

Introduction and Literature Review - While you identify important an educational problem that needs to be addressed, confusion among definitions of populations of students creates some misleading and inaccurate information. Citations would help strengthen points you attempt to make (particularly in the first few paragraphs. Findings from studies The Effects of Using Storybook Intervention to Enhance Vocabulary Skills of Students at

Risk of Reading Difficulties located for your

review should

be reported in

the results section (this is your data)

Research question is

appropriate.

Methods - Good first attempt. Examples would be by clarify your criteria.

Results & Discussion - Organization (and back (theory) made most of the results; discussion difficult to follow. Work on clarity and supporting statements and ideas with citations from the literature.

Writing - Continue to work on clarity of writing and

App style.

George Mason University

Henrietta Rema Sawyer

Very good, please

Abstract

Reading storybooks to young children is the ideal way to introduce new words.

Unfortunately children of poverty or children at risk for reading disabilities do not have large

vocabulary knowledge and therefore struggle in reading. The purpose of this study is to

synthesize research on using storybook intervention and vocabulary instruction to improve the

academic performance of students at risk of reading difficulties. This search yielded ten

published studies that reported findings on the storybook intervention, including explicit

vocabulary instruction. All ten studies used a group research design methodology and the

students that took part in the studies were in pre-school, pre-kindergarten, kindergarten or first

grade. The findings revealed that when using the storybook intervention in which vocabulary is

explicitly taught, there is a possibility of improving academic performance of students especially

in reading.

Keywords

Storybook intervention, vocabulary, at risk children, English language

learners

The Effects of Using Storybook Intervention to Enhance Vocabulary Skills of Students at Risk of Reading Difficulties

Introduction

In recent times, some kindergarten students enter school with limited vocabulary

especially those students who did not enroll in prekindergarten program. Moreover, there has

been an increase in the number of English language learners in our schools. Due to lots of

families migrating to the United States, our classrooms have children from culturally and

linguistically diversified backgrounds. This is a main concern for educators especially because

there is the need to meet the needs of all the students in their classrooms. In addition to this, it

has become necessary for teachers to be trained and to attend professional development in order

to meet the needs of students who are at risk for reading difficulties because these children do

have language difficulties or impairments and are not able to communicate well in English as

compared to their peers who speak, write and comprehend the language of instruction. The

United States Department of Education did indicate that about eight million elementary and

middle school students are struggling readers and this makes it even more important to develop

vocabulary skills as early as possible (Pullen et al., 2010).

According to Pullen et al. (2010), vocabulary knowledge is a strong predictor of reading

comprehension. Current research indicates that majority of fourth grade students in the United

States, do not perform well academically, especially in reading. Moreover students who are not

exposed to large vocabulary words earlier on especially those in the lower elementary grade

levels are more likely to struggle in reading once they reach the upper grades (Maynard &

Coyne, 2010). Chlapana and Tafa (2014) notes that it is alarming to see a lot of children,

APA - write out all authors first time.

APA - write out all authors first time.

This is a reference to at-risk for disabilities, not for ELL students.

Citations would be made in this section.

APA

especially children from homes in which English is not the dominant language at school and that these children come to school with insufficient vocabulary. Kelley, Goldstein, Spencer, &

Sherman (2015), indicated that children from families with low socioeconomic status have

limited oral language skills and this puts them at risk for reading disabilities later on.

It is widely known that when students are exposed to rich literacy environments that

foster vocabulary development they are more likely to succeed in school and to understand or

comprehend books that they read as compared to their peers who have limited vocabulary

(Coyle, McCoach, & Kapp (2007). According to Coyle, McCoach & Kapp (2007), young

children are at a risk of experiencing reading and learning difficulties and being identified as

having a language or reading disability if they fall behind their peers in developing vocabulary

knowledge.

According to Chlapana and Tafa (2014), the ideal way of introducing words to children is

to read storybooks aloud for children to hear. Recent studies that have been conducted by

prominent researchers on vocabulary development suggests that children who come from low

socioeconomic backgrounds and who are poor are more likely to fall behind their peers who are

from high income families. Children with limited oral and language skills are more likely to be

at risk for reading disabilities, especially if they are from families with low socio economic status

(Kelley, Goldstein, Spencer, & Sherman, 2015). According to Coyle, McCoach, Loftus, Zipoli,

& Kapp (2009), children of poverty are more likely to have poor vocabulary skills compared to

their middle or high-income peers since initial oral vocabulary skills begin at home based on the

interactions and experiences that these children have with their family members (Coyle,

McCoach, Loftus, Zipoli, & Kapp, 2009). Nielsen and Frierson (2012), suggest that not all

APR
this is a finding from a study in your review it should be reported in your results section.

APR
it seems like you are saying that speakers are from other languages as English as primary from a low socioeconomic being socioeconomically disabled, likely causes a reading disability, not accurate.

children of poverty lag behind their peers but rather it depends on the language experiences that these children encounter as a result of being exposed to vocabulary words.

According to Wasik and Bond (2001), children learn vocabulary by reading books and also learn about conventions of print. Moreover, children who engaged in higher level

conversations and dialogue about the story perform better on vocabulary and language

measures that children who focused mainly on low level utterances such as describing a page or answering questions that required a yes or a no response. Wasik and Bond (2001) also indicate that children who are raised in poverty often enter school with limited exposure to books and have poor language skills. Children from low income families normally have lower vocabulary

when compared to their peers from middle and high income homes. Research also indicate that children who are engaged in reading a book with an adult learned more vocabulary compared to their peers who listened passively to the book reading (Wasik & Bond, 2001).

According to Coyne et al. (2009), research on storybook reading suggest that students who are at risk for language and literacy difficulties and have smaller vocabularies are less likely than their peers with larger vocabularies to learn words incidentally while listening to stories. Pullen et al. (2010) notes that vocabulary knowledge plays an important and critical role in an individual's process of becoming a reader because having a large repertoire of core vocabulary makes reading a text much easier than not knowing any words at all. Vocabulary knowledge is critical since it helps in learning to read and reading to learn (Pullen et al., 2010)

← Maynard and Coyne (2010), suggest that emergent literacy skills based on alphabetic principle, phonemic awareness and phonics only does not necessarily have an impact on students reading ability and that for students to be fluent readers, there is the need to build a strong foundation on phonics, alphabetic principle, phonemic awareness and vocabulary.

Source comment

Source comment

for results section

It belongs to search system - Maryam - show for this is a system -

Justice, Meier, & Walpole (2005) suggest that in order for vocabulary instruction to be successful, there is the need to emphasize explicit instruction of the words or core vocabulary needed to succeed in the general education classroom. Silverman (2007) indicated that when teaching vocabulary to children through read alouds, children should be actively engaged in defining, discussing, manipulating, experiencing, saying and spelling words.

According to Neilsen and Frieresen (2012), there is little research on vocabulary development in the lower grade levels in public schools, especially, in pre-kindergarten and kindergarten. As a result students are at risk for reading difficulties when they get to fourth grade. Research on storybook reading indicate that children who are at risk for language and literacy difficulties and have less vocabularies are more than likely to learn words incidentally while listening to stories. Research also suggests that there is the need to focus on developing the depth of vocabulary knowledge by providing students with opportunities to discuss and interact with the words they hear during storybook reading (Coyne, McCoach, Loftus, Zipoli, & Kapp, 2009). Huemkens and Xu (2010) indicated the importance of family involvement on children's literacy development and suggest that children's vocabulary, phonological awareness, decoding skills, print concepts, and alphabet awareness can be developed through when families engage their children during storybook reading.

The purpose for conducting this study is to develop and enhance vocabulary skills of students who are at risk for reading difficulties by using storybooks. My research question is what is the impact of storybook intervention in enhancing vocabulary skills in students who are at risk for reading difficulties?

Source
comment.

Method

Search procedures. A systematic search was conducted to locate vocabulary and

storybook intervention studies for students at-risk for reading difficulties conducted over fifteen

years (2000-2015). A data base search was conducted using EBSCO, ERIC (Educational

Resources Information Center), Social Sciences Citation Index and PsycInfo databases using a

combination of keywords: *storybook intervention, vocabulary, reading interventions, and*

students at risk for reading difficulties. Ancestry searches were conducted using relevant studies

as well as previous literature reviews (i.e., Snow et al., 1991). However, this article did not meet

the criteria since articles selected had to be between the year 2000 and 2015. Descendent

searches were conducted using google scholar databases. In addition, hand searches were

conducted of the two most recent issues of journal in the field of special education that

commonly publish studies with participants who are at risk for reading disabilities (i.e., *Reading*

Psychology, Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, etc.)

Looking, but you
seem to be focusing on
on ELL? It may be
used.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria Studies were included in this research synthesis (a) the language

only-if-the studies were peer reviewed, (b) the student participants were at risk for reading

difficulties, (the participants were either English language learners, or students struggling to read,

(c) the studies focused on developing vocabulary skills using a storybook intervention, (d) the

participants were in the lower grade levels, preferably in pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, first,

second or third grade level), (e) if the study involved more than one participants, and (f) if the

study was an intervention study that used a group research design. Studies were excluded if the

studies did not use a storybook intervention, the study was published prior to 1999, and if the

study was not peer reviewed. Studies were also excluded if the study involved participants who

reading
difficulty
is not
the same
thing as
reading
disability.

If you
want
high
level
research
that
surpassed
your
own
standards.

These criteria don't seem
to go together

used.

used.

used.

used.

used.

used.

used.

used.

were identified as part of the special education population of if the study involved participants with disabilities. Studies were also excluded if it involved participants in the upper grade levels. In addition to this, studies were excluded if the intervention involved parents as participants in the study. Studies were included if the intervention involved using storybooks; however, studies were also excluded if the intervention involved the use of electronic storybooks (e.g. Korat & Shamir, 2006). Studies were excluded if the study was an intervention study that used a single subject research design.

I'm not clear on this decision.
Included by these decisions as well

Coding procedures, A coding instrument and coding manual with coding conventions

were developed for the systematic review. Studies that met all criteria were coded using the coding manual. The coding manual focused on the following major categories: (a) study information (including study identification number, year of publication, journal code, author's names, number of students in the study, grade level of students, gender, mean age, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status), (b) academic achievement, (c) information concerning students at risk for reading difficulties, (d) special education population, English language learner populations, (e) the size of the instructional group, (f) comparison and treatment group information, (g) information concerning interventionists, (h) type of interventionist, (i) information about training for interventionist and the length of training, (j) research design, (k) type of intervention, (l) information about the content area for the study, (m) type of text used in the intervention and criteria for selecting books and the number of books used in the study, (n) the number of words selected from the storybook, (o) materials used during the intervention, and (p) measure information. A total of ten studies were coded. The coding manual provided instructions as to how to code studies. Coders had to refer to the article or study being coded and look for specific items and provide the page numbers of where to find those specific items in the article or study.

This section isn't very clear.
Splitting several sentences and adding words.
Why?

After finding the information, and noting the page numbers on the coding sheet, the coder had to assign numerical values for the information found on the coding sheet. The information or data collected was then put in SPSS, which is a statistical software program for data analysis.

Results

For the purpose of this synthesis only ten studies were reviewed. The ten articles for this

study came from the following journals: Learning disabilities Research and Practice, Literacy

Research and Instruction, Language Speech and Hearing Services, Reading and Writing, Journal

of Reading Psychology, Journal of Educational Psychology, Reading Psychology, Journal of Early

Intervention, Early Childhood Research Quarterly, The Elementary School Journal and Journal of

Research and Educational Effectiveness.

APP - journal names are italicized.

Table 1 provides an overview of studies included in this synthesis according to the focus

of the intervention. Table 1 describes studies that examined the storybook intervention. All the

studies used a group research design, which is also known as an experimental research design,

single group, single group pretest-posttest design, treatment control, multiple group comparison.

In table 1, column 1 includes the author names and publication date. Column two represent the

grade levels of the participants. Column three provides the total number of participants who took

part in the studies as well as provides specific information on the number of male students and the

number of female students who participated in the studies. Column four provides information of

the different ethnic groups. Information on whether participants were white, black or African

American, Hispanic and Asian was provided. Students from other ethnic groups were put into the

other category. The fifth column describes the setting where the studies took place. For example

whether the study occurred in a classroom or whether the intervention was a one-on-one

intervention or whether it occurred in small groups. The sixth column described the criteria used

Remember you have 8 pages of text which you are reading to organize the results for the reader. Why didn't you do this?

This description is not hypothetical with this text
you should have coded all studies most with inclusion criteria

in book selection. The seventh column provides information on criteria for word selection. The eighth column provides example of words. The ninth column provides information on who the interventionist were for the studies. The tenth column focuses on the duration for the intervention. The eleventh column describes the treatment administered to participants. The twelfth column describes the measures for each study and the thirteenth column summarizes the results reported in each study.

In analyzing all ten studies, the minimum number of students who took part in all ten

studies is eighteen students and the maximum number of students who participated in the studies

was two hundred and twenty four students. The mean number of students who took part was 94.70

and the standard deviation was 74.355. Eight out of ten studies had seven male participants as the

minimum number of students and one hundred and sixteen male students as the maximum number

of male students. The average number of male students for all ten studies is 38.63 and the standard

deviation was 33.423. Eight out of the ten studies had eight female participants as the minimum

number of students taking part in the studies. The maximum number of female participants that

took part in the studies was one hundred and eight (108). In terms of ethnicity, four out of the ten

studies had three students being white and this was the minimum number of students who were

white. The maximum number of white participants was one hundred and thirty. The average

number of white participants was 35.25 and the standard deviation was 63.174.

Moreover, five out of the ten studies had eight students being black and this was the

minimum number of black students among all ten students. The maximum number of black

students who took part in all ten students was fifty and the mean was 28.80 and the standard

deviation was 19.005. In addition to this, four out of ten studies had no Hispanic students. The

maximum number of Hispanic students that participated was 22, the mean was 9.25, and the

See App
for manual
for how
to report
Means
and Standard
Deviation

?

much?

standard deviation was 9.912. Four out of the ten studies had only one Asian student taking part in the studies. This was the minimum number in all ten studies. The maximum of Asian students was fourteen and the mean number of Asian students who took part in this study was 5.50, making the standard deviation to be 5.802.

In terms of socioeconomic status, all ten studies reported the socioeconomic status of the students who participated in the studies. Three out of the ten studies reported that academic achievement of students as being minimal. In other words, the studies did not provide sufficient information regarding the academic achievement of students after the intervention. Seven out of the ten studies provided detailed information regarding the academic achievement. Moreover, two studies did not provide any information or data concerning participants who were at risk for reading disabilities. Six studies provided some information about participants being at risk for reading disabilities, but this information was very limited. Two of the studies provided detailed information and data concerning participants at risk for reading disability. In determining whether special education population was included in the studies, none of the studies had students in that category. However, seven out of the ten studies had no English language learners taking part in the studies. Three studies had English language learners as participants in the studies.

In determining the size of the instructional group, three studies had more than one hundred participants taking part in the intervention. One study had ten to sixty participants and three studies had less than ten participants taking part in the intervention. Two studies did not provide any procedures used to increase the likelihood that relevant characteristics of participants in the sample were comparable across conditions. Two studies had procedures but no disaggregated data and six out of ten studies had procedures and disaggregated data presented. Random assignment or

Handwritten notes in the left margin:
13
15
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

matching actually occurred in only two studies. In addition to this, two other studies had assignment by instructional groups and six studies had random assignment by student.

In comparing interventionist information provided regarding interventionist, three out of the ten studies did not provide any information about interventionist. Five out of the ten studies described the interventionist and two of the ten studies described the interventionist and were comparable across conditions. Two studies out of the ten studies did not provide any information concerning the type of interventionist. One study had the researcher, parent, and language interpreter collecting data and following procedures for the intervention. Another study had a language interpreter as the interventionist. Three studies had graduates and teachers as the interventionist, two studies had only graduate students and one study had the researcher as the interventionist for the study. In terms of whether the interventionist were trained prior to doing the intervention, five studies did not provide any information concerning training of the interventionist. Five other studies did provide information concerning training of the interventionist. In relation to how long the training lasted, all ten studies did not provide any information about the length of training.

Two studies involved using the quasi-experimental study and five studies involved using a group research design. All ten studies used the storybook and vocabulary intervention. Eight out of the ten studies focused on reading and vocabulary instruction. Two studies focused on vocabulary instruction. Three out of the ten studies focused on narrative text. The other seven studies did not indicate the type of text used in the intervention. The criteria that was used in book selection by the various studies varied from one study to the other. For example, Justice et al. (2005), chose books that had colorful illustrations that helped to narrate the text, contained vocabulary words in the text that were unlikely to be known by the children and were neither

excessively too long nor heavily reliant on text for telling the story. Three studies did not have any criteria for selecting books. Ewers & Brownson (1999) chose book that were age appropriate for the children. Coyne et al. (2009) selected books based on the story of Goldilocks. Coyne et al. (2010) selected books on what kindergarteners were interested in and included engaging narratives, rich language, and illustrative pictures. Storybooks were included if it had multicultural characters and themes. Nielsen & Friksen (2012) selected books that were narratives. The books selected included characters goals, attempts to reach goals and resolution. The length of the books and whether the books were appealing to the kindergarteners were also taken into consideration. Kelley et al. (2015) selected books that had words that were challenging.

In terms of audio narration, eight studies did not use any audio narration. Only two studies used audio narration. In terms of the length of the intervention, two studies conducted their intervention in two weeks. Five studies had their intervention lasting more than ten weeks and one study did not provide any information about the length of the intervention. The number of books used in an intervention is very important. Two studies did not specify the number of books used in the study. Six studies used more than one book and two studies used only one book. One study provided information on the kind of materials included in the intervention package. For example, Kelley et al. (2015) had a dialogue reading protocol, reading questions, and contact information for interpreter. Eight studies used only storybooks. For fidelity of implementation, one study did not provide this information. For examples, Nielsen & Friksen (2012) did not provide any information concerning fidelity of implementation in their study. Four studies described procedures but did not provide any data to go with it. Five studies described the procedures and reported data as well. All ten studies included measures in their studies and all ten studies also included measures of vocabulary in their studies.

Ten studies addressed the question of whether the storybook intervention with vocabulary instruction is an effective way to improve reading with students at risk of reading difficulties. Chlapana & Tafa (2014) examined the impact of direct instruction and interactive instruction on immigrant kindergarten children's vocabulary learning during storybook reading. The first children were randomly assigned to two experimental groups and one control group. In the first experimental group, target words were explained to children by direct instruction. The second experimental group the children were involved in discussing target words according to interactive instruction techniques. In the control group stories were read without any explanation of target words. The results indicate that interactive instruction was more beneficial on target vocabulary learning as compared to direct instruction. (Chlapana & Tafa, 2014).

Coyne et al. (2009) compared two methods of direct teaching word meanings to kindergarten students using storybook intervention. The first method was embedded instruction and the second method was extended instruction. The findings indicated that the extended instruction resulted in more full and refined word knowledge, while the embedded instruction resulted in partial knowledge of targeted vocabulary (Coyne et al., 2009):

Coyne et al. (2010) used a quasi-experimental design in their study. Eighty kindergarten students were taught the meaning of fifty four vocabulary words. Students were divided into three groups. Students in group one receive intensive experimental vocabulary intervention as compared to students in group two. Students in group three also received vocabulary intervention. Findings indicate that students who received vocabulary intervention outperformed students who did not receive vocabulary intervention (Coyne et al., 2010):

Ewers and Brownson (1999) used an experimental design to investigate the effect of active versus passive storybook reading conditions on the vocabulary acquisition of kindergarteners.

↑
 2- narrative
 review
 stylistic
 N.S.
 sec from
 15 marks
 Hypothesis

APA

Participants were randomly assigned to active or passive storybook reading conditions. The results revealed that children with higher vocabulary knowledge acquired more words than their peers with lower vocabulary skills. Thus, active participants acquired more words than passive participants (Ewers & Brownson, 1999).

Justice et al. (2005) conducted a study in which a pre-test and posttest research design was used. Fifty seven kindergartners took part in this study. Children in the treatment group completed twenty small group storybook reading sessions during which they were exposed to sixty words. Children in the treatment group also completed a book reading intervention using ten storybooks. Children in the comparison group were incidentally exposed to thirty vocabulary words. The results indicated that children in the treatment group made gains in elaborated words compared to children in the comparison group (Justice et al., 2005).

Kelley et al. (2015) conducted a study in which the treatment group used a small group intervention in which vocabulary and question-answering lessons are embedded in a series of storybooks. Participants were randomly assigned to the comparison group and completed measures of vocabulary and comprehension. The results indicated that participants who were exposed to the story friends small group intervention performed better and had significantly higher scores on measures of vocabulary than the comparison group (Kelley et al., 2015).

Maynard et al. (2010) study compared rich and basic instruction of target vocabulary to incidental exposure during storybook reading. Two hundred and twenty four first grade students were randomly assigned to a condition in the classroom. There were three groups in all and all three groups received instruction of the storybook intervention for approximately thirty minutes. The results indicated that rich instruction was superior and better than basic and incidental exposure across all measures (Maynard et al., 2010).

Nielson and Frieresen (2012) investigated the effects of small group storybook intervention on kindergarten student's vocabulary and narrative development. Twenty eight kindergartners were randomly assigned to intervention or control group. Students in the intervention group were engaged in a thirty minute storybook lesson for twelve weeks which focused on vocabulary and narrative development. Results indicated that students in the treatment group did perform better than those in the control group.

Pullen et al. (2010) on the other hand conducted a study in which two hundred and twenty four first grade students were randomly assigned to groups. There were three groups in all and students were put into these groups based on whether they were at risk for reading difficulties and did receive some form of intervention which was based on storybooks and vocabulary. The results indicated that students at risk for reading failure do benefit from tier two vocabulary instruction.

Wasik and Bond (2001) conducted a study in which one hundred and twenty seven four year olds from low income families were randomly assigned to the intervention condition with lasted fifteen weeks. Students in the experiment group in which the interactive book reading intervention was implemented did perform better than children in the comparison group.

Discussion

~~The purpose of this study was to provide a synthesis of the research on storybook intervention conducted with students at risk of reading difficulties. The goal was to locate all intervention studies published within the past sixteen years that evaluated the effects of storybook intervention and vocabulary instruction on elementary students who are at risk of reading difficulties. In general, the findings from this synthesis suggested that using storybook intervention that focuses on providing explicit vocabulary instruction can improve students' academic performance in reading. One way to improve reading is to develop vocabulary skills.~~

*This is hypothetical not read at all
discuss*

Research show that children initially acquire words in their home environment from the conversations with and among adults and that children who grow up in homes that do not provide rich language and literacy experiences may not develop the foundation in vocabulary necessary for academic learning (Silverman, 2007). Another way is for adults to explicitly teach core vocabulary. Often times teachers do not spend time teaching vocabulary to students. Not having enough time to teach core vocabulary to students is one of the main issues that need consideration. When reading storybooks to children, it is important to use that opportunity to engage students in the text and to explain, define, and discuss words from the text in order for children to understand the meaning of the words based on the context. Allowing students to collaborate together is another way of developing vocabulary skills in children. Asking peers, who are often better readers to serve as a model for students at risk for reading difficulties is another way to enhance vocabulary skills in children. According to Maynard et al. (2010), vocabulary knowledge plays an important role in comprehending text and reading as a whole. Research also suggest the need for explicit instruction in vocabulary.

According to Pullen et al. (2010), children who enter school with deficits in vocabulary knowledge may not be fluent readers and may have problems understanding or comprehending text. Pullen et al. (2010) indicate the need for early intervention to reduce the gap that is evident in children with low and high vocabularies. Finding from the study conducted by Justice et al. (2005), reveal incidental exposure to novel words resulted in nonsignificant word learning gains for at risk kindergarteners. Another major finding was that children in the treatment group showed greater gains from pre-test to posttest compared to those in the comparison group. Findings from Coyne et al. (2009) study revealed that there was a significant differences at posttest that focused on extended and embedded instruction.

APA

you need citations for these classes

There are implications for practice. For many students struggling to read, particularly students at risk for reading difficulties, becoming a fluent reader is a challenge that must be overcome in order to progress in reading. Despite the role of vocabulary or word knowledge in reading, vocabulary instruction has not played a prominent role in reading instruction. Because of this apparent lack of attention to vocabulary development, recent synthesis of research on reading have highlighted the importance of including vocabulary building as part of daily instruction.

As discussed previously a lot of children who enter kindergarten and are labelled at risk children are children of poverty and are behind their middle and high income peers in vocabulary development. Findings from the studies show that it is possible to increase vocabulary with explicit instruction. This implies that it is imperative for teachers of young children to provide explicit instruction that focuses on vocabulary. Teachers therefore play an important role in language development.

Another implication is that kindergarten teachers and teachers in the lower grade levels should use interactive instruction practices which encourage young children to actively participate in vocabulary instruction. In addition to this, there is the need for repetitive and multiple exposures to vocabulary words and vocabulary can be acquired through incidental learning.

Overall, the findings from this research synthesis suggest that for children to improve academically, especially to read fluently. Teachers must find time to teach vocabulary and word meanings to children who are at risk for reading difficulties and it is through storybook reading that is interactive and actively engages students that vocabulary can be taught explicitly to children.

When
are
children
more
likely
to
support
these
stakeholders

References

*Chlapana, E., & Tafa, E. (2014). Effective practices to enhance immigrant kindergarteners' second language vocabulary learning through storybook reading. *Reading and Writing*, 27(9), 1619-1640. doi: 10.1007/s11145-014-9510-7

*Coyne, M. D., McCoach, D. B., Loftus, S., Zipoli, R., & Kapp, S. (2009). Direct vocabulary instruction in kindergarten: Teaching for breadth versus depth. *The Elementary School Journal*, 110(1), 1-18.

*Coyne, M. D., McCoach, D. B., Loftus, S., Zipoli, R., Ruby, M., Crevecoeur, Y. C., & Kapp, S. (2010). Direct and extended vocabulary instruction in kindergarten: Investigating transfer effect. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 3(2), 93-120. doi: 10.1080/19345741003592410

*Ewers, C. A., & Brownson, S. M. (1999). Kindergarteners' vocabulary acquisition as a function of active versus passive storybook reading, a prior vocabulary and working memory. *Journal of Reading Psychology*, 20, 11-20.

Huennekens M. E., & Xu, Y. (2010). Effects of a cross linguistic storybook intervention on the second language development of two preschool English language learners. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 38, 19-26. doi: 10.1007/s10643-010-0385-1

*Justice, L. M., Meier, J., & Walpole, S. (2005). Learning new words from storybooks: An efficacy study with at-risk kindergarteners. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 36(1), 17-32. doi: 10.1044/0161-1461(2005/003).

Only minor HiH errors, but some consistent mistakes -
 be sure to work on these.

- *Kelley, E. S., Goldstein, H., Spencer, T. D., & Sherman, A. (2015). Effects of automated tier two storybook intervention on vocabulary and comprehension learning in preschool children with limited oral language skills. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 31*, 47-61. doi: 10.1016/j.ecresq.2014.12.004.
- *Maynard, K. L., Pullen, P. C., & Coyne, M. D. (2010). Teaching vocabulary to first grade students through repeated shared storybook reading: A comparison of rich and basic instruction to incidental exposure. *Literacy Research and Instruction, 49*(3), 209-242. doi: 10.1080/19388070902943245
- *Nielsen, D. C., & Friesen, L. D. (2012). A study of the effectiveness of a small group intervention on the vocabulary and narrative development of at-risk kindergarten children. *Reading Psychology, 33*(3), 269-299. doi:0.1080/02702711.2010.508671
- *Pullen, P. C., Tuckwiller, E. D., Konold, T. R., Maynard, K. L., & Coyne, M. D. (2010). A tiered intervention model for early vocabulary instruction: The effects of tiered intervention for young students at risk for reading disability. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 25*(3), 110-123. Doi: 10.1111/j.1540-5826.2010.00309.x
- Silverman, R. D. (2007). Vocabulary development of English language and English only learners in Kindergarten. *The Elementary School Journal, 107*(4), 365-383.
- *Wasik, B. A., & Bond, M. A. (2001). Beyond the pages of a book: Interactive book reading and language development in preschool classroom. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 93*(2), 243-250.

Table 1
Literature Table

Study	Grade	Participants	Ethnicity	Setting
Chlapana & Tara (2014)	Kindergarten	87 students 42 male 45 female	Not reported	Classroom
Coyne et al. (2009)	Kindergarten	42 students 19 male 23 female	White (3) Black (8) Hispanic (12) Asian (1)	Small Group
Coyne et al. (2010)	Kindergarten	80 students 40 male 40 female	Not reported	Small Group
Ewers & Brownson (1999)	Kindergarten	66 students 30 male 36 female	White	Classroom
Justice et al. (2005)	Kindergarten	57 students 35 male 22 female	White (5) Black (48) Asian (4)	I on 1 Small Groups
Kelley et al. (2015)	Pre-K	18 students 11 male	Black (18)	Classroom and Small Groups

Handwritten notes:
 Your families are not in APP - are not in home care fully making them MISW + consider the reported
 as table of + of pages which is a parallelism are the restrictions, see published reviews for better understanding.

		7 female			
		224 students	First Grade	Maynard et al. (2010)	
Classroom	White (130) Black (50) Hispanic (22) Asian (14) Other (8)	116 male 108 female			
Classrooms	White (3) Black (20) Hispanic (3) Asian (3)	28 students 20 male 8 female	Kindergarten	Nielson & Friesen (2012)	
Small Groups	Not reported	224 students	First Grade	Pullen et al. (2010)	
Classroom	Black (94%)	121 students	Pre-K	Wasik & Bond (2001)	

Continuation of Literature Table

Study	Criteria for Book Selection	Criteria for Word Selection
Chlapana & Tafa (2014)	Books recently published were selected for the study.	Words were chosen from the storybooks Words included nouns, verbs and adjectives
Coyne et al. (2009)	Storybooks were selected based on the story of Goldilocks.	Rare words were selected of very low frequency Tier two words were selected for instruction
Coyne et al. (2010)	Storybooks were based on what kindergarten were interested in, and included engaging narratives, rich language and illustrative pictures. Storybooks depicted multicultural characters and themes.	Words were chosen that typical kindergarten students would unlikely not know Words included nouns, verbs and adjectives

<p>Ewers & Brownson (1999)</p>	<p>Age appropriate books for kindergarten</p>	<p>Not Provided</p>
<p>Justice et al. (2005)</p>	<p>Books contained colorful illustrations that helped to narrate the text. Books contained vocabulary words in the text that were unlikely to be known by children, were neither excessively too long nor heavily reliant on text for telling the story</p>	<p>Words were selected from storybooks in series of collaborative discussions. A word was required to meet the categorization of a tier two word that is a medium to high frequency word that occurs across a variety of contexts for mature language users. Words needed to be judged as likely unknown by kindergarten children. Target words needed to occur in the storybook text in a nondirective manner. A target word could occur only one time in the text of the storybook from which it was selected.</p>

<p>Maynard et al. (2010)</p>	<p>Not provided</p>	<p>Words were selected from the storybook Goldilocks and the Three Bears</p>
<p>Kelley et al. (2015)</p>	<p>Challenging vocabulary words, basic concept words and story questions</p>	<p>Target words were age appropriate Challenging vocabulary words were selected to represent tier two words in the model of robust vocabulary instruction Sophisticated high utility words that represent concepts that preschool children would know and that would allow for greater precision in expression The words were unlikely to be in the lexicon of pre-K children with limited vocabulary The word was likely to occur relatively frequently in the conversation of adult speakers The word could be defined simply with a child friendly definition</p>

<p>Nielson & Friersen (2012)</p> <p>The books selected were narratives. They included characters goal, attempts to reach goals and resolution, the length of the books, and whether the books were appealing to the kindergartners.</p>	<p>Words were chose based on their frequency in the books and also whether they could be categorized as tier two words</p>	<p>Not Provided</p>
<p>Pullen et al. (2010)</p> <p>Storybooks provided multiple exposures to target words</p>	<p>Words selected were unfamiliar to children</p>	<p>Wasik & Bond (2001)</p> <p>Books were selected based on themes.</p>

Continuation of Literature Table

Study	Example of Words	Delivery	Duration
Chiapana & Tafa (2014)	Not Provided	Researcher	2 weeks
Coye et al. (2009)	Weald, duvet, domicile, parlor, lass, shards	Graduate Students	1 week
Coyne et al. (2010)	Peculiar	Classroom teachers	18 weeks
Ewers & Brownson (1999)	Not Provided	Not provided	Not Provided
Justice et al. (2005)	Heaved, pouted, ruffle, gaze, ripple, surface, discovered, furnace, gloomy, overjoyed, rare, wondered, decided, notice, tight	Graduate students	10 weeks
Kelley et al (2015)	High, low, many, few	Adult Facilitator and Research Staff	14 weeks

Wasik & Bond (2001)	Flowers, carrot	Shovel, rake, insects,	Classroom Teachers	15 weeks
Pullen et al. (2010)	Not Provided		Graduate Students and Research Assistants	2 weeks
Nielson & Frieresen (2012)	Bard		Classroom Teachers	12 weeks
Maynard et al. (2010)	Weald, duvet, torrid, fatigued, dismay, smithereens, impish, revelation		Professor and Graduate Students	1 week

Continuation of Literature Table

Study	Treatment or	Measure
Chlapana & Tafa (2014)	Storybook Intervention	Non-verbal cognitive ability measure Peabody Picture Vocabulary test Target Vocabulary Test
Coyne et al. (2009)	Storybook Intervention and vocabulary instruction	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Expressive Target Word Definition Measure Receptive Target Word Definition Measure
Coyne et al (2010)	Storybook Intervention Vocabulary Instruction	Measure of Target Word Knowledge Measure of General Vocabulary Knowledge Measure of Listening Comprehension Measure of Metalinguistic Awareness
Ewers & Brownson (1999)	Storybook Intervention Vocabulary Instruction	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Pretest form of the Senechal Vocabulary Test The Children's Test of Non-word Repetition
Justice et al. (2005)	Storybook Intervention Vocabulary Instruction	Criterion Referenced Assessment
Kelley et al (2015)	Storybook Intervention Vocabulary Instruction	Unit Vocabulary Test Assessment of Story Comprehension

Measures of Receptive and Expressive Vocabulary	Storybook Intervention	Maynard et al (2010)	Posttest measures
The Expressive One Word Picture Vocabulary Test	Storybook Intervention	Nielson & Friesen (2012)	Test
Post-test Measure of Target Word Knowledge	Storybook Intervention	Pullen et al. (2010)	Measure of Expressive Level of Word Knowledge
Measure of Contextual Level of Word Knowledge	Vocabulary Instruction		Measure of Receptive Level of Word Knowledge
Measure of Expressive Level of Word Knowledge	Storybook Intervention		PPVT-4
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – III	Storybook Intervention	Wasik & Bond (2001)	Receptive Language Measure
A Measure of Expressive Vocabulary	Vocabulary Instruction		

Continuation of Literature Table

Study	Results
Chlapana & Tafa (2014)	Results showed that interactive instruction was more beneficial on target vocabulary learning that direct instruction and the impact was greater for instructed words than for uninstructed ones. In additions results showed that boys and girls responded differently to the teaching procedures. Specifically in both conditions where teaching procedures were implemented, girls outperformed boys on instructed words. Furthermore, children's initial level in Greek Receptive vocabulary and target word knowledge had a significant impact on target word learning.
Coyne et al. (2009)	The results indicated that extended instruction resulted in more full and refined word knowledge, while embedded instruction resulted in partial knowledge of target vocabulary.
Coyne et al (2010)	Results indicate that students who received vocabulary instruction outperformed controls on a measure of target word knowledge as well as measures of generalized receptive vocabulary related to posttest performance on all measures.
Ewers & Brownson (1999)	The results revealed that children with higher vocabulary knowledge acquired significantly more words than lower vocabulary peers. Active participants acquired significantly more words than passive participants and children with high versus low working memory did not differ in word acquisition

<p>Justice et al. (2005)</p> <p>Overall word-learning gains were modest. Children in the treatment group made significantly greater gains in elaborated words relative to children in the comparison group. No influence of storybook reading exposure was seen for non-elaborated words. Children with low vocabulary scores made the greatest gains in elaborated words.</p>	
<p>Kelley et al (2015)</p> <p>Story friends' participants had significantly higher scores on measures of vocabulary than the comparison group and the effect sizes were larger, whereas more modest effects were shown for comprehension measures.</p>	
<p>Maynard et al (2010)</p> <p>Results indicated that rich instruction was superior to both basic and incidental exposure across all taught measures.</p>	
<p>Nielson & Friesen (2012)</p> <p>The intervention students made greater gains on both standardized and non-standardized measures of vocabulary and narrative achievement than did the control group children</p>	
<p>Pullen et al. (2010)</p> <p>Results revealed significant differences in measures of target vocabulary knowledge at the receptive and context level, suggesting that students at risk for reading failure benefit significantly from a second tier of vocabulary instruction.</p>	
<p>Wasik & Bond (2001)</p> <p>Children who were in the interactive book reading intervention scored significantly better than children in the comparison group on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – III and other measures of receptive and expressive language.</p>	