 62–69.
- STAHL, S.A., BURDGE, J.L., MACHUGA, M.B., & STECYK, S. (1992). The effects of semantic grouping on learning word meanings. *Reading Psychology*, 13, 19–35.
- STAHL, S.A., RICHEK, M.A., & VANDEVIER, R.J. (1991). Learning meaning vocabulary through listening: A sixth-grade replication. In J. Zutell & S. McCormick (Eds.), *Learner factors/teacher factors: Issues in literacy research and instruction* (40th yearbook of the National Reading Conference, pp. 185–192). Chicago: National Reading Conference.
- STANLEY, P.D., & GINTHER, D.W. (1991). The effects of purpose and frequency on vocabulary learning from written context of high and low ability reading comprehenders. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 30(4), 31–41.
- STERNBERG, R. (1987). Most vocabulary is learned from context. In M.G. McKeown & M.E. Curtis (Eds.), *The nature of vocabulary acquisition* (pp. 89–106). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- STERNBERG, R.J., & POWELL, J. (1983). Comprehending verbal comprehension. *American Psychologist*, *38*, 878–893.
- TEMPLIN, M.C. (1957). *Certain language skills in children, their development and interrelationships*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- TERMAN, L.M. (1916). *The measurement of intelligence*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- VERHOEVEN, L.T. (1990). Acquisition of reading in a second language. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *25*, 90–114.
- WALSH, K. (2003). Basal readers: The lost opportunity to build the knowledge that propels comprehension. *American Educator*, *21*(1), 24–27.
- WATTS, S.M. (1995). Vocabulary instruction during reading lessons in six classrooms. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, *27*, 399–424.
- WEST, M. (1953). *A general service list of English words*. London: Longman.
- WHITE, T.G., GRAVES, M.F., & SLATER, W.H. (1990). Growth of reading vocabulary in diverse elementary schools: Decoding and word meaning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *82*, 281–290.
- WHITE, T.G., SOWELL, J., & YANAGIHARA, A. (1989). Teaching elementary students to use word-part clues. *The Reading Teacher*, *42*, 302–308.
- WHITEHURST, G.J., ARNOLD, D.H., EPSTEIN, J.N., ANGELL, A.L., SMITH, M., & FISCHER, J.E. (1994). A picture book reading intervention in day care and home for children from low-income families. *Developmental Psychology*, *30*, 679–689.
- WHITEHURST, G.J., EPSTEIN, J.N., ANGELL, A.L., PAYNE, A.C., CRONE, D.A., & FISCHER, J.E. (1994). Outcomes of an emergent literacy intervention in Head Start. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *86*, 542–555.
- WHITEHURST, G.J., ZEVENBERG, A.A., CRONE, D.A., SCHULTZ, M.D., VELTING, O.N., & FISCHER, J.E. (1999). Outcomes of an emergent literacy intervention from Head Start through second grade. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *91*, 261–272.
- WITROCK, M.C., MARKS, C.B., & DOCTOROW, M.J. (1975). Reading as a generative process. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *67*, 484–489.
- WYSOCKI, K., & JENKINS, J.R. (1987). Deriving word meanings through morphological generalization. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *22*, 66–81.
- XIN, J.F., & RIETH, H. (2001). Video-assisted vocabulary instruction for elementary school students with learning disabilities. *Information Technology in Childhood Education Annual* (pp. 87–104). Norfolk, VA: Association for Advancement of Computing in Education.
- ZECHMEISTER, E.B., CHRONIS, A.M., CULL, W.L., D'ANNA, C.A., & HEALY, N.A. (1995). Growth of a functionally important lexicon. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, *27*, 201–312.