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Abstract

To increase vocabulary knowledge, 25 first grade African American students were engaged in systematic vocabulary instruction connected to five storybooks. The storybooks were read orally, followed by activities to expand the meanings of the words. Data was collected at the beginning of the study assessing the students’ prior knowledge of all 30 words. A final posttest of all the words was administered following the conclusion of the intervention. Each week, the students completed a pretest and posttest to measure the effectiveness of the six words taught in the weekly lessons. All assessments were examiner created and included multiple choice definition options on the pretest and posttest of all 30 words and a weekly six question pretest and posttest. The results indicated that overall, there was significant effect on the vocabulary acquisition from the intervention.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

In the primary grades, many components contribute to a student’s success in reading proficiency. One component which has emerged as a significant indicator of reading success is vocabulary knowledge. The knowledge of word meanings is a large predictor of reading comprehension and fluency in primary grades but also later on in high school (Beck, & McKeown, 2007; Cunningham & Stanovich, 1997). Many children enter school with rich literary experiences and others not. These early experiences nurture a wide range of knowledge of word meanings. First-grade children from higher-SES groups knew twice as many words as children from lower-SES group (Graves, Brunetti, & Slater, 1982; Graves & Slater, 1987). Therefore, a child’s word knowledge is closely related to reading proficiency. Thus, more attention has been directed to vocabulary instruction to bolster word knowledge acquisition in early primary grades (Biemiller, 2001). Recent research has also studied the impact of vocabulary instruction on children in kindergarten and first grade (Beck & McKeowen, 2007; Biemiller & Boote, 2006; Coyne M. D., McCoach, Loftus, Zipoli Jr., & Kapp, 2009; Justie, Meier & Walpole, 2005; Silverman, 2007). In these studies, researchers have examined many approaches for vocabulary instruction. Research by Beck, Perfetti, and McKeowen (1982) and McKeowen et al. (1987) has indicated that instruction which enables frequent exposure to each word, rich instruction with discussion regarding the word’s meaning, and opportunities to use the word outside the classroom have positive effects on a building a child’s vocabulary knowledge. Other research has examined approaches such as dramatizing and illustrating words, defining words, and using words in new contexts (Beck & McKeowen, 2007; Silverman, 2007). Studies have also used storybook read-alouds as a context of implementing rich vocabulary instruction (Silverman &
Crandell, 2010). Especially in primary grades, vocabulary instruction is an important part of a balanced reading program.

**Action Research Considerations**

As a first grade teacher in an urban school in the Midwest, I noticed how many of the African-American first grade students lacked experience in both vocabulary knowledge and read aloud experiences with storybooks. I decided to conduct my research on read aloud literature as a context to teach vocabulary. I wanted to determine if there was an impact on vocabulary instruction used with storybook read alouds. I conducted my study on my first grade class in a K4 to 8th grade choice school in the central city. The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of vocabulary instruction using read aloud literature with first grade students. The research question was: What effect does vocabulary instruction paired with read aloud literature have on first grade students reading achievement?

During the course of six weeks, I engaged my students in storybook read alouds and vocabulary discussions and activities. This aligns with Common Core Standards in Language: Vocabulary Acquisition and Use. Thus, teaching vocabulary with a read aloud as a context to conduct this study aligns with standard L1.4: Determine or clarify the meaning of unknown and multiple-meaning words and phrases based on grade one reading and content, choosing flexibly from an array of strategies (Common Core Standards Initiative, 2010). The storybooks that were selected were developmentally appropriate and engaging for students in the first grade. I began the study with a pretest of the 30 vocabulary words that were to be taught. Each week consisted of a pretest on the six words that would be taught with a storybook, a read aloud of the storybook, discussion of text and vocabulary words as they appeared in text and follow-up activities after each lesson’s discussions. This section of the weekly sessions aligns with the
Common Core Standard in Language for grade 1; L1.5: With guidance and support from adults, demonstrate understanding of word relationships and nuances in word meanings (Common Core Standards Initiative, 2010). Through discussion of each vocabulary word meaning, students were provided examples and non-examples of the target vocabulary words meaning. The week ended with a posttest of the six words. For each storybook, I followed the discussion activities from a curriculum specifically focused on teaching vocabulary words using children’s literature, *Text Talk: Level B* (Beck & McKeown, 2005). A posttest of the six words studied was administered at the end of the week. After the completion of five weeks of storybooks and instruction, a cumulative posttest of all 30 words learned throughout the study was administered.

In this first chapter, relevant research was examined, an overview of the research study was provided, and key vocabulary terms were defined. In the next chapter, the discussion of more relevant research connected to vocabulary knowledge and read alouds is expanded.

**Key Terms**

Tier one words: Basic words. These words rarely require instructional attention in school to their meanings in school. Examples include: clock, baby, happy, walk (Beck, McKeown, & Kucan, 2002).

Tier two words: Words selected based on frequency and relevance to students. These are words that are likely to appear in other contexts and require instruction in order for students to understand (Beck, McKeown, & Kucan, 2002).

Direct vocabulary instruction: Students are explicitly taught meanings of words

Contextual vocabulary instruction: Using a context to teach vocabulary words.
A child’s vocabulary has an integral part in his/her reading ability and comprehension. Vocabulary knowledge of children entering school is a formidable indicator of reading achievement (Pullen, Tuckwiller, Konold, Maynard, & Coyne, 2010). Children with low vocabulary knowledge are at greater risk for reading difficulties (Pullen et al., 2010). Current research indicates children with low vocabulary knowledge are at a significant disadvantage as they learn to read and this difference will grow larger in the early primary grades (Coyne, McCoach, Loftus, Zipoli, & Kapp, 2009; Pullet et al., 2010). Additionally, vocabulary instruction in the early grades has an important role in decreasing this reading achievement gap (Coyne et al., 2009). Studies have been conducted in order to determine how to close this widening gap of reading achievement. The focus of such research centers on instructional methods of word knowledge including intense intervention, supplemental small group instruction, and embedded instruction within whole group read alouds. These methods have demonstrated positive effects on students with low-vocabulary knowledge as well as enabling them to equal their peers in reading achievement (Silverman, 2007). This research indicates the importance of developing children’s vocabulary knowledge with explicit instruction. The research of this chapter will emphasize the resounding importance of vocabulary knowledge in facilitating reading comprehension. The first section reviews research conducted on specific tiered vocabulary, the second section reviews research conducted on vocabulary instruction using read aloud literature and the last section reviews research of read alouds and focused and explicit instruction of vocabulary. The first study, researchers Pullen et al. (2010), presents their findings on one such approach to increasing vocabulary knowledge focused on tiered instruction for students who are at risk for reading difficulty.
Tiered Vocabulary Instruction

There are many effective approaches of increasing word knowledge for students in the primary grades. Direct vocabulary instruction is one method which is most effective when it involves explanation of unfamiliar words by definition and within context (Loftus, Coyne, McCoach, Zipoli, & Pullen, 2010). Therefore, in order to support this approach, extended time must be devoted to vocabulary instruction. In the research presented by Pullen et al., 2010, additional vocabulary instruction was administered to at-risk readers to analyze the effects on word knowledge growth.

Pullen, Tuckwiller, Konold, Maynard, and Coyne, (2010) explained the effects of tiered vocabulary intervention paired with shared storybook reading. Pullen et al. (2010) also examined the feasibility and effectiveness of the intervention model for first-grade students and explore the implications for use of the model. The authors’ purpose for examining this quasi-experimental study was to determine the effectiveness of intervention for vocabulary instruction to students who are at risk of a reading disability. Pullen et al., (2010) asserted there is an effect on vocabulary knowledge instruction targeted at students who are at risk of falling into a reading disability category. For this study, the independent variables included an intervention instruction of targeted vocabulary words (Tier One) during whole group instruction and an additional treatment group of further vocabulary (Tier Two) intervention instruction in small groups following whole group instruction. Tier One words include most basic words which do not require instructional attention and Tier Two words include specific content knowledge words related to topic and subject of text as well as high frequency words (Beck, McKeown, & Kucan, 2002). The dependent variable was the three levels of word knowledge assessed by the
researchers which included the expressive, contextual, and receptive levels of word knowledge for all groups in this study.

Participants in this study included 224 first grade students from three elementary schools within a medium sized school district. Students represented a diverse population of moderate to low socioeconomic status families based on the percentage of families receiving free or reduced price lunches. For the treatment groups 98 students were selected as at-risk (AR) for reading disability and 126 students as not at-risk (NAR) for reading disability. This determination was based on the results of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Fourth Edition (PPVT-4) (Dunn & Dunn, 1981).

The researchers also used this test at the end of the treatment to determine the effects of the treatment. Comparison of the PPVT-4 for three groups was utilized in the data collection and analysis of this study. The PPVT-4 was utilized to gather data for a standardized unit of measurement of word knowledge. The expressive, contextual, and receptive levels were assessed by questions (using 0 for incorrect and 1 for correct responses) asked by researchers. The participants were split into three groups; at-risk control (ARC), at-risk treatment (ART) and not at-risk (NAR). The ARC, ART, and NAR groups all received whole group vocabulary instruction and ART received additional small group instruction to support whole group instruction the following day. The researchers concluded the study with a posttest and a delayed posttest 4 weeks after intervention.

The results of this study concluded the NAR significantly outperformed the ARC and ART groups. Both the ARC and ART groups significantly increased mean posttest scores, however, the delayed posttest scores did not demonstrate any significant differences of word knowledge acquisition. This indicates that students in the ARC and ART groups did not maintain
word level knowledge acquired during intervention. The researchers indicated that their study only focused on the effects of intervention of vocabulary instruction but did not consider the effects of such intervention in relation to reading comprehension. The researchers asserted that further study and investigation should be conducted to determine the effects of vocabulary instruction on reading comprehension.

The implications of this study support the researchers’ assertion that explicit vocabulary instruction is needed for students who are at-risk for reading disability. Also, the effects of Tier 1 instruction are not enough to support an effective intervention, but with the Tier 2 intervention, would be beneficial for AR students. Lengthened instruction on targeted vocabulary is an area in which the researchers’ claim would also increase the effectiveness of such intervention instruction. Frequency, intensity, and duration would also increase the effectiveness and maintain the levels of word knowledge acquired. Even though the researchers made suggestions for improvements to vocabulary instruction, this does not diminish that the ARC and ART students did benefit from the intervention of the study. Continuing to build on the effort to reduce the gap between students who have a low-word level knowledge and high word-level knowledge will help to improve the students’ levels of reading ability and comprehension. This study clearly suggests that students who are at-risk for reading difficulty benefit from explicit vocabulary instruction. The benefits of this component of intervention would increase the effectiveness of gained word knowledge and maintain levels of vocabulary. In the next study, the researchers examined this component of supplemental instruction for effectively increasing word knowledge for students who have low-levels of vocabulary knowledge.

Coyne, McCoach, Loftus, Zipoli, and Kapp (2009), designed a study to study and compare two methods of directly teaching word meanings to kindergarten students’ storybook
read alouds. The variance in the methods included instructional time and depth of instruction. The independent variables included three instructional conditions; two intervention conditions and a comparison condition. The conditions were embedded vocabulary, extended instruction, and incidental exposure of the target vocabulary. The researchers wanted to determine what effects the two different methods of instruction had on the intervention groups and if the students maintained the vocabulary knowledge. The dependent variable was collection of data included pretest, posttest and delayed posttest. The standardized measurement instrument used in this research study was the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III (PPVT) (Dunn and Dunn, 1997). Other research measures included context/full knowledge and context/partial knowledge assessments with yes/no questions based on target vocabulary embedded within instruction.

The participants in this study included 42 kindergarten students in a PreK to 8th grade elementary school in a large city located in the Northeast. The demographic makeup of the participants included: 69% Hispanic, 24% black, and 6% white students. Students that qualified for free or reduced lunches included 65% of the participants. The average range of age of participants was 4 years, 10 months to 6 years, 1 month. Nineteen males and 23 females participated in the study.

The goal of the instruction was to embed vocabulary introduced during storybook readings in a time-efficient method. The extended instruction intervention group was exposed to vocabulary with additional instructional time. All students listened to readings with target words and the intervention was delivered in small groups of three to four students. Interventions were administered over three sessions and the target vocabulary words were used in instruction and were selected from storybooks.
The compared results of the assessment measures of the two intervention groups indicated a significant difference in the extended instruction versus embedded pertaining to fuller and more refined word knowledge. The research findings also indicated that the knowledge of the vocabulary was maintained over an extended amount of time. Significant differences were also found after post-testing asserting the extended instruction and embedded instruction were higher than an incidental exposure to word during story reading.

The researchers asserted their findings will help students with their lexical knowledge of new vocabulary when vocabulary is embedded within instruction. However, the researchers point out this may not include the acquisition of deep word knowledge. Conversely, Coyne et al. (2009) asserted both embedded and extended instruction of vocabulary has a place in instruction in primary classrooms. The findings support a strong relationship between vocabulary knowledge and intense literacy instruction for at-risk students. Therefore, this research study supports the importance for word learning within the contexts of reading instruction in primary classrooms. Limitations of this study led the researchers to acknowledge embedded and extended instruction may not be enough to assist students with low-vocabulary knowledge and therefore, it is important that these students receive more assistance in word learning.

Despite the limitations presented by the researchers, the study supported research suggesting low-vocabulary students’ benefit from intense word knowledge instruction. In the next study of this section, Loftus, Coyne, McCoach, Zipoli, and Pullen (2010) defended the importance of tiered vocabulary instruction for at-risk readers. This research supports the benefits of supplemental instruction in addition to regular classroom instruction.

Loftus et al. (2010) conducted a study to determine the effectiveness of supplementary vocabulary instruction. The purpose of the study was to examine the effectiveness of a
vocabulary intervention designed to supplement research based classroom vocabulary instruction, implemented with students who may be at risk for language and learning difficulties. The researchers specifically asked whether students would learn target vocabulary with supplemental instruction besides regular classroom instruction and whether this supplemental vocabulary instruction would provide at-risk students accelerated word learning which would be comparable to their peers who only received classroom-based instruction with target vocabulary. Data was collected in order to determine the effect of the supplemental intervention and whether the intervention was effective to improve word learning gains of at-risk students. The independent variable of this study included kindergarten students who only received classroom instruction of target vocabulary versus at-risk kindergarten students who received classroom instruction and supplemental booster intervention of target vocabulary. Dependent variables included a standardized vocabulary assessment and questions created by examiners which included data for word recognition, target word picture vocabulary, context, and expressive measures (Loftus et al., 2010).

Participants in this study included 43 kindergarten students of a PK-8 elementary school in a large urban city in the Northeast (Loftus et al., 2010). There were 23 males and 20 females in the treatment group. In the control group there were 12 male and 11 female participants. The students attended a school where 73% of the population was eligible for free or reduced lunches and the ethnic makeup included 70.7 % Hispanic, 22.8 % Black, 5.4 % White and 1 % Asian American and American Indian.

The procedures for this study included a classroom based instruction of target vocabulary for all 43 students. This instruction incorporated storybook reading with a 30-minute whole-class lesson. Over the course of the two weeks of the study, two storybooks were read twice and each
book contained four target words for a total of eight total words which were the focus. The supplemental intervention was focused for 20 students who scored the lowest on a standardized vocabulary knowledge assessment. The at-risk students received supplemental instruction on two of the target vocabulary words following the classroom instruction.

Results of this study indicated overall, at-risk students made greater gains in word knowledge on target words with the supplemental intervention as compared to gains made by students who received only classroom-based instruction. Students who received the supplemental intervention also demonstrated word-learning gains that approached those of their peers. These results were based off of the Word Recognition Measure, the Context Questions Measure, and the Expressive Definitions Measure, however, similar results were not found on the standardized vocabulary assessment. Researchers surmised that the results might be due to the experimenter-developed measures, and that a more succinct measure may be required to determine the acquisition of vocabulary. The positive results and findings of this study were similar to the findings of other relative research of direct vocabulary instruction leading to positive gains in word knowledge. Similarly, results of this study are consistent with results of previous research which found that at-risk students benefit from additional vocabulary instruction.

The findings of this study support the ever-expanding research in importance of vocabulary instruction for students who are at-risk for literacy difficulties. Intervention should be provided to students early on as indicated by the current study. Providing Tier Two instruction for target vocabulary to at-risk students will support closing the word knowledge gap. In this study, small group intervention instruction supported this effort to bridge the gap for at-risk students and provide them with the support they need to make gains in word knowledge.
comparable to their peers. The next study presented discusses the importance of vocabulary instruction in younger students.

Word knowledge has an essential role in a students’ acquisition of language as well as reading proficiency. The larger a student’s word knowledge the greater impact on fluency and comprehension is in later school years. Therefore, determining effective methods of increasing word knowledge in the primary grades is important to influencing reading achievement. Neuman, Newman and Dwyer (2011), focused on an intervention program in preschool classrooms. The purpose of the study was to examine the hypothesis that helping preschool students learn words through categorization to enhance their conceptual knowledge base which would act as bootstrap for learning. The four questions posed for this study includes: (a) What is the impact of the vocabulary intervention on word knowledge for preschoolers who come from an economically disadvantaged urban area? (b) Does the intervention enhance the student’s ability to develop conceptual and categorical development associated with these words? (c) Do potential gains in conceptual development improve students’ ability to make inferences and generalizations about novel words and their meanings, providing some initial evidence of cognitive bootstrapping? (d) Are potential gains in word and conceptual development sustained beyond the immediate treatment period? The researcher’s hypothesized that teaching words in a rich structured categorical context would improve word knowledge and help students infer beyond specific instruction.

Variables of this study included the years of experience of the teachers of the control and treatment groups. The control group teachers had significantly less teaching experience as the treatment group teachers. The treatment group teachers were also trained on using the implemented curriculum World of Words (Neuman, Dwyer, Koh & Wright, 2007). WOW is a
supplemental and conceptual curriculum for pre-K students. The independent variable was the supplemental instruction program World of Words. The dependent variable was the word knowledge, expressive language and conceptual knowledge gains of the study participants.

The researcher’s utilized 28 Head Start classrooms for their study which included 604 students, lead teachers, and assistants. 14 classrooms were selected at random for the control group, seven full day programs of 3-4 year old children, and seven half-day programs. The treatment group was also selected randomly and seven classrooms were full day programs and seven half day. Head start eligibility requires all students to qualify for free or reduce lunches. The demographic makeup of the students included: 55% female and 45% male with 53% African-American, 1% Hispanic, 10% Asian, 3% Middle Easter, and 7% Multiracial; and the treatment group was 51% female and 49% male with 25% Caucasian, 46% African-American, 2% Hispanic, 8% Asian, 7% Middle Eastern and 12% Multiracial. Ninety six percent of the treatment and control groups used English as a primary language.

In the time the study was implemented, the procedure for the treatment and control groups followed an eight-day instructional cycle. The treatment group administered the WOW curriculum for 12-15 minutes a day while the control group also provided supplemental activities during a similar time period. The control classroom used materials from a different supplemental program which included the use of storybooks and vocabulary activities, print and phonological awareness skills. Teacher selected strategies to use with the storybook reading. The treatment group teachers followed the structured WOW curriculum which is organized by topics. Words were preselected with categorical structure and revisited numerous times. Prior to the start of the study a formal standard measurement was administered as a pretest, a different assessment was administered mid-year and finally a posttest was administered and the end of the study. A formal
assessment measure was also used to determine students’ expressive vocabulary. Other measures to assess conceptual knowledge and categorical knowledge included researcher designed assessments and informal observations. A delayed posttest was given to determine if the intervention on student’s word knowledge was retained.

The results from this study were categorized into four areas: the intervention of the WOW curriculum on word knowledge, the growth of concepts and categorical knowledge, the student’s ability to inference and generalize, and the students’ knowledge of words, categories and concepts in a delayed posttest. In the first category of data, the impact on the student’s word knowledge, there was no significant difference between the control group and the treatment group. The treatment group scored slightly higher than the control group only on the first Unit assessment of the WOW curriculum. The result for conceptual and categorical development for the treatment and control group on the first unit of assessment was not significantly different; however, the treatment group out preformed the control group in units two and three. More results revealed the treatment group students scored significantly higher than the control group in ability to make inferences and generalizations. This result indicated a connection between understanding word knowledge concepts. In the last category of sustained word knowledge, the results indicated the treatment group scored significantly higher than the control group.

The findings indicated the supplemental program not only helped students with their word knowledge but also with the ability to make inferences beyond what was being taught. The students that received the intervention not only learned the vocabulary but also the concept and related topics to what was being taught. Also, the researchers concluded the treatment group significantly improved their ability to categorize and conceptualize than their control group peers. Additionally, the categorization instruction also aids in the development of conceptual
knowledge furthers students to process incoming information. One area this study did not demonstrate significant difference was in the expressive language measured by the formal vocabulary knowledge assessment. The researchers determined this area was one in need of further research and exploration.

The researchers also concluded that the curriculum might need more intensive instruction with more opportunities of exposure to vocabulary. Another area in which the researchers indicted further exploration and research was the grouping in which both control and treatment groups were instructed. The researchers’ suggested that a whole group setting may not have made enough impact to conclude meaningful learning of the vocabulary being taught. Despite the researchers own conclusions and suggestions for improvement to the study, this study indicated student word knowledge was impacted by supplemental programs and instruction in vocabulary.

The data collected by Neuman, Newman, and Dwyer (2011) supported research of supplemental instructional which assists students who have significant deficits in word knowledge. Implementing programs that provided extra support in word knowledge, conceptual knowledge, and categorical knowledge can only positively impact student’s word knowledge and ultimately reading comprehension. The supplemental instruction provided supported positive implications in supporting word knowledge.

The research presented in this section supported the positive effect of supplemental tiered vocabulary instruction for at-risk students. The first study, presented by Pullen et al., 2010, confirmed the effectiveness of explicit vocabulary instruction and the maintained levels of word knowledge for low-vocabulary readers. Additionally, this study suggested a larger increase would have been achieved if more time was given to the intervention instruction for the low-
vocabulary students. Similarly, Coyne et al. (2009) examined the effect the variable of instructional time of supplemental vocabulary instruction for at-risk readers. The researchers asserted the importance of such intervention beyond regular classroom instruction. Loftus et al. (2009) presented a study which supported evidence of the positive effects of additional instruction of target vocabulary increased reading achievement of at-risk students. In the last study presented by researchers Neuman, Newman and Dwyer (2011), the results suggested a positive impact on word knowledge from the supplemental instruction. Therefore, this research supports the importance of providing primary students with additional exposure to vocabulary with explicit instruction. This intervention can be further supported with new vocabulary instruction delivered in a context which is meaningful for students. One method which supports instruction with meaningful context is story book read alouds. In the following section, research is presented which supports vocabulary instruction paired with read alouds.

**Vocabulary Instruction and Read Alouds**

Until recently, there has been limited research of targeted vocabulary instruction with read alouds (Silverman, 2007). Despite this limited research, teaching vocabulary with storybook reading is one strategy to provide a meaningful context for students to understand new vocabulary (Beck & McKeown, 2007). In the next section, research presented will examine several methods of vocabulary instruction using storybook read alouds. Coyne et al. (2009) found positive benefits of instruction provided during and after storybook reading. In the research presented by Fien et al. (2011) the researchers examined small group instruction focused on vocabulary along with a read aloud curriculum. Lovelace and Stewart (2009) presented research on the use of read alouds and multicultural texts with robust vocabulary
instruction. In the last article, Justice, Meyer, and Walpole (2005) also investigated acquisition of novel vocabulary words through repeated exposure and readings of storybooks.

Fien et al. (2011) conducted a study to determine the effects of small group instruction on vocabulary and comprehension of first-grade students identified with low language and low vocabulary knowledge. The researchers asserted that current research indicated extensive word knowledge greatly affected student comprehension. The question the researchers posed was: To what extent does supplementing the whole-class Read Aloud Curriculum with all-group vocabulary instruction affect student vocabulary and retelling? The hypothesis of this study was if there was an effect on vocabulary and retelling. The independent variable of this study was small group vocabulary instruction. The dependent variables were the narrative and expository retelling measured by the TOLD-3 (Bankston, 1990) and Strong Narrative Assessment Procedure (Strong, 1998), and vocabulary knowledge was measured by a vocabulary scoring assessment created by Eller, Pappas, and Brown (1988).

The study included 18 first grade classrooms. The participants consisted of 106 first grade students from Title One schools. The intervention group included 54 students and the 52 students were included in the control group. The demographic composition of the intervention group included 55.6% female and 44.4% male. The control group included 40.4% female and 59.6% male. The researchers concluded there was no significant difference between the intervention group and control group in regards to their ethnicity.

The control group received the Read Aloud Curriculum and not the booster instruction. The intervention group received the whole group read aloud instruction and small group intervention or booster instruction for approximately 30 minutes over 40 days. The booster instruction included thematic units using Big Books for read alouds, discussions focusing on the
vocabulary in big books, and visuals for each vocabulary word discussed. Explicit, consistent instruction was used when introducing the vocabulary or target word for the lesson and as well as an extended conversation of the vocabulary word. The control group did not receive previously described instruction as the researchers used this group as a non-treatment control group to determine if there was an effect from the booster instruction.

The researchers determined that the intervention group outperformed the control group on vocabulary assessments and expository retells but not narrative retells. This research study also provided a preliminary finding to support small group instruction which appears to enhance vocabulary knowledge and expository retelling (Fien et al., 2011). The researchers asserted the reason for the increase in vocabulary and expository retellings of the intervention group was the intense high level of instruction that was planned and delivered to the intervention group. Extended opportunities to be exposed to new vocabulary with a variety of texts is a practice the researchers asserted is valuable for whole and small group instruction based on the findings of this study.

The study indicated that small group intense instruction has a benefit for vocabulary knowledge and expository text retelling which has significant implications in the classroom. As a teacher it is important to recognize students who have difficulty reading may have limited vocabulary knowledge in comparison to their peers who are at or above reading level. Therefore, teachers must take more opportunities to expose their students to a variety of text and frontload students with vocabulary that is meaningful and purposeful. As the researchers stated, these were only preliminary findings to support vocabulary instruction to aid comprehension. In the next article, Silverman (2007), compared three methods of vocabulary instruction and discussed which methods supported word learning.
Silverman (2007) compared three methods of teaching vocabulary instruction along with storybook read-alouds. The three methods compared included contextual, analytical, and anchored instruction. The researcher compared the three approaches on 94 children’s learning of taught words at the end of intervention. The researcher also compared these results with a posttest 6 months after the intervention, when the children were in first grade. The questions the researchers presented for the studies included: Which of the following three methods was more effective at promoting children’s word learning through storybook reading: (a) contextualized instruction, (b) contextualized instruction augmented by analytical instruction, or (c) contextualized instruction augmented by analytical instruction and anchored instruction (i.e., phonological and orthographic analysis); were the effects of the methods consistent across receptive and expressive vocabulary knowledge tasks; were the effects of the methods consistent after 6 months without planned instruction? The independent variables were the three methods of instruction: contextual, analytical, and anchored. The dependent variables included experimenter designed receptive and expressive vocabulary measures.

The sample of this study included six classrooms of a diverse public school in the northeast. Ninety-four kindergarteners participated in this study. The study included classrooms within the school district and intact classrooms were maintained to observe the effectiveness of instructional methods. One classroom from the two schools was given one instructional method. This reduced the influence of teacher and school effects. The intervention included three methods of teaching Tier 2 vocabulary words. The first method was contextual based instruction in which the teacher lead student discussion of words based on personal experiences of the students. The second intervention was an analysis of the words outside the context of the book
and children’s backgrounds. The third intervention was a focus on the letters and sounds of the target words.

At the conclusion of the study the researcher found instruction with active analysis of word meanings was more effective than instruction of target words using the context of the story. Additionally, instruction that included study of orthographical features and attention of phonological properties was more effective. The findings supported research that described effective vocabulary instruction to include a deep understanding of words as well as connection to prior experiences and knowledge (Silverman, 2007). Therefore, this study supported the benefits of vocabulary instruction that goes beyond surface level of the classroom but specific and focused instruction on target vocabulary.

This research suggests these methods will assist students in reading comprehension. Students who lack vocabulary knowledge are in need of instruction to support their growth in word knowledge that also supports comprehension of text. Based on this study, knowledge of included intervention instruction beyond regular whole class instruction provided during the storybook reading also has an impact on student word learning.

Both studies presented by Fien et al. (2011), and Silverman (2007), support methods that build vocabulary intervention and instruction of read aloud stories. However, read aloud vocabulary instruction is not enough to support students with limited vocabulary to develop maintained word knowledge. Fien et al. (2011) stated intense instruction should accompany storybook read aloud and has positive effects on student vocabulary growth. Similarly, Silverman (2007) found contextualized and anchored instruction of target vocabulary along with storybook read alouds have a significant effect on student word knowledge. Therefore, it would seem appropriate to conclude that in order to increase student learning of word knowledge tiered
vocabulary instruction paired with a context such as storybook read alouds would enhance student learning and knowledge for reading and comprehension. Continuing to examine the best methods and contexts of increasing vocabulary knowledge includes further examination of children who lack vocabulary and background knowledge.

Research suggests children from low socioeconomic status (SES) backgrounds have decreased experiences and background knowledge (Lovelace & Stewart, 2009). One suggestion to overcome the discrepancy associated with low levels of vocabulary knowledge is to supplement vocabulary instruction which builds on word knowledge starting in kindergarten and continuing through second grade. In the study presented by Lovelace and Stewart (2009), an alternating treatment design was used to examine the effects of vocabulary instruction among African American children. The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of a systematic vocabulary technique and to examine the influence of book type in the retention of vocabulary words in African American second-grade children with below-level vocabulary skills. The researchers hypothesized that given the supplemental vocabulary instruction, the participants would not only learn novel vocabulary words but would retain more vocabulary from books that depicted images and experiences similar to their cultural background. The independent variable of this study was robust vocabulary instruction, and the dependent variable was word knowledge. This was measured by a scoring criteria based on four stages of word knowledge.

The participants in this study included African-American children. Participants were selected based on the following criteria: (a) students in second grades ages ranging from seven to eight years (b) ability to sustain 30 minutes of instruction with investigator (c) normal hearing abilities (d) normal perception abilities (e) cognitive skills within normal limits based on a nonverbal intelligence test (f) vocabulary skills below one or two standard deviated means of a
standardized vocabulary test; and (g) no or limited knowledge of target words. After criteria was implemented three boys, in which two were twins, and two girls met all the above criteria and were selected to participate in this study. The age range of the selected participants was 7.2 years to 8.0 years. The children were all African-American and were from four different elementary schools in the city. All students met criteria of low SES as indicated by parent reports of eligibility of free or reduced lunch in the public school.

The study used two selected storybooks based on criteria in which one book was accurate in cultural history, realistic illustrations, lack of derogatory language, and nonstereotypical portrayals. The books chosen were Miss Viola and Uncle Ed (Duncan, 1999) and Sophie’s Knapsack (Stock, 1989). Miss Viola and Uncle Ed portrayed African-Americans in the story and Sophie’s Knapsack portrays a Caucasian girl going on a hike with her parents. Both books were similar in lexical density and target words selected from each book were verbs in order to build rich representations of each word. A set of 18 words were selected for the study.

The participants were involved in a 30 minutes session twice a week for a four-week period. A total of eight sessions were held. During the sessions a single book reading occurred followed by a vocabulary lesson on the selected target words for that book. Pre and post tests were administered to participants on word knowledge. The session instruction began with the storybook reading followed by activities with target words. During the reading of the story participants were encouraged to predict what the story would be about and provide additional background knowledge. The vocabulary instruction included lessons focused on the target word set with explanation and contextual use of each target word. Also, three to four activities in which the participants interacted with each word was utilized during the sessions. Each word in the target word set received three to four exposures for the participants.
The result of the robust vocabulary instruction demonstrated a significant increase in the participant’s knowledge of the target words from pre to post test. Also, the impact of the book type did not demonstrate a significant difference in the word knowledge of the participants. Concept knowledge of participants increased as a result of this study. A further result of the study indicated that the two children with the lowest pretest made the greatest gains. The study’s findings supported the current research of robust vocabulary instruction is effective in developing and maintaining knowledge of children.

As the researcher’s discussed the impact of the book type for the study, the story book that seemed to have the greatest effect on the students’ vocabulary knowledge was the book that featured a Caucasian girl. The researcher’s hypothesis was the storybook with African-American characters would impact the participants’ word knowledge. Explanation of this result indicated that the storybook itself has minimal impact on the participants’ word knowledge acquisition. The storybook, was just a context in which to build the participants understanding and knowledge of selected target words. Another explanation of this result was the children have become desensitized to the perception of racial and ethnic imagery. The researchers further explain a possible cause of this study’s results was the participants seemed to make more significant gains was because they understood the concept of the storybook. The researchers also suggested robust vocabulary instruction used for facilitating vocabulary development in children with below average vocabulary skills is significant in conjunction with a balanced approach of contextualized exposures and encounters with target vocabulary (Lovelace & Stewart, 1999). This suggests instruction targeted toward specific vocabulary instruction provided in context with storybooks is one means to providing young children a meaningful experience in acquiring word knowledge.
In this last study, researchers Justice, Meir, and Walpole (2005), examined vocabulary development of young children. Based on theoretical perspectives of how young children acquire new vocabulary, the researchers’ questions focused on incidental exposure to new novel vocabulary and repeated exposure to vocabulary words with storybook readings. This study examined the influence of small-group storybook reading with vocabulary instruction for at-risk kindergartners, and the impact of word elaboration. The research questions addressed in this study included: (a) To what extent do at-risk kindergartners acquire new vocabulary words through small-group storybook sessions? (b) To what extent does elaborated exposure influence children’s learning of new words? (c) To what extent do word-learning outcomes vary for children with high versus low in priori vocabulary knowledge?

The researchers hypothesized the following: (a) novel word learning is impacted with repeated exposure to new words over the course of several sessions (b) new word knowledge is accelerated when adult readers elaborate on meanings of unfamiliar words; and (c) children respond differently to word-learning opportunities based on their own vocabulary skills. The researchers decided to test their hypotheses by using 60 target words, and 10 storybooks for their study. 30 words would be elaborated on by instruction and the other 30 were non-elaborated. Thus, this study’s independent variable was the 30 randomly assigned elaborated vocabulary words. The dependent variable was the word knowledge of the selected vocabulary words given as a pretest and posttest for this study. Formal assessments were also used to examine expressive and receptive vocabulary of the participants.

The participant group for this study was selected from six kindergarten classrooms of two elementary schools in a small urban community in a Mid-Atlantic state. Each school qualified for free or reduced meals. Each school was diverse in population: composition for the first school
was 60% African American, 30% Caucasian, 5% Hispanic, and 5% other: the second school composition was 72% African American, 18% Caucasian, 3% Hispanic, 3% Asian, and 4% other. One hundred twenty kindergartners from the two schools were selected to participate in the study based on their performance of an informal phonological awareness assessment. A total of 57 kindergartners (35 males and 22 females) of ages from 5 to 6.5 years old participated in the study. Forty-eight children were African-American, five were Caucasian, and four were Asian descent. All participants were administered pre and posttests as well as two formal assessments measuring receptive and expressive vocabulary.

A total of ten storybooks were selected to use during the intervention of this study. Sixty words total were compiled to use during the sessions and were selected and randomly divided into nouns, verbs, and adjectives. 30 words were randomly selected to be elaborated on during the sessions and 30 were randomly selected to be non-elaborated. During the intervention of this study, the participants were divided into small groups ranging from three to six children. The sessions were delivered over a 10 week period and each of the ten storybooks were used and read four times throughout the study. One group was randomly selected to receive the treatment which was the elaborated instruction of vocabulary words and the other group received the non-elaborated words. The sessions lasted approximately 20 minutes and the instruction of the session focused on the storybook and maintaining student focus on the story. The treatment group received instruction that identified the vocabulary word in the text being read, defined the word, and then used the word in context similar to the story being read. The children in the non-elaborated group only received exposure to target vocabulary through exposure to words during the storybook read alouds.
The results of this study demonstrated an increase in word knowledge of both groups from the pre to posttests. The gains made from pretest to posttest for the elaborated group was 3.6 points and 3.1 points for the non-elaborated group. This translates to approximately six words gained per child. The findings of this study included the incidental exposure to the novel words over four repeated readings were not significant for the at-risk kindergartners. The children in the treatment group demonstrated significantly greater gains in word knowledge from pre to posttests. The difference in gains from the treatment group to comparison group was approximately four words. Other findings included greater word knowledge gains made by participants in the treatment group who scored lower level vocabulary skills as indicated by the informal assessment given at the beginning of the study. The impact of non-elaborated word exposure during the reading indicated the word knowledge gained for participants was insufficient. Possible explanations for this result included risks factors such as poor attendance and low performance on literacy screening tasks. Such participants may need a more intense and diverse exposure to new novel vocabulary words. Another explanations for the results were the possibility this group of children may have needed a prolonged exposure to fewer words and more time on fewer storybooks as well. The treatment group, the elaborated words exposure, suggests an advantage over the non-elaborated group with a difference of two to four more words gained over mere exposure. The researchers suggested the findings may impact further research of exposure to novel words for developing vocabulary in at-risk children.

Implications for further research and development discussed as a result of this study included time allocation, use of storybooks with repeated readings and exposure of new novel vocabulary words, and providing the meaning of new vocabulary in context. The researchers also discussed the importance of vocabulary development with mixed-methods of exposure to word
meanings and use in context. Also, the researchers suggested the activity in which children interact with the new vocabulary words. Research suggests to not only utilizing associative processing but also generative processing which also children to use the word in some capacity such as using the word in a sentence. Time allocation is another area in which the researchers indicate more discussion and study be developed in regards to vocabulary development. The more time spent on a targeted vocabulary word increases the impact of word learning. The greater number of exposures children have with new words supports greater gains in understanding of new vocabulary. Justice et al., (2009) suggested further research be completed to support their findings in developing word knowledge in young children who are at-risk for reading difficulty. Therefore, research again suggests vocabulary is a strong indicator of reading achievement and word knowledge is important in reading achievement. The use of storybook read alouds indicates the context provided for learning new vocabulary words effects growth in word knowledge. The research provided in this section supported the use of repeated readings and exposure to target vocabulary words, discussion, and analysis of the words to aid in supporting sustaining word knowledge growth. This growth in word knowledge significantly supports reading achievement.

Vocabulary knowledge has been acknowledged as a critical component of learning to read and reading to learn (Pullen et al., 2010). Explicit vocabulary instruction, as asserted by Pullen et al. (2010), is a vital component to increasing vocabulary knowledge. However, while this research does support explicit instruction, Coyne et al. (2009), also asserted both embedded and extended instruction of vocabulary has a place in instruction in primary classrooms. Providing additional supplemental support in addition to regular instruction would be beneficial for at-risk readers. Additionally, the context in which supplemental vocabulary instruction is
provided will also give at-risk readers another avenue of understanding new words. In the research presented by Lovelace & Stewart (2009) and Justice et al. (2009), research suggested students with low word knowledge demonstrate an increase in vocabulary when read alouds and robust vocabulary instruction are used to provide a context to acquire new word knowledge. Extended opportunities to be exposed to new vocabulary in a variety of texts is a practice which is valuable for whole and small group instruction based on the findings of the study conducted by Fein et al. (2011). Storybook read alouds provide exposure to target vocabulary and build word knowledge (Fien et. al., 2011). Building upon this research, and extending instruction to include methods which add to solidifying word knowledge will increase the effectiveness of supplemental vocabulary intervention. In this next section, research continues to provide a strong testament for increasing reading achievement through extended vocabulary instruction used in conjunction with storybook read alouds.

Read Alouds with Focused and Extended Vocabulary Instruction

This next section continues to exemplify research conducted on vocabulary knowledge acquired with the use of read alouds to provide a rich meaningful context for children but also delves deeper into the type of instructional device accompanied with the storybook reading. Read aloud storybooks are a vehicle with drives and gives children literacy experiences regardless of reading ability or exposure to books or reading experiences (Cazden, 1992). Read alouds do provide another means for children to acquire literary experiences and possibly acquire new vocabulary, however, the simple act of reading aloud is not enough to provide consistent results to support the connection of reading aloud and vocabulary learning (Beck & McKeown, 2007). Further studies by Sénéchal and Cornwell (2012), Brabham and Lynch-Brown (2002), Coyne et al. (2010), and Beck and McKeown, (2007) continue to identify instructional
interventions which advance acquisition of vocabulary knowledge are identified in this next section and focus on specific instruction focused on developing deep meaning of novel vocabulary words as well as time spent on such instruction.

Sénéchal and Cornwell (2012) examined whether preschool children learn new vocabulary from a simple reading of a storybook and if certain conversational devices used by parents during joint reading facilitate vocabulary growth. The effectiveness of adult interaction with children of ages four to five years old was the focus the researchers choose for this study. Thus, the purpose of this study was to investigate what device would be effective in vocabulary acquisition. The independent variables included the conversational method of questioning, recasting, word-repetition and verbatim reading. In the questioning condition, participants were asked what and where questions and were encouraged to label target items from the selected storybook. The recasting condition included the adult to read the sentence from the storybook which introduced the target vocabulary word, and then repeat the sentence but with a synonym of the target word in the same sentence. In the word-repetition condition, the adult repeated the sentence introducing the target vocabulary word. The verbatim condition only allowed the children to listen to the story. They were not allowed to participate in the reading and the reader did nothing to specifically prompt or reinforce the target vocabulary. The dependent variable for this study was expressive and receptive vocabulary assessments for each of these conditions which included a pretest, immediate posttest and delayed posttest. Learning was measured by posttest of both receptive and expressive vocabulary.

Participants for this study included 80 children of ages four and five years old. Two groups were established based on age; one group consisted of children four years old and the other group included children five years old. Within each age group an equal amount of females
and males were randomly assigned to each condition. The children who participated were recruited from local daycares, nursery schools, and kindergartens. Seven children were Asian and the remaining were Caucasian. The experiment of this study was a two (Age: four vs five) x four (Reading Practice: questioning vs. recasting vs. word repetition vs. verbatim reading) factorial design. The children who participated were administered pretests for their knowledge of synonyms of target words and knowledge of target words. The children were pretested on knowledge of 10 words and on average only 1.87 words were known by the children. Posttests were administered for each condition with both expressive and receptive vocabulary assessments. The picture book selected for this study did not have text, therefore, the researchers created text to accompany the book. Ten vocabulary words and ten synonyms were selected to use with the book.

The procedure involved the children individually and interacted with two experimenters. The first experimenter, who had no participation in the treatment of the study, tested the children. The second experimenter read the story to the children. This procedure consisted of two sessions. The first session was 25 minutes in which the children were administered the pretest by the first experimenter then read the story book by the second experimenter. At each mention of a target vocabulary word, the experimenter would point to the illustration corresponding with the target word introduced. This procedure was repeated for each vocabulary word. For the questioning condition, the experimenter asked what and where questions after the first mention of each target vocabulary word. In the recasting condition, the first mention of the target vocabulary word the experimenter repeated the sentence but replaced the target word with a synonym. The recasting condition consisted of the same procedure but did not replace the target word with a synonym but just repeated the sentence with the target vocabulary word at the first mention of the word.
The verbatim condition consisted only of the experimenter reading the story to the children. After listening to the story the children were administered posttests for knowledge of vocabulary words and receptive vocabulary knowledge. A week later a delayed posttest was administered.

The results of this study suggested there was an increase in performance of word knowledge from pretest to immediate posttest. Children in the five year old age group made greater gains in vocabulary knowledge than the four year old group on both posttests. The results indicated the reading experience was sufficient to boost the children’s receptive vocabulary. The delayed posttest implied the five year old group retained more words than the four year old group. Another result of the study was that the active participation of the children did not increase the children’s vocabulary knowledge, because verbatim reading was just as effective as asking questions or recasting new vocabulary introduced from the book. Though, the experience of reading the book increased the children’s vocabulary knowledge, the results indicated that the condition had little effect on the increase in word knowledge. However, the researchers concluded that the reading experience affected the children’s vocabulary knowledge despite the insignificant results of the type of reading experience. In the next article, another study focuses on the type of read-aloud style and how it may effect vocabulary knowledge.

Brabham and Lynch-Brown (2002) presented a study on the effects of reading without additional activities, performance reading, and interactional reading-aloud styles on learning with first and third grade students. The purpose of this study included (a) examination of reading styles with larger groups of readers (b) utilizing three reading-aloud styles (interactional, performance, and just reading) with several storybooks, and (c) executing an experimental design with the reading-aloud styles to determine effects for first and third grade students in vocabulary acquisition and comprehension. The independent variables of this study included the
three reading-aloud styles just reading, interactional, and performance. The dependent variables included assessments for vocabulary knowledge and comprehension. A vocabulary pretest with 40 multiple choice items based on the 20 vocabulary word from each of the storybooks was developed and administered to all participants. The comprehension pretest consisted of 17 multiple choice items constructed from previously published tests. Both vocabulary and comprehension assessments were then administered after the completion of the study’s treatment.

Participants of Brabham and Brown-Lynch’s (2002) study included 246 subjects. There were 117 first grade students and 129 third grade students. Across the two grade levels there were 87 participants in the just reading group, 79 in the performance group, and 80 in the interactional group. The participant sample included 123 females and 123 males and 10 were Asian-American, 50 were African-American, and 171 were Caucasian, and 8 were Hispanic-Americans (ethnicity was not recorded for 7 students).

Thirty preservice teachers participated by reading the two informational storybooks and administered vocabulary and comprehension tests. The pretest was administered the day before the storybook was read to participants. Participants in the just-reading condition were asked to listen to the story without asking questions or making comments and were discouraged from responding verbally. In the after reading session subjects were required to respond silently and independently to the story with writing or drawing. The performance reading condition was scripted with comments, questions and specific words about the content. A five-minute discussion was conducted after the reading of the storybook and scripted questions guided the discussion for the remainder of the 20 minutes of the session. Scripted questions and comments about words and concepts were the same for the interactional and performance style readers, but
interactional readers used the questions to interact with the storybook before, during and after reading. Rereading continued over three consecutive days and immediately after the third rereading, the posttest was administered to participants.

The results of this study indicated effects of reading-aloud styles were statistically significant and consistent for vocabulary acquisition for informational storybooks and grade level. The just-reading style resulted in the smallest vocabulary gains for interactional reading. Vocabulary acquisition was increased for first and third grade subjects though older subjects knew more meanings of words on the pretest. Vocabulary scores revealed greater effect sizes for reading-aloud styles than grade level. Comprehension scores revealed greater effect sizes for grade level than read-aloud styles. The just-reading and performance reading style produced less word learn than interactional reading, yet all yielded pretest to posttest gains. From pretest to posttest, results revealed vocabulary gains (averaged from the two books) as follows: 5.3% for first graders and 12.0% for third graders in just reading; 12.7% for first graders and 21.0% for third graders in performance reading; and 25.0% for first graders and 27% for third graders in interactional reading. The findings indicated students made gains in vocabulary from hearing texts read aloud. Research on interactive read alouds with direct and extended vocabulary instruction continues in the next study.

Coyne et al. (2010), studied the effect of direct and extended vocabulary instruction with the use of interactive read alouds. The purpose of this study was to investigate the efficacy of an 18-week program of direct and extended vocabulary instruction with kindergarten students on both vocabulary knowledge and transfer measures of language and literacy. The dependent variables of the study included posttest measures of overall receptive vocabulary knowledge with the PPVT-III (Dunn & Dunn, 1997), a listening comprehension measurement which included
words targeted from instruction, and an experimenter-developed measurement which assessed the students’ ability to infer meanings of novel vocabulary words within the context of a sentence. The independent variables included the treatment condition which was the experimental vocabulary intervention and a no-treatment control. The design of this study was a quasi-experimental design.

The participants included kindergarten students who attended three elementary schools in three different school districts in the Northeast. Each school served a demographic in which large percentages of students would be considered at-risk for literacy and language difficulties based on performance data on state reading assessments. There were 124 students who participated in this study. Eighty students were in the treatment group (40 male and 40 female) and 44 students (23 males and 21 female) were in the control group. In the treatment group, 55% of students were Hispanic, 21% Caucasian, 19% African-American, and 5% other ethnicity (not indicated in study). In the control group, 57% were Hispanic, 16% Caucasian, 25% African-American, and 2% were other ethnicities. There were 31 students in the treatment group who were English learners and 17 English learners in the control group. All schools administered instruction only in English.

The design of the study was to examine the effects of the treatment of experimental vocabulary instruction with one group (treatment) and no-treatment group (control). The teachers of the schools selected in this study delivered instruction to all students during whole class sessions. Students were randomly assigned to either group and those students in the treatment group received the intervention in small groups of three or four outside the classroom. The treatment intervention included extended instruction on the targeted vocabulary words that was interactive, robust, and varied.
The intervention (treatment) which was delivered to all students consisted of 36 half-hour instructional sessions. This included two lessons per week over 18 weeks. There were a total of 18 storybooks that were selected for this study and were read aloud to students. Following the read aloud post-reading activities were implemented for about 10-15 minutes. There were 54 words total selected from the storybook which were the focus of the intervention. The interventionists would introduce the three vocabulary words selected to accompany the storybook being read aloud and would ask the students to listen for the selected words and acknowledge when they heard the words in the story. When the vocabulary would be identified the interventionist would reread the sentence that contained the vocabulary word and had the students pronounce the vocabulary word. After the reading, students were engaged in activities which included reintroducing the target word within the context of the story, presenting pictures of examples and non-examples of the target vocabulary word, using the target word in other contexts, asking open-ended questions design to extend student responses to demonstrate understanding of the word meaning and providing additional turns to two or three students who may have struggled with understanding. The intervention included systematic and distributed review of the target words. Each of the 36 words was given additional attention in approximately five additional lessons beyond the lesson they were originally introduced. Review lesson and activities reinforced definitions and encouraged processing of word meanings through interactions and explorations of target words and other novel vocabulary words.

The results of the study following this intervention for 18 weeks included the comparison of pre- and post-assessments. Overall, the treatment groups outperformed the control group on the target word learning and scored higher on the PPVT-III (Dunn & Dunn, 1997) posttest. For the results of the listening comprehension measure, the treatment group again, outperformed the
control group. There were no significant differences between the treatment group and control group in assessments which measured the student’s ability to infer meaning of words. Overall, this study demonstrated that kindergarteners who received the vocabulary instruction demonstrated a greater knowledge of words on the posttest compared with those students who did not receive the intervention. Again, research suggests a connection between specific vocabulary intervention and the use of the read aloud. The focus of specific instruction of research conducted by Coyne et al. (2010) was very similar to the next article on Beck and McKeown’s (2007) research on read alouds and direct vocabulary instruction.

Beck and McKeown, (2007) presented two studies which compared different methods of vocabulary instruction with the use of read aloud literature. The purpose of conducting both studies and comparing results was to examine the effects of rich vocabulary instruction on children in first grade and kindergarten. The purpose of study one was to examine the extent in which children learned a set of sophisticated vocabulary words which were taught to them in comparison to children who did not receive the instruction. The dependent variable of this study included assessments to measure vocabulary knowledge, was the PPVT-III (Dunn & Dunn, 1997), and an experimenter-designed pre- and posttests to measure learned words. The independent variable was the treatment group which was administered the Text Talk program (Beck & McKeown, 2001). The experimenter-designed assessments were designed to assess 22 words for the kindergarten classes and a separate assessment on a different set of 22 words for the first grade classrooms.

Children from four kindergarten classes and four first grade classes participated in the study. In each grade level, two classes were designated as the experimental group and two classes as comparison. There were a total of 98 participants in this study. Fifty-two students were
in the experimental group and 46 in the control group. The study was conducted in a school from a small urban district with a lower SES population. The children were all African-American and 82% were eligible for free or reduced lunch.

The classroom teachers implemented the vocabulary instruction, the Text Talk project which was based on read alouds (Beck & McKeown, 2001; McKeown & Beck, 2003). The four teachers, who participated in this study, were introduced to this program with a three hour workshop which explained the approach and motivation for the project’s development. A total of 36 books would be used in the intervention instruction over a ten week period. This was only for the treatment group. The comparison group was provided vocabulary instruction through read alouds as part of the schools reading curriculum but did not receive instruction from the Text Talk program.

The Text Talk program instruction was developed to provide rich instruction in vocabulary which occurred after the storybook has been read aloud. The vocabulary instruction would occur after the story was read aloud and discussed. The procedure for teaching the vocabulary words included: introducing the vocabulary word within the context of the story, the meaning of the word would be explained, children asked to repeat the word, examples in context would be provided, children would make judgments of what were examples of the vocabulary word and what were non-examples, children asked to provide their own examples and the word’s phonological and meaning representations reinforced. This procedure occurred for every target word for the selected storybook.

The results displayed a gain in learned words for each grade level. The instructed kindergarten groups demonstrated significantly higher gains than the comparison group. The same was for the instructed or treatment group in first grade. Differences in pretest to posttest
test gains between classrooms in each group were tested separately for kindergarten and first grade. In kindergarten there were no differences in gains in the pre- and posttests between the two control groups or the two experimental groups. Similar results occurred in the first grade, with no significant gains between comparison groups and treatment groups. Therefore, there were higher gains for both first grade and kindergarten treatment group than their grade level comparison groups. This study supports vocabulary instruction is essential for more advanced literacy development.

The second study, was designed to provide the same rich vocabulary instruction for all words and then to design additional instructional time for the subset of words. The additional instructional time was provided to the More Rich Instruction group. The same instruction was administered to the participants but the instruction on the targeted words was allotted a longer and more frequent duration. Study two took place in a different school but in the same urban school district as Study One. The children who participated in Study Two were all African-American and 81% were eligible for the free or reduced-price lunch. There were 36 kindergarten students who participated in this study and 40 first grade students. The experimenter’s hypothesis was that to learn and develop an understanding of sophisticated words, children need additional instruction.

The dependent variables for Study Two included experimenter designed pretests and posttests for 42 words for kindergarten and 42 words for first grade. The independent variables were Rich Instruction vs. More Rich Instruction. The second condition, More Rich Instruction was the same as Rich Instruction except the teachers were provided with additional instruction to be presented across several days. Teachers who implemented instruction for this study participated in a two hour workshop on implementing the Text Talk program (Beck &
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McKewon, 1997). The teacher in each grade level was provided seven trade books, each with lesson plans for six words. The instruction was to be completed over a five-day cycle. The first day was the read aloud and discussion of the story. Day Two was Rich Instruction on the first three words. Day Three was Rich Instruction on the next three target vocabulary words. On days Four and Five, the More Rich Instruction group received more instruction on the target vocabulary words. Lessons were designed to be equal in length and were approximately 20 minutes. With the additional instructional time for the More Rich Instruction, this group received about 6.6 more minutes of instruction per word than the Rich Instruction group. This was about 27.6 more minutes of instruction than the Rich Instruction group.

The results for Study Two included separate analysis for kindergarten and first grade. The pre-to-post gain for kindergarten in number of words known in the group More Rich Instruction was significantly higher than pre-to-post gains in the Rich Instruction. Similar results were revealed for the first grade More Rich Instruction group having greater gains in words known than the Rich Instruction group. Therefore, Study Two revealed that more instruction was beneficial, with the gains about twice as large for word given more instruction, in both kindergarten and first grade. Considering both studies, Beck and McKeown, (2007) suggested the more instructional time students received on target vocabulary the greater gain in word knowledge.

Conclusion

In this chapter, research articles revealed a common theme regarding positive benefits of vocabulary instruction for children in primary grades. In the first section, the research articles discussed the need for Tiered Vocabulary instruction for children who are at-risk for reading difficulty. Pullen et al. (2010) researched the effectiveness of a tiered vocabulary intervention
with storybook reading. Direct and explicit vocabulary instruction was also the focus of Coyne et al. (2009) who compared time utilized on instruction with an explicit vocabulary intervention. The extended time on vocabulary instruction suggested increased benefits for children to retain vocabulary knowledge and in the research presented by Loftus et al. (2010), continued implications pointed toward effectiveness of extended amounts of time on specific vocabulary instruction. As indicated by the studies, vocabulary instruction was beneficial for children, and in the last article of the first section, researchers Neuman, Newman, and Dwyer (2011) presented results of supplemental vocabulary instruction as a vehicle to bolster children’s word knowledge. Additionally, studies in the first section of this chapter utilized read aloud as a context to provide meaningful vocabulary instruction. In the next section of this chapter, research was presented which evaluated the effectiveness of vocabulary instruction included with story book read alouds. Fien et al. (2010) examined effects of a read aloud curriculum in small group instruction with first grade students. The results of this study indicated a greater increase in word knowledge for the group which received the supplemental instruction of the read aloud curriculum. Silverman (2007) continued research with the use of read alouds with three different methods of instruction. The results from this study suggested contextual instruction supported greater gains in word knowledge than the other methods. The studies continue to build momentum to support utilizing read alouds effectively to support vocabulary knowledge. Lovelace and Stewart (2007) presented a study that not only examined the effects of word knowledge but whether or not the context or type of book used in the read aloud had an effect. Despite, the insignificant effect of book type, word knowledge increased as a result of the vocabulary intervention. The last article for the second section of the chapter included a study on small group instruction paired with storybook reading by researchers Justice, Meir, and Walpole (2005). This study also supported
similar findings of effective vocabulary intervention with a read aloud. Finally, in the last section of this chapter, more analysis of read alouds used with vocabulary instruction was examined and specific focus was given to the explicit instruction implemented. In the study presented by Coyne et al. (2010), a specific and direct instruction intervention was implemented to determine the effects of the gains in word knowledge of kindergarten students who received the treatment of the experimental instruction than those who had no-treatment. The results indicated the experimental instruction supported greater gains in word knowledge. In the final article of this section, Beck and McKeown, (2007) compared two studies which utilized a researcher created curriculum which is an explicit model of direct teaching of word meanings and use in various contexts with read aloud literature. One study presented the implementation of the curriculum compared and the second study of extending instructional time on target vocabulary words of the same curriculum. Both studies indicated growth in vocabulary knowledge as well as a great gain for the participants who had extended instructional time with the target vocabulary words.

Overall, the research presented in this chapter suggested common components to effective vocabulary instruction that includes vocabulary instruction provided in a meaningful context for children in primary grades and the extended time on direct instruction for the acquisition of new vocabulary knowledge. This chapter discussed results of recent research on vocabulary intervention and in the next chapter the researcher will discuss procedures, participants, and data collection for the present study.
CHAPTER THREE: PROCEDURES FOR THE STUDY

Children who have limited exposure to vocabulary are at risk of reading difficulty in later grades (Pullen, et al., 2010). Effective vocabulary instruction then is important to improve student reading achievement. Effective vocabulary instruction includes instructional methods of word knowledge including intense intervention, supplemental small group instruction, and embedded instruction within whole-group read alouds (Silverman, 2007). Therefore, vocabulary instruction has an important role in a balanced reading program. In the primary grades teaching vocabulary should be purposeful and meaningful for young students. Read alouds provide an appropriate context for vocabulary instruction. The purpose of this study then was to examine the effects of vocabulary instruction using read aloud literature with first grade students. The next chapter explains the study’s participants, intervention steps, and data collection.

Sample Population

During the action research project to examine the impact of direct vocabulary instruction with the use of storybooks and word knowledge, a first grade class was selected to participate in this study. The school is located in a Midwestern city. All students participate in the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program and qualify for free or reduced lunches. The researcher’s first grade class was selected to participate in the study and 29 families were provided with the parental informed consent form to sign; however, only 25 forms were returned. Therefore, 25 African American students participated in this study (see Appendix A for the informed consent form). The student ages ranged from six to eight years old with an average of 6.64 years old. Sixteen male students and nine female students completed the study.

Materials and Methods
Prior to the beginning of the study, the researcher selected the curriculum guide from *Text talk professional guide: Level B*, Beck & McKneown, (2005), to use for the vocabulary instruction and storybooks for this study. The books were selected from the curriculum guide as well as the words from each of the texts. The words that the curriculum authors chose were based on Tier Two criteria, frequency and relevance to students. The five narrative texts chosen included: *The Principal’s New Clothes* (Clemenson, 1898), *Mole’s Hill* (Ehlert, 1994), *Possum’s Harvest Moon* (Hunter, 1996), and *Mice Make Trouble* (Bloom, 1999). Appendix B contains the lesson plans and lesson materials. Appendix C contains the pretest and posttest for all 30 vocabulary words, and the weekly pretests and posttests. The vocabulary words taught each week are listed in the following table (see Table 1).

Table 1

*Read Aloud Texts and Vocabulary Words*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week One: <em>Ruby the Copycat</em>  (Rathman, 1991)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coincidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week Two: <em>The Principal’s New Clothes</em>  (Clemenson, 1989)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>delicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trickster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week Three: <em>Mole’s Hill</em>  (Ehlert, 1994)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>burst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strolled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week Four: <em>Possum’s Harvest Moon</em>  (Hunter, 1996)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>autumn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snug</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week Five: <em>Mice Make Trouble</em>  (Bloom, 1999)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>assortment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inappropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each book and set of six vocabulary words was taught for four days. On the first day, the students were administered a pretest on the six vocabulary words. The pretest was orally read to the students and students were directed to circle “yes” or “no” to indicate if the vocabulary term in the sentence was used correctly. After the pretest, the storybook was read aloud to the students. During the read aloud, the researcher emphasized the vocabulary words as they were encountered and used the curriculum guide to check for comprehension of the story. Following the read aloud, the students then engaged in an activity to provide them another exposure to the vocabulary words and to follow-up the discussion of the story. On day two, the story was reread and the first three vocabulary words were introduced to the students. They were discussed in context with the story and following the curriculum guide the students were explicitly provided the word’s meaning. Another activity guided the students through discussion of examples and non-examples, using the word in context, and deciding which term would best fit an example given. Following the discussion, the students would then be guided through questions that asked the students to pick the word to best fit the question or statement, or pick the meaning of the word. The researcher guided the students through the examples as a whole class. On day three, the researcher reread the story again and introduced the next three vocabulary words in context with the story, explicating stated the word’s meanings and led the discussion of the words as the procedure listed in day two.

On day four, the researcher reread the story and led the students through a review discussion of all six words. The curriculum guide provided more examples of each word in sentences that the researcher used as a review activity with the students. For example, for the vocabulary term coincidence, the researcher would ask; which would be coincidence, going to your best friend’s birthday party or having the same birthday as a friend? All six vocabulary
words would be reviewed with questions of this type. After this review discussion the teacher then administered the posttest of the six words. The weekly posttest included identical questions on the six words as the pretest. This procedure was followed for the next four storybooks and vocabulary words. Upon the completion of the storybook and vocabulary words instruction a posttest on all 30 words was administered to the students.

**Data Collection**

Data collection occurred several times throughout the study. The results of the pretest on all 30 vocabulary words were collected at the beginning of the study. This assessment was read orally to the students by the researcher. The students chose the correct definition from three definition choices. Each question was assigned one point for a total of 30 points. Then, each week, the pretest and posttest result for six vocabulary words was collected. The students were instructed to decide if the sentence the vocabulary word was used in made sense by circling yes or no. Each sentence was worth one point for a total of six points on both the pretest and posttest. Following the completion of the study, the final posttest was administered for all 30 vocabulary words. The final posttest contained the same questions and was administered in the same order as the initial pretest. All assessments were examiner created. Data analysis was completed on the mean scores of words learned from the pretest and posttest of all 30 vocabulary words. The weekly pretest and posttest of the selected six vocabulary words was also scored for mean scores for words learned. A one tailed, dependent \( t \)-test was conducted on all pretest to posttest scores to determine the significant effect of the intervention.

**Summary**

In this chapter, the procedures, participants, data collection and analysis have been explained for the current research study. The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of
vocabulary instruction using read aloud literature with first grade students. Twenty-five Africa-American students were selected to participate in this six week research study. A cumulative pretest and posttest of all 30 vocabulary words was administered as well as five weekly pretest and posttests on a set of six vocabulary words. Data analysis of the mean scores determined if the intervention had an impact on student word knowledge after the conclusion of the study. In the next chapter, the results of the pretests and posttest will be discussed.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

The previous chapter discussed the population, procedures, and data collection of this study and in this next chapter the results of the study will be presented. Research indicates effective vocabulary instruction includes instructional methods of word knowledge including intense intervention, supplemental small group instruction, and embedded instruction within whole-group read alouds (Silverman, 2007). These methods have demonstrated positive effects on students with low-vocabulary knowledge as well as enabling them to equal their peers in reading achievement (Silverman, 2007). The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of vocabulary instruction using read aloud literature with first grade students. The research question was: What effect does vocabulary instruction paired with read aloud literature have on first grade students reading achievement?

The intervention of this study included a read aloud of five texts: Ruby the Copycat (Rathmann, 1991), The Principals New Clothes (Calmenson, 1989), Mole’s Hill (Ehlert, 1994), Possum’s Harvest Moon (Hunter, 1996), and Mice Make Trouble (Bloom, 1999). Each week the researcher read aloud one story and taught six vocabulary words and administered weekly pretests and posttests to assess student progress. A pretest and posttest of all 30 words was administered before the intervention began and immediately after the intervention concluded.

Pre and Post Test Results

On the pretest, 30 questions directed students to choose the correct meaning of each word selected for the intervention. The posttest contained the same questions regarding the word’s meaning, and each word and answer choices were presented in the same order as the pretest. On the pretest, the students scored a mean of 11.73 words known with a standard deviation of 2.74. On the posttest, the students increased their average to 20.14 words known with a standard
deviation of 5.77. This was an increase in the mean from the pretest to the final posttest by 8.41. The standard deviation increased from pretest to posttest which indicated the scores were further away from the mean of 20.14.

A one-tail dependent t-test was used to test the researcher’s hypothesis that students’ word knowledge would improve on the posttest compared with their pretest scores. There was a significant effect for words learned \( t(7)=0.000000075, p>.05, \) with the posttest receiving higher mean scores than the pretest. The results suggested that the intervention was successful in improving students’ word knowledge. Mean scores, standard deviations, and t-test values are presented in Table 1 (see Figure One for the mean score comparison of the pretest to posttest).

Table 1

Mean Performance on Pretest and Posttests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>20.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.746111</td>
<td>5.77309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T test</td>
<td>7.48E-07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L1 Pre</th>
<th>L1 Post</th>
<th>L2 Pre</th>
<th>L2 Post</th>
<th>L3 Pre</th>
<th>L3 Post</th>
<th>L4 Pre</th>
<th>L4 Post</th>
<th>L5 Pre</th>
<th>L5 Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.032094</td>
<td>1.348488</td>
<td>1.135991</td>
<td>1.082126</td>
<td>1.648451</td>
<td>1.354006</td>
<td>1.333946</td>
<td>0.902378</td>
<td>1.090097</td>
<td>1.045738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T test</td>
<td>0.142122</td>
<td>0.248956</td>
<td>0.009936</td>
<td>0.387604</td>
<td>0.012221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results indicated the intervention had an effect on improving student word knowledge. The data which was examined was based on knowledge of all 30 word meanings taught during the intervention. The researcher also examined data from a week to week basis which included only six words which were taught weekly. This data presented the students’ mean scores from each weekly pretest and posttest. Results of the weekly pretests and posttests continued to be similar to the overall mean performance, but were not consistent.

**Weekly Pre and Posttests**

In week one, *Ruby the Copycat* (Rathmann, 1991) was the text used to teach six vocabulary words. The students completed the pretest prior to reading of the text. The pretest and posttest were both scored from zero to six total points. Each vocabulary word was assigned one question on the pretest and posttest and students choose either “yes” or “no” indicating if the vocabulary word was used correctly in the sentence context. The correct answer was assigned one point. The posttest, which was administered on the fourth day of instruction, included the same questions as the pretest. On the pretest for Lesson One (L1), the mean was 3.25 and the standard deviation was 1.03. On the posttest, the mean was 3.65. The standard deviation was 1.34. Although the mean of the posttest was slightly higher, the standard deviation indicated the scores were slightly farther away from the mean.

A one-tail dependent t-test was used to test the researcher’s hypothesis that students’ word knowledge improved on the posttest compared with their pretest scores. There was no significant effect on words learned $t(14) = 0.14, p > .05$, from pretest to posttest. This suggested the intervention had no effect in improving students’ word knowledge (see Figure Two for the mean score comparison of L1 pretest and posttest).
In the second week for the Lesson Two (L2), the text *The Principal’s New Clothes* (Calmenson, 1989) was selected for the intervention. Six new words were taught following the same format as Lesson One. The mean of the pretest scores was 3.9. The standard deviation for the pretest was 1.13. The mean for the posttest was 4.14 and the standard deviation was 1.08. This is a 0.24 difference in the means. On the pretest, the standard deviation indicated the students’ scores were slightly farther away from the mean score. On the posttest, the standard deviation indicated the students’ scores were slightly closer to the mean score than the pretest.

A one-tail dependent t-test was used to test the researcher’s hypothesis that students’ word knowledge improved on the posttest compared with their pretest scores. There was no significant effect on words learned $t(24) = 0.24$, $p > .05$, from pretest to posttest. These results suggest that there was no significant difference from the pretest to the posttest. This implied the
intervention had no effect in improving students’ word knowledge. The mean score comparison of L2 pretest and posttest is included in Figure Three.

![Figure 3 Mean Performance on Lesson Two pretest and posttest.](image)

The third week of intervention of the Lesson Three (L3) included the text, *Mole’s Hill* (Ehlert, 1994). Six more words were learned from this story. The pretest was administered before the text was read and the posttest was administered on the fourth day of intervention. The mean score from the pretest was 3.25. The standard deviation from the pretest was 1.64. The mean score from the posttest was 4.33. The standard deviation was 1.35. This was a 1.08 difference of the means of the pretest to posttest. The standard deviation of the pretest \((SD=1.64)\) indicated the students’ scores were slightly farther away from the mean score. On the posttest, the standard deviation \((SD=1.35)\) indicated that the students’ scores were slightly closer to the mean score than the pretest.

A one-tail dependent t-test was used to test the researcher’s hypothesis that students’ word knowledge improved on the posttest compared with their pretest scores. There was significant difference in words learned \(t(9) = 0.009, p>.05\), with the posttest receiving a higher
mean score than the pretest. The results suggested that there was significant difference from the pretest to the posttest. This implied the intervention had an effect in improving students’ word knowledge. Figure Four contains the mean score comparison of L3 pretest and posttest.

![Figure 4 Mean Performance on Lesson Three pretest and posttest.](image)

In the fourth week, Lesson Four (L4) included the text *Possum’s Harvest Moon* (Hunter, 1996). The students learned six more words with the read aloud of this storybook. The pretest was administered prior to the reading of the text. On the pretest, the mean score was 4.82 and standard deviation was 1.33. On the posttest, the mean score was 4.71 and standard deviation was 0.9. The difference in mean scores from pretest to posttest was 0.11. This indicated a slightly lower mean score on the posttest than the pretest. The standard deviation of the pretest indicated the students’ mean scores were slightly farther away from the mean score. On the posttest, the standard deviation ($SD=0.9$), indicated the students’ scores were slightly closer to the mean score. These results indicated there were no significant gains from pretest to posttest.

A one-tail dependent t-test was used to test the researcher’s hypothesis that students’ word knowledge would improve on the posttest compared with their pretest scores. There was no
significant effect on words learned \( t(38) = 0.38, p > .05 \), from pretest to posttest. This implied the intervention had no effect in improving students’ word knowledge. The comparison of mean scores for the pretest and posttest of L4 are found in Figure Five.

\[ \text{L4 Pre} \quad \text{L4 Post} \]

\begin{tabular}{c|c|c|c}
  \hline
  \textbf{Number of Words} & 4.82 & 4.71 \\
  \hline
  \textbf{Mean Scores} & \textbf{L4 Pre} & \textbf{L4 Post} \\
  \hline
\end{tabular}

\textit{Figure 5} Mean Performance on Lesson Four pretest and posttest.

In the fifth and final lesson (L5), \textit{Mice Make Trouble} (Bloom, 1999), was the final storybook selection to accompany the last six vocabulary words used for intervention. The mean score of the pretest was 3.95 and standard deviation was 1.09. The mean score of the posttest was 4.74 and standard deviation was 1.04. The students’ mean score had a slight increase of 0.79 from pretest to posttest. The standard deviation of the posttest \((SD=1.04)\) indicated the students’ mean scores were slightly closer the mean of the posttest. The standard deviation of the pretest \((SD=1.09)\) indicated the students’ means scores were slightly farther from the mean score than the posttest.

A one-tail dependent t-test was used to test the researcher’s hypothesis that students’ word knowledge improved on the posttest compared with their pretest scores. There was a significant effect \( t(1) = 0.01, p > .05 \), with the posttest receiving a higher mean score than the
pretest. This implied the intervention had an effect on improving students’ word knowledge. The comparison of mean scores for the L5 pretest and posttest are found in Figure Six.

![Figure 6](image)

**Summary**

The weekly results indicated there was effect on improving students’ word knowledge for two of the five weekly pretest and posttests. The mean scores on four out of the five weekly pretest and posttest showed a slightly higher mean score on the posttests. However, the t-test values indicated the increase was not a significant effect on the students’ word knowledge.

Overall, the intervention had effect on the students’ word knowledge of all 30 vocabulary words as indicated by the mean scores of the pretest to posttest. The weekly pretests and posttests indicated on three out of five occurrences, there was no significant effect on students’ word knowledge. In the next chapter, the researcher will discuss possible explanations for the results of the overall effect on the intervention as well as the results from the weekly pretest and posttests.
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS

The previous chapter discussed the results of the study on storybook read alouds and vocabulary instruction for first grade students. In this chapter, the researcher will review literature and methodology, discuss conclusions, strengths, limitations of the current study and implications for further research.

Review of Literature

Vocabulary instruction in the early grades has an important role in decreasing the reading achievement gap (Coyne et al., 2009). Vocabulary knowledge is an important aspect of reading comprehension and one way to increase comprehension with vocabulary instruction is through the use of storybooks. Storybook read alouds have been used to set a foundational context in which to instruct novel vocabulary words to students. Fien et al. (2011) conducted a study on the effect of storybook read aloud curriculum in small groups in which the results suggested an impact on student growth in vocabulary knowledge. Research conducted by Justice et al. (2009) suggested students with low word knowledge demonstrated an increase in vocabulary when read alouds and robust vocabulary instruction were used to provide a context to acquire new word knowledge. Additionally, Coyne et al., (2010) studied effects of direct and extended vocabulary instruction with the use of interactive read alouds. The results of this study indicated growth in vocabulary knowledge of students who received the vocabulary instruction versus the students who did not. Similarly, Loftus et al. (2010) conducted a study which provided Tier Two instruction to at-risk students and results indicated this intervention would support closing the word knowledge gap. In this study, the small group intervention instruction supported the effort
to make gains in word knowledge. Besides using the context of read alouds as a basis to instruction vocabulary, the additional and focused vocabulary instruction was extremely beneficial for students. The data collected by Neuman, Newman, and Dwyer (2011) supported research of supplemental instructional which assists students who have significant deficits in word knowledge. Implementing programs that provided extra support in word knowledge, conceptual knowledge, and categorical knowledge positively impacts student’s word knowledge and ultimately reading comprehension. The supplemental instruction provided supported positive implications in supporting word knowledge.

Additional research, by Silverman (2007) included findings that also supported benefits of using storybook read alouds and direct vocabulary instruction. The findings supported research that described effective vocabulary instruction to include a deep understanding of words as well as connection to prior experiences and knowledge (Silverman, 2007). This study supported the benefits of specific and focused vocabulary instruction. These findings supported the utilization of methods that assist students in reading comprehension. Students who lack vocabulary knowledge are in need of instruction to support their growth in word knowledge that also supports comprehension of text. Based on this study, extended instruction in addition to regular whole class instruction provided during the storybook reading also had an impact on student word learning.

Beck and McKeown, (2007) compared two studies which utilized a researcher created curriculum which is an explicit model of direct teaching of word meanings and use in various contexts with read aloud literature. Both studies indicated growth in vocabulary knowledge as well as a considerable gain for the participants who had extended instructional time with the target vocabulary words. Therefore, in primary grades, the use of read aloud literature and
vocabulary instruction is one method which may increase students’ word knowledge. The purpose of the current study was to examine the impact of extending student word knowledge with direct vocabulary instruction paired with read aloud literature for first grade students.

**Review of Methodology**

In this current study, the researcher posed the question, what effect will vocabulary instruction paired with read aloud literature have on first grade students? The researcher hypothesized there would be an effect on student vocabulary knowledge. Before the study commenced, the researcher administered a pretest on all 30 vocabulary words of the study’s intervention. Next, the intervention included reading five different storybooks and instruction of six vocabulary words with each book over the course of five weeks. Each week, the researcher would read the story, administer instruction of selected six words, guide students through examples and non-examples of each word and administered weekly pretests and posttests to assess word knowledge of students. At the end of the intervention a posttest of all 30 vocabulary words was administered to determine effects of the intervention.

The results of the pretest and posttest of all 30 words taught during the study indicated a growth in vocabulary knowledge. The use of read aloud literature to instruct vocabulary words is appropriate for first grade students. Results of the pre to posttest of this study suggest a positive effect on word knowledge when taught in context with read aloud literature. This connects to the Common Core Standards for Vocabulary Acquisition and Use in Grade 1, L1.4a because the format of the weekly lessons assisted students’ to determine or clarify the meaning of unknown and multiple-meaning words and phrases based on grade 1 reading and content, choosing flexibility from an array of strategies (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010). The use of appropriate literature and discussion surrounding the vocabulary words taught is one method
in which multi-meaning words can be taught to first grade students. This finding is based on the overall growth of the students during the study however, as the researchers found by examining the weekly pretest and posttest the results did not remain consistent.

**Explanation of Results**

The results of the first weekly intervention lesson, which used the text *Ruby the Copycat* (Rathmann, 1991) indicated the mean scores from the pretest to posttest of the six vocabulary words slightly increased but there was no significant effect on words learned from pretest to posttest. The first intervention indicated no effect on student word knowledge. This could be due to unfamiliarity in which the students had with each of the vocabulary words and lack of experience with discussing words and their meanings. The students had four days of intervention with exposure to six new vocabulary words, therefore, the time spent on the read aloud and discussion of the new six vocabulary words was not sufficient to support word knowledge growth. Similar findings continued to follow as the researcher analyzed the weekly intervention results.

In the second lesson, the text *The Principal’s Clothes* (Calmenson, 1989) was read aloud with six new vocabulary words introduced to the students with the same procedure as the first storybook. The results of this lesson’s pretest and posttest indicated no significant effect on words learned. The mean scores from L2 pretest to posttest suggested a slight increase in student word learning, however, there was no sufficient effect on student word knowledge for Lesson Two. Again, the discussion and exposure to the new six vocabulary words did not impact student word knowledge. This finding also suggests the students may need more instructional time or exposure to the words being taught. The time needed for exposure and extended experiences with new words is essential for vocabulary acquisition for young students.
The third lesson used the text *Mole’s Hill* (Ehlert, 1994) in the intervention of the next six vocabulary words. The results of the pretest and posttest for Lesson Three indicated a significant effect which suggested an impact on student word knowledge. For this third lesson, the read aloud text and vocabulary intervention impacted students’ words learned. The read aloud of text, instruction and discussion of vocabulary terms was beneficial for student word learning in this instance. The researcher, who implemented the intervention, continued the same procedure as the previous week. This demonstrates an important component related to Common Core Standard in Language: Vocabulary Acquisition and Use Grade 1 L1.5. Students acquire vocabulary knowledge with guidance and support from adults, and demonstrate understanding of word relationships and nuances in word meanings (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010). The discussion after the text was read aloud focused on the vocabulary word’s meaning, examples and use in sentence context. This seemed to be effective for students during the third week of intervention of this current study. Similarly, a study conducted Beck and McKeown (2007) examined the effects of read aloud literature paired with vocabulary instruction and results indicated gains in words learned with the group of students who received instruction of vocabulary words in context of a storybook read aloud compared to the group who did not receive the intervention. The results for the first three lessons have only indicated that one week of intervention was effective on students’ word knowledge. As analysis continued the researcher determined the weekly pretest and posttest results did not stay consistent.

The text used for Lesson Four was *Possum’s Harvest Moon* (Hunter, 1996). The results from the pretest and posttest of the six words taught for this lesson indicated no effect in the intervention. The mean score for the pretest was 4.82 which indicated students may have known the meanings of five of the six words that were taught. The context of the book included the
season of fall and events that surround the season. The reason the students may have known the words to be taught may have been because of prior knowledge that existed for many of the students. This topic, fall is a common theme in kindergarten and the beginning of the year topic for many teachers to discuss, read stories, and teach. The posttest mean scores of *Possum’s Harvest Moon* (Hunter, 1996) was 4.71 which was lower but very similar to the pretest mean (*M*=4.82). Similar results occurred in Lovelace and Stewarts (2009) study in which the researchers’ suggested a possible explanation of the students’ word knowledge growth was because the students were familiar with the topic of the storybook used for the intervention. In the current study, the researcher suggests there was no significant word knowledge growth because the students were familiar with the words prior to the intervention. In the final analysis of weekly pretest and posttest the results indicated growth in the students’ word knowledge.

In the last lesson of the intervention, *Mice Make Trouble* (Bloom, 1999) was the text that was used during the instruction of the last six vocabulary words for the study. Results suggest there was an impact on students’ word knowledge. The mean scores increased slightly from pretest to posttest indicating an effect on students’ word knowledge. Overall, of all the lessons of intervention, two of the five weekly lessons suggested gains in student word knowledge. This suggests the use of the read aloud literature and vocabulary instruction was beneficial for student word knowledge. Similar studies have also concluded read alouds are a meaningful context in which to approach vocabulary instruction. This study incorporated components which previous research conducted by Coyne et al. (2010) and Beck and McKeown (2007) also conducted research studies which focused on storybook read alouds and vocabulary instruction. Similarly, this was a strength of the current study.
Strengths and Limitations

The use of read alouds was a strength of studies by Coyne et al. (2010) and Beck and McKeown (2007) because of the meaningful context provided for the students. The current study also used read aloud literature which was appropriate and high interest for first grade students. The selected texts for this study were of high interest and highly motivating for the students to be engaged during the intervention. For example in one text, which was of high interest to students, was *Ruby the Copycat* (Rathmann, 1991). This story was one that students could easily relate to because of the setting and plot of a little girl, Ruby who was a copycat of her classmate. The familiarity of the storybook topic was an additional strength of the current study. Another highly motivating text was *Possum’s Harvest Moon* (Hunter, 1996). The researcher suggests the topic of the book, which was the season fall, was familiar to many of the students which resulted in insufficient results to show any word knowledge growth. Conversely, the familiarity of the text allowed for the intervention session to be motivating and engaging for the students. However, the explanation for the result of the mean posttest test score to be slightly lower than the pretest mean, could be due to testing fatigue or error by students during administration of the posttest. Another possible reason for insufficient effect on student mean scores could be due to the amount of time spent on exposure to target words, which would also by a limitation of this study.

Limitations of this study included the number of exposures of the selected vocabulary words. The researcher utilized four days on the six words for each storybook. In the study by Beck and McKeown (2007), findings suggested that increasing the amount of instructional time and exposures to targeted words resulted in substantial gains in word learning. The researcher of the current study concurs that more time utilized on students’ exposure to new vocabulary words would increase the amount of words learned. Thus, more time is needed on exposure and
instruction of target words. Time was also a limitation to the current study, as each session for the intervention was approximately 30 minutes. The students would greatly benefit from more time on vocabulary and activities that would provide repeated exposure and interaction of word meanings of the targeted vocabulary. Another consideration for limitations of this study would be the extension activities of the target words. Though, during the intervention the research led students through examples and non-examples of target words, the study did not include extension activities in which the students used the words in context other than the intervention sessions. This would be a way to improve on the current study as well research on vocabulary acquisition.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The number of days of intervention of the new vocabulary words of this current study was four, therefore, as indicated by results of the weekly posttests, more time with exposures to the words is needed. Extending the number of days discussing or reviewing words would be beneficial for students to retain word knowledge. A recommendation for further research would be to study the effects of the amount of time dedicated to target vocabulary instruction has on student word knowledge. Research on the number of exposures students needed to meaningfully learn and acquire new vocabulary is recommended for further research. The researchers asserts another suggestion for further research would be to explore other methods of effective methods other than in read alouds would be beneficial for word knowledge growth. This may include target vocabulary words in small group or independent word work time would also be one way for the teacher to increase opportunities of student encounter of the words. Additionally, time devoted to examining multiple meaning vocabulary words during word work in whole group and small group instruction will aid in increasing the students’ retention of word knowledge. The change for research to include extended time dedicated to instruction and exposure and other
methods of instructing target vocabulary is necessary to determine the best practice for word knowledge retention. The recommendations of this study have been similar to those of Coyne et al. (2009) and Beck and McKeown (2007) and also contribute to the continuing effort to find best practices to increase student word knowledge. The continued research of vocabulary instruction and best practices will not only benefit students’ acquired word knowledge but also their reading comprehension.

Summary

Vocabulary acquisition is an important area for teachers and administrators to direct particular attention when considering methods of improving student reading proficiency. Read aloud text and vocabulary instruction should be considered important part of increasing student’s reading achievement. The present findings support using read alouds as a context to teach vocabulary to primary students. Overall, considering the findings of this study, the students’ scores increased almost 10 words as a result of the intervention, supports using literature as meaningful context for vocabulary instruction. In the primary grades, reading is an essential part of a students continued academic success and instruction in vocabulary is one area teachers should intentionally focus instruction appropriate for students to acquire new vocabulary.
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INFORMED CONSENT FORM

January 18th, 2013

Using Children’s Literature to Increase Vocabulary

I am conducting a study, for my graduate program, on the use of children’s literature with first grade students. The purpose of the study is to see if using children’s literature with first grade students will increase comprehension and vocabulary knowledge. I would like to include your child in this study.

Procedure: The study will begin with a vocabulary test to assess student prior knowledge on words covered in the study. This test will take place in our classroom during our reading skills time. The purpose of this test is to assess your child’s vocabulary knowledge. For five weeks the students and I will work together daily for 30 minutes during our reading skills time. Each week, the students and I will read one children’s literature book to gain interest in reading. Before reading the book, I will pre test your child on key vocabulary words from the story. On day one, the students will engage in pre-reading activities designed to activate and build prior knowledge on the topic of the text and I will orally read the pre-selected text and discuss the content of the story. On day two, I will introduce three vocabulary words and discuss them as we have read them in the text. On days three, I will introduce three more vocabulary words and discuss them in relation to the text. On day four, we will engage in vocabulary activities including syllabication, using the context, discussing meanings, word games, making new sentences, and using graphic organizers. On day five, the students will complete a post test assessing the key vocabulary words taught. At the end of five weeks, the students will complete a post test that assesses all the words taught in the five weeks. I will examine all the results to determine word knowledge growth.

Confidentiality: All information will remain confidential (i.e., I will not reveal your child’s responses or results).

Risks: I do not anticipate this study will cause any type of risk, psychological or otherwise.

Benefits: I believe that as a result of participation in this study, the students will increase their reading comprehension and vocabulary knowledge.

Participation is Voluntary: If at any time you wish to withdraw your child from this study, please feel free to contact me. Your child’s responses to the questions and results will be destroyed upon your request. Your child will not be penalized in any way.

Use of Your Information: My goal is to present the results of this study for a paper required for completion of my graduate program. Only aggregate (combined) data from all participants will be used, and in no case will any names be associated with this study.

Contact Information: If you are interested in the results of this study (which should be completed by February 28th, 2012), or if you have any other questions, concerns, or comments on this project, please contact:
Nicole Drager  
2345 N 25th St  
Milwaukee, WI 53206  
nicole.drager@hopeschools.org  
920-296-9941  

Michael Flaherty  
Cardinal Stritch University  
1037 W. McKinley Ave.  
Milwaukee, WI 53205  
mflaherty@wolfmail.stritch.edu  
414-410-4484  

If you have any concerns about this study, please call or write:  
Joan L. Whitman COEL, IRB Chair  
Cardinal Stritch University  
6801 N. Yates Rd. Box 375  
Milwaukee, WI 53217  
414-410-4343  
jlwhitman@stritch.edu  

Although your name may be asked, all concerns are kept in confidence.  

Thank you for your cooperation.  

This research project has been approved by the Cardinal Stritch University Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Research Participants on January 16th, 2013, for a period of 12 months.  

I have received and explanation of the study and permit my child to participate in this study. I understand that participation is voluntary.  

I agree to permit my child/dependent to participate in the study.  
I do not permit my child/dependent to participate in the study.  

____________________________________________________  
Name of Minor Child/Dependent  
____________________________________________________  
Date_________________  
Signature of Parent or Legally Authorized Representative
### Lesson Plans and Materials

**Content/Grade Level:** Vocabulary (Text Talk)/1st  
**Week of:**  
**Teacher Name:** Drager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWBAT describe traits of characters in <em>Ruby the Copycat</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWBAT identify and explain the vocabulary words coincidence, loyal, and bitter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWBAT identify and explain vocabulary words murmured, recited, and sensitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment/ Exit Ticket (Please attach if necessary)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 1 Pretest write vocab words and draw an event from the story Worksheet Lesson 1 Day 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit slip Lesson 1 Day 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Slip Lesson 1 Day 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson 1 Posttest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connection to Prior Knowledge Time:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give pretest Show title and author of book. What do you notice about the way the girls on the cover are dressed? Which child do you think is Ruby the copycat? Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review story-Use pictures and students tell story, review character traits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review coincidence, loyal, and bitter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review story and find next 3 vocabulary words in text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review all words- Read sentences from text. TE pg. 20 using Confirm section to guide review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INM Time:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read story Use text talk notes to scaffold and monitor comprehension. Stop and point to each vocabulary word (coincidence, loyal, bitter, murmured, recited, sensitive)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show 3 vocabulary words Explain meanings TE pg. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show 3 vocabulary words Explain meanings TE pg. 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have students explain in own words. TE pg. 20 using Connect section to prompt students and review on pg. 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GP Time:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE pg. 15 and Text Talk notes How does Ruby feel when she gets to school? Why does she act the way she does? How does Ruby act when Angela gets mad at her? How is Ruby different at the end of the story?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Vocabulary TE pg. 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Vocabulary TE pg. 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students take posttest- All tests are read orally to students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IP Time:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will write vocabulary words.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Choose the best answer on WS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students complete sentences using vocabulary words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students complete exit slip using vocabulary words.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will draw how Ruby feels at different points in the story</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students complete exit slip.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Book connection TE pg. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 vocabulary words Pretest <em>Ruby the Copycat</em> Teacher’s Edition (Text Talk) Worksheet Day 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ruby the Copycat</em> 3 Vocabulary words TE Exit Slip Lesson 1 Day 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ruby the Copycat</em> 3 Vocabulary words TE Exit Slip Lesson 1 Day 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ruby the Copycat</em> Lesson 1 Weekly Posttest TE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>SWBAT make connections of the important events The Principal's New Clothes</td>
<td>SWBAT identify and explain the vocabulary words delicate, drafty, rave</td>
<td>SWBAT identify and explain vocabulary words trickster, genuine, imposter</td>
<td>SWBAT demonstrate their understanding of the 6 vocabulary words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment/ Exit Ticket (Please attach if necessary)</td>
<td>Lesson 2 Pretest write vocab words and draw an event from the story Worksheet Lesson 2 Day 1</td>
<td>Exit slip Lesson 2 Day 2</td>
<td>Exit Slip Lesson 2 Day 3</td>
<td>Lesson 2 Posttest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to Prior Knowledge Time:</td>
<td>Give pretest Show title and author of book. Tell students this book is based on an old tale called The Emperor's New Clothes. Ask- Why do you think the man and woman on the cover are measuring the principal?</td>
<td>Review story-Use pictures and students tell story, review event connections</td>
<td>Review delicate, drafty, rave Review story and find next 3 vocabulary words in text</td>
<td>Review all words- Read sentences from text. TE pg. 30 using Confirm section to guide review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INM Time:</td>
<td>Read story. Use text talk notes to scaffold and monitor comprehension. Stop and point to each vocabulary word (delicate, drafty, rave, trickster, genuine, imposter)</td>
<td>Show 3 vocabulary words Explain meanings TE pg. 26</td>
<td>Show 3 vocabulary words-Explain meanings TE pg. 28</td>
<td>Have students explain in own words. TE pg. 30 using Connect section to prompt students and review on pg. 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP Time:</td>
<td>TE pg. 25 and Text Talk notes What starts everything going? How does this connect to what happens next?</td>
<td>Develop Vocabulary TE pg. 27</td>
<td>Develop Vocabulary TE pg. 29</td>
<td>Students take posttest- All tests are read orally to students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP Time:</td>
<td>Students will write vocabulary words.</td>
<td>Students complete sentences using vocabulary words</td>
<td>Choose the best answer on WS</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>Students will draw the principal's new suit</td>
<td>Students complete exit slip using vocabulary words.</td>
<td>Students complete exit slip.</td>
<td>Book connection TE pg. 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>6 vocabulary words Pretest Lesson 2 The Principal's New Clothes Teacher's Edition (Text Talk) Worksheet Day 1</td>
<td>The Principal's New Clothes 3 Vocabulary words TE Exit Slip Lesson 2 Day 2</td>
<td>The Principal's New Clothes 3 Vocabulary words TE Exit Slip Lesson 2 Day 3</td>
<td>The Principal's New Clothes Lesson 2 Weekly Posttest TE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content/Grade Level: Vocabulary (Text Talk)/1st Week of: Teacher Name: Drager

**HOPE Prima Weekly Lesson Plan Template**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC Standard</td>
<td>RL1.7. Use illustrations and details in a story to describe its characters, setting, or events. L.1.4.a. Use sentence-level context as a clue to the meaning of a word or phrase.</td>
<td>RL1.7. Use illustrations and details in a story to describe its characters, setting, or events. L.1.4.a. Use sentence-level context as a clue to the meaning of a word or phrase.</td>
<td>RL1.7. Use illustrations and details in a story to describe its characters, setting, or events. L.1.4.a. Use sentence-level context as a clue to the meaning of a word or phrase.</td>
<td>RL1.7. Use illustrations and details in a story to describe its characters, setting, or events. L.1.4.a. Use sentence-level context as a clue to the meaning of a word or phrase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>SWBAT make connections</td>
<td>SWBAT identify and explain</td>
<td>SWBAT identify and explain</td>
<td>SWBAT demonstrate their understanding of the 6 vocabulary words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the important events</td>
<td>the vocabulary words</td>
<td>vocabulary words</td>
<td>understanding of the 6 vocabulary words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole’s Hill</td>
<td>burst, gathered, quivered</td>
<td>compromise, obstacle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment/</td>
<td>Lesson 3 Pretest</td>
<td>Exit slip Lesson 3 Day 2</td>
<td>Exit Slip Lesson 3 Day 3</td>
<td>Lesson 3 Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Ticket</td>
<td>write vocab words and draw an event from the story</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Please attach if necessary)</td>
<td>Worksheet Lesson 3 Day 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to Prior Knowledge Time:</td>
<td>Give pretest</td>
<td>Review story-Use pictures and students tell story, review event connections</td>
<td>Review burst, gathered, quivered</td>
<td>Review all words- Read sentences from text. TE pg. 40 using Confirm section to guide review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>Show title and author of book. Give background knowledge about harvest time and possums.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INM Time:</td>
<td>Read story. Use text talk notes to scaffold and monitor comprehension. Stop and point to each vocabulary word (burst, gathered, quivered, strolled, compromise, obstacle)</td>
<td>Show 3 vocabulary words Explain meanings TE pg. 36</td>
<td>Show 3 vocabulary words- Explain meanings TE pg. 38</td>
<td>Have students explain in own words. TE pg. 40 using Connect section to prompt students and review on pg. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP Time:</td>
<td>TE pg. 35 and Text Talk notes What does Fox want? How does this affect Mole? What does Mole do about the problem?</td>
<td>Develop Vocabulary TE pg. 37</td>
<td>Develop Vocabulary TE pg. 39</td>
<td>Students take posttest- All tests are read orally to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP Time:</td>
<td>Students will write vocabulary words. Students complete sentences using vocabulary words</td>
<td>Choose the best answer on WS</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>Students will draw the mole collecting seeds. Students complete exit slip using vocab words.</td>
<td>Students complete exit slip. Book connection TE pg. 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Content/Grade Level:** Vocabulary (Text Talk)/1st

**Week:** HOPE Prima Weekly Lesson Plan Template

**Teacher Name:** Drager
|GP Time: | TE pg. 45 and Text Talk notes  
What are the biggest things that happen in this story? Talk about only the most important events. | Develop Vocabulary TE pg. 47 | Develop Vocabulary TE pg. 49 | Students take posttest- All tests are read orally to students |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IP Time:</td>
<td>Students will write vocabulary words.</td>
<td>Students complete sentences using vocabulary words</td>
<td>Choose the best answer on WS</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>Students will draw the possum’s party.</td>
<td>Students complete exit slip using vocabulary words.</td>
<td>Students complete exit slip.</td>
<td>Book connection TE pg. 52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|Materials | 6 vocabulary words  
Pretest Lesson 4  
Possum’s Harvest Moon  
Teacher’s Edition (Text Talk)  
Worksheet Day 1 | Possum’s Harvest Moon  
3 Vocabulary words  
TE  
Exit Slip Lesson 4 Day 2 | Possum’s Harvest Moon  
3 Vocabulary words  
TE  
Exit Slip Lesson 4 Day 3 | Possum’s Harvest Moon Lesson 4 Weekly Posttest TE |

**Content/Grade Level:** Vocabulary (Text Talk)/1st  
**Week of:**  
**HOPE Prima Weekly Lesson Plan Template**  
**Teacher Name:** Drager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|**CC Standard**| RL1.7. Use illustrations and details in a story to describe its characters, setting, or events.  
L.1.4.a. Use sentence-level context as a clue to the meaning of a word or phrase. | RL1.7. Use illustrations and details in a story to describe its characters, setting, or events.  
L.1.4.a. Use sentence-level context as a clue to the meaning of a word or phrase. | RL1.7. Use illustrations and details in a story to describe its characters, setting, or events.  
L.1.4.a. Use sentence-level context as a clue to the meaning of a word or phrase. | RL1.7. Use illustrations and details in a story to describe its characters, setting, or events.  
L.1.4.a. Use sentence-level context as a clue to the meaning of a word or phrase. |
|**Objective**| SWBAT will recognize the problem/solution of Mice Make Trouble | SWBAT identify and explain the vocabulary words assignment, civilized, contributed | SWBAT identify and explain vocabulary words inappropriate, concoct, orderly | SWBAT demonstrate their understanding of the 6 vocabulary words |
|**Assessment/Exit Ticket**| Lesson 5 Pretest  
write vocab words and draw an event from the story  
Worksheet Lesson 5 Day 1 | Exit slip Lesson 5 Day 2 | Exit Slip Lesson 5 Day 3 | Lesson 5 Posttest |
|**Connection to Prior Knowledge Time:**| Give pretest  
Show title and author of book.  
What is shown on the cover? What looks to you like it could be trouble? | Review story-Use pictures and students tell story, explain problem/solution in own words | Review assortment, civilized, contributed  
Review story and find next 3 vocabulary words in text | Review all words- Read sentences from text.  
TE pg. 60 using Confirm section to guide review |
|**INM Time:**| Read story.  
Use text talk notes to scaffold and monitor comprehension.  
Stop and point to each vocabulary word (assignment, civilized, contributed, inappropriate, concoct, orderly) | Show 3 vocabulary words  
Explain meanings TE pg. 56 | Show 3 vocabulary words-Explain meanings TE pg. 58 | Have students explain in own words.  
TE pg. 60 using Connect section to prompt students and review on pg. 61 |
|**GP Time:**| TE pg. 55 and Text Talk notes  
How does Henry get into trouble? Name his problem. What does he do to make it better? (Problem/Solution) | Develop Vocabulary TE pg. 57 | Develop Vocabulary TE pg. 59 | Students take posttest- All tests are read orally to students |
<p>|<strong>IP Time:</strong>| Students will write vocabulary words. | Students complete sentences using vocabulary words | Choose the best answer on WS | Posttest |
|<strong>Closing</strong>| Students will draw the possum’s party. | Students complete exit slip using vocabulary words. | Students complete exit slip. | Book connection TE pg. 62 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Pretest Lesson 5</th>
<th>Mice Make Trouble</th>
<th>Mice Make Trouble</th>
<th>Mice Make Trouble</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 vocabulary words</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Vocabulary words</td>
<td>3 Vocabulary words</td>
<td>Lesson 5 Weekly Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td></td>
<td>TE</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td>TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mice Make Trouble (Text Talk)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exit Slip Lesson 5 Day 2</td>
<td>Exit Slip Lesson 5 Day 3</td>
<td>TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worksheet Day 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ruby the Copycat

Write each word twice.

coincidence______________________________________
loyal____________________________________________
bitter____________________________________________
murmured________________________________________
recited____________________________________________
sensitive________________________________________

Draw a picture of how Ruby acted when Angela gets mad at her.

Draw a picture of how Ruby is different at the end of the story.
Ruby the Copycat

Directions: Using the words from the box write the correct word in the sentence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>coincidence</th>
<th>loyal</th>
<th>bitter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. My mom liked the way the plumber quickly took care of the leak, so she became a ________________________ customer.
2. I got a letter from my best friend right when I was missing her most, which was a nice ________________________ .
3. I was ________________________ after the boy carelessly broke my toy.

Exit Slip

Directions: Use the words from the box to answer the questions.

1. Which word tells about a surprising event or planned event?
   ______________________________________________________________

2. Which word is like faithful?
   ______________________________________________________________

3. Which word means to have the feeling you have when you stay very angry?
   ______________________________________________________________
Ruby the Copycat

Directions: Choose the best answer for each question.

1. Which makes people *murmur* more?
   a. something they want everyone to know
   b. something they don’t want everyone to know

2. Which would a kindergarten student *recite*?
   a. the alphabet
   b. a picture he drew

3. Which person is *sensitive*?
   a. the one who feels sad after hearing a story
   b. the one who tells the story to a lot of people

Exit Slip

Directions: Choose the best answer for each question.

1. Who would *murmur*?
   a. someone telling a secret
   b. someone singing

2. Which would be *recited*?
   a. a newspaper
   b. a book report

3. Who would be *sensitive*?
   a. someone who hugged you when you were sad
   b. someone who ignored you when you were sad
The Principal’s New Clothes

Write each word twice.

drafty ____________________ ____________________
delicate ____________________ ____________________
imposter ____________________ ____________________
trickster ____________________ ____________________
rave ____________________ ____________________
genuine ____________________ ____________________

Draw a picture of the Principal's new suit.
The Principal’s New Clothes

Directions: Using the words from the box write the correct word in the sentence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>drafty</th>
<th>delicate</th>
<th>imposter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. No one was allowed to touch the ________________________ picture.
2. The man in the blue jacket is an ________________________ .
3. Even though it was _______________________ we were happy to stay in the old barn.

Exit Slip

Directions: Use the words from the box to answer the questions.

1. Which word tells about a person who is cold would not like to sit by this kind of window?

2. Which word means someone who is pretending to be something he is not?

3. Which word is like fragile?
The Principal’s New Clothes

Directions: Choose the best answer for each question.

1. Which words means someone is a trickster?
   a. someone playing an April’s Fool’s joke
   b. someone playing a CD

2. Which would be something you would rave about?
   a. looking for books in the library
   b. eating a tasty meal

3. Which one is genuine?
   a. a ring made of real gold
   b. a plastic hamburger

Exit Slip

Directions: Write the word from the box to answer for each question.

| trickster | rave | genuine |

1. Which word is most like real?

2. What do we call someone who fools others?

3. Which word tells what a person did when he spoke excitedly about something?
Mole’s Hill

Write each word twice.

burst ____________________ ____________________
gathered ____________________ ____________________
quivered ____________________ ____________________
strolled ____________________ ____________________
compromise ____________________ ____________________
obstacle ____________________ ____________________

Draw a picture of the Mole gathering seeds she was going to save.
Mole’s Hill
Directions: Using the words from the box write the correct word in the sentence.

| quiver | strolled | compromise |

1. When a rabbit sniffs something, its nose begins to __________________________ .
2. The boys were able to __________________________ and both get what they wanted.
3. Cindy stopped to look in the shop windows as she __________________________ home.

Exit Slip
Directions: Use the words from the box to answer the questions.
1. Which word is about something that would require you to agree with someone else?
   ______________________________________________________________________
2. What might a person who was cold or frightened do?
   ______________________________________________________________________
3. If a person were moving along slowly, what would he do?
   ______________________________________________________________________
Mole's Hill

Directions: Choose the best answer for each question.

1. Which one means something is *gathered*?
   - a. ten horses running across a field
   - b. a pile of sticks picked up after a storm

2. Which would be something that would *burst*?
   - a. touching a soap bubble
   - b. a dog fetching a ball

3. Which one is an *obstacle*?
   - a. an open door
   - b. large rocks in a road

Exit Slip

Directions: Write the word from the box to answer for each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gathered</th>
<th>burst</th>
<th>obstacle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Which word is about something that’s blocking the way?
   
   ______________________________________________________

2. What word is like collected?
   
   ______________________________________________________

3. If you popped a ball, what did it do?
   
   ______________________________________________________
Possum’s Harvest Moon

Write each word twice.

autumn ____________________  ____________________
creature ____________________  ____________________
harvest ____________________  ____________________
snug ____________________  ____________________
accomplished__________________  ____________________
conclude ____________________  ____________________

Draw a picture of what you think Possum’s party will look like.
Possum’s Harvest Moon

Directions: Using the words from the box write the correct word in the sentence.

| autumn | harvest | accomplished |

1. The students ________________ the task.
2. The farmers sell all of their fruits and vegetables after the ________________.
3. I rake the fallen leaves during ________________.

Exit Slip

Directions: Use the words from the box to answer the questions.

1. When would you be most likely to jump in a pile of leaves?

2. Which word is about reaching a goal?

3. What words means the time to pick plants?
Possum’s Harvest Moon

Directions: Choose the best answer for each question.

1. Which one means something is concluded?
   a. the curtain closes at the end of a play
   b. a child throws a ball

2. Which would be something that would be snug?
   a. running throw a rainstorm
   b. sitting under a blanket in front of a fire

3. Which one is a creature?
   a. a hot fudge sundae
   b. a bear cub

Exit Slip

Directions: Write the word from the box to answer for each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>creature</th>
<th>snug</th>
<th>conclude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Which word means to be under a warm blanket?

2. What word describes a puppy?

3. What words means when something ends?

Write each word twice.

assortment

civilized

contributed

inappropriate

concoct

orderly

Draw a picture of something you would think would make the mice clean up after themselves.
Mice Make Trouble
Directions: Using the words from the box write the correct word in the sentence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>assortment</th>
<th>civilized</th>
<th>contributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. My mom keeps her office _________________________ so that she can find what she needs quickly.
2. After the boys started fighting, the teacher told them they were not acting ______________________ .
3. My dad is a good cook, and he has a big ______________________ of pots and pans.

Exit Slip
Directions: Use the words from the box to answer the questions.

1. Which means to have a tidy room?
   ______________________________________________________

2. Which words means different kinds?
   ______________________________________________________

3. Which word describes how a polite person would act?
   ______________________________________________________
Mice Make Trouble

Directions: Choose the best answer for each question.

1. Which one means to contribute?
   a. no one took care of the class pet
   b. everyone in the class brought a snack to share

2. Which would be something that is inappropriate?
   a. making your bed
   b. picking your neighbor's flowers without asking

3. Which one means to concoct?
   a. make up a new kind of ice cream
   b. paint a house

Exit Slip

Directions: Write the word from the box to answer for each question.

| contributed | inappropriate | concoct |

1. Which word is means that someone took part in a picnic by bringing food to eat?

2. Which word is about someone creating something?

3. Which word describes chewing with your mouth open?
Appendix C
Pretests and Posttests

Name _____________________________________

Vocabulary Pretest

Sample: Read the word. Mark one answer.

curious

I know what this word means. I have heard this word but I don’t know what this word means.

[ ] [ ] [ ]

Sample: Circle the answer. What does curious mean?

a. to cause bad things to happen
b. wanting to find out more
c. wandering around

1. Read the word. Mark one answer.

coincidence

I know what this word means. I have heard this word but I don’t know what this word means.

[ ] [ ] [ ]

2. Circle the answer. What does coincidence mean?

a. things that do not happen at the same time
b. things that happen by chance at the same time
c. things that happen by accident

3. Read the word. Mark one answer.

loyal

I know what this word means. I have heard this word but I don’t know what this word means.

[ ] [ ] [ ]
4. Circle the answer. What does *loyal* mean?
   a. always being there for someone or a group
   b. to have a feeling of belonging to something or someone
   c. to do good things for others

5. Read the word. Mark one answer.

   **bitter**

   I know what this word means. I have heard this word but don’t know what it means. I don’t know what this word means.

   [ ] [ ] [ ]

6. Circle the answer. What does *bitter* mean?
   a. things that do not happen at the same time
   b. when one thing is better than another
   c. a feeling you have when you stay very angry

7. Read the word. Mark one answer.

   **murmured**

   I know what this word means. I have heard this word but don’t know what it means. I don’t know what this word means.

   [ ] [ ] [ ]

8. Circle the answer. What does *murmured* mean?
   a. shouting loudly
   b. to be startled by something
   c. say something softly

9. Read the word. Mark one answer.

   **recited**

   I know what this word means. I have heard this word but don’t know what it means. I don’t know what this word means.

   [ ] [ ] [ ]
10. Circle the answer. What does *recited* mean?
   a. read or say something out loud
   b. share a story
   c. to be happy or joyful

11. Read the word. Mark one answer.

   **sensitive**

   I know what this word means.  
   I have heard this word but don’t know what it means.  
   I don’t know what this word means.

   [ ] [ ] [ ]

12. Circle the answer. What does *sensitive* mean?
   a. to be like someone else  
   b. understand the feelings of others  
   c. angry

13. Read the word. Mark one answer.

   **drafty**

   I know what this word means.  
   I have heard this word but don’t know what it means.  
   I don’t know what this word means.

   [ ] [ ] [ ]

14. Circle the answer. What does *drafty* mean?
   a. to be creative  
   b. to float down a river  
   c. a place with a cold breeze

15. Read the word. Mark one answer.

   **delicate**

   I know what this word means.  
   I have heard this word but don’t know what it means.  
   I don’t know what this word means.

   [ ] [ ] [ ]
16. Circle the answer. What does *delicate* mean?

a. handle carefully
b. small or tiny
c. a substance that is runny

17. Read the word. Mark one answer.

**imposter**

I know what this word means.  
I have heard this word but don’t know what it means.  
I don’t know what this word means.

18. Circle the answer. What does *imposter* mean?

a. to hang paper on the wall
b. feeling sad
c. someone who pretends to be someone else

19. Read the word. Mark one answer.

**trickster**

I know what this word means.  
I have heard this word but don’t know what it means.  
I don’t know what this word means.

20. Circle the answer. What does *trickster* mean?

a. someone who plays tricks
b. someone who sneaks around
c. someone who loses a game

21. Read the word. Mark one answer.

**rave**

I know what this word means.  
I have heard this word but don’t know what it means.  
I don’t know what this word means.
22. Circle the answer. What does *rave* mean?
   a. having fun at a park
   b. an up and down motion
   c. speak excitedly about something

23. Read the word. Mark one answer.

**genuine**

I know what this word means.  
I have heard this word but don't know what it means.  
I don't know what this word means.

24. Circle the answer. What does *genuine* mean?
   a. to wait for something
   b. worth a lot of money
   c. honest or real

25. Read the word. Mark one answer.

**quivered**

I know what this word means.  
I have heard this word but don't know what it means.  
I don't know what this word means.

26. Circle the answer. What does *quivered* mean?
   a. to be tired
   b. shook a little bit
   c. a large hole in the ground

27. Read the word. Mark one answer.

**strolled**

I know what this word means.  
I have heard this word but don't know what it means.  
I don't know what this word means.
28. Circle the answer. What does *strolled* mean?

   a. to push something  
   b. walked in a relaxed way  
   c. walked in an angry way

29. Read the word. Mark one answer.

   **compromise**

   I know what this word means.  
   I have heard this word but don’t know what it means.  
   I don’t know what this word means.

30. Circle the answer. What does *compromise* mean?

   a. lying to someone  
   b. to promise something to another person  
   c. reach an agreement by giving up something

31. Read the word. Mark one answer.

   **gathered**

   I know what this word means.  
   I have heard this word but don’t know what it means.  
   I don’t know what this word means.

32. Circle the answer. What does *gathered* mean?

   a. came or brought together  
   b. mixed up  
   c. run across a field

33. Read the word. Mark one answer.

   **burst**

   I know what this word means.  
   I have heard this word but don’t know what it means.  
   I don’t know what this word means.
34. Circle the answer. What does burst mean?
   a. break open suddenly
   b. diving into water
   c. planted a bunch of seeds

35. Read the word. Mark one answer.

obstacle
I know what this word means.     I have heard this word but don’t know what it means.     I don’t know what this word means.

□    □    □

36. Circle the answer. What does obstacle mean?
   a. to run around
   b. something blocking your path
   c. an open door

37. Read the word. Mark one answer.

autumn
I know what this word means.     I have heard this word but don’t know what it means.     I don’t know what this word means.

□    □    □

38. Circle the answer. What does autumn mean?
   a. winter
   b. summer
   c. fall

39. Read the word. Mark one answer.

harvest
I know what this word means.     I have heard this word but don’t know what it means.     I don’t know what this word means.

□    □    □
40. Circle the answer. What does *harvest* mean?

a. find a lot of animals  
b. pick the fruits and vegetables  
c. make a lot of food

41. Read the word. Mark one answer.

**accomplished**

I know what this word means.  
I have heard this word but don’t know what it means.  
I don’t know what this word means.

42. Circle the answer. What does *accomplished* mean?

a. reach your goal  
b. to find the answer  
c. hurry to finish

43. Read the word. Mark one answer.

**creature**

I know what this word means.  
I have heard this word but don’t know what it means.  
I don’t know what this word means.

44. Circle the answer. What does *creature* mean?

a. any living thing  
b. a box under your bed  
c. strange noises at night

45. Read the word. Mark one answer.

**snug**

I know what this word means.  
I have heard this word but don’t know what it means.  
I don’t know what this word means.
46. Circle the answer. What does snug mean?

a. slow  
   b. warm and comfortable  
   c. still and silent

47. Read the word. Mark one answer.

**conclude**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I know what this word means.</th>
<th>I have heard this word but don't know what it means.</th>
<th>I don’t know what this word means.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48. Circle the answer. What does conclude mean?

a. finish first  
   b. throwing a far distance  
   c. to come to an end

49. Read the word. Mark one answer.

**assortment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I know what this word means.</th>
<th>I have heard this word but don’t know what it means.</th>
<th>I don’t know what this word means.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50. Circle the answer. What does assortment mean?

a. many different kinds of things  
   b. choose between many things  
   c. a pile of white socks

51. Read the word. Mark one answer.

**civilized**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I know what this word means.</th>
<th>I have heard this word but don’t know what it means.</th>
<th>I don’t know what this word means.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
52. Circle the answer. What does civilized mean?
   a. behave badly in public
   b. to live in a lonely place
   c. act in a polite kind way

53. Read the word. Mark one answer.

orderly
I know what this word means. I have heard this word but don't know what it means. I don't know what this word means.

☐ ☐ ☐

54. Circle the answer. What does orderly mean?
   a. a single file line
   b. be in the proper place
   c. being altogether

55. Read the word. Mark one answer.

contributed
I know what this word means. I have heard this word but don't know what it means. I don't know what this word means.

☐ ☐ ☐

56. Circle the answer. What does contributed mean?
   a. took part in something
   b. take a piece
   c. not taking care of a responsibility

57. Read the word. Mark one answer.

inappropriate
I know what this word means. I have heard this word but don't know what it means. I don't know what this word means.

☐ ☐ ☐
58. Circle the answer. What does *inappropriate* mean?
   a. describes how to act at dinner
   b. describes something kind and pleasant
   c. describes something you shouldn’t do

59. Read the word. Mark one answer.

**concoct**

I know what this word means. I have heard this word but don’t know what it means. I don’t know what this word means.

☐ ☐ ☐

60. Circle the answer. What does *concoct* mean?
   a. painting a house
   b. mixing ingredients for a cake
   c. create
Answer Key
Odd Numbered Questions:
Answers will vary

Even Numbered Questions:

2. b
4. a
6. c
8. c
10. a
12. b
14. c
16. a
18. c
20. a
22. c
24. c
26. b
28. b
30. c
32. a
34. a
36. b
38. c
40. b
42. a
44. a
46. b
48. c
50. a
52. c
54. b
56. a
58. c
60. c
Ruby the Copycat

Directions: I will read some sentences that make sense and some that don’t make sense. You decide—if the sentence makes sense circle yes. If it doesn’t make sense, circle no.

Example: A child who asks questions is curious

   a. Yes ☑
   b. No ☒

1. A sensitive parent understands your feelings.
   a. Yes ☑
   b. No ☒

2. You murmur when you want everyone to hear you.
   a. Yes ☑
   b. No ☒

3. The audience clapped when the students recited their poems.
   a. Yes ☑
   b. No ☒
4. It would be a **coincidence** to bump into your friend at the mall as you were buying her present.
   a. Yes ☺
   b. No 😞

5. It is pleasant to be around **bitter** people.
   a. Yes ☺
   b. No 😞

6. A **loyal** dog is never happy to see you.
   a. Yes ☺
   b. No 😞
The Principal’s New Clothes

Directions: I will read some sentences that make sense and some that don’t make sense. You decide—if the sentence makes sense circle yes. If it doesn’t make sense, circle no.

1. If a room is **drafty**, it is warm and comfortable.
   a. Yes ☑
   b. No ☐

2. When people are **genuine**, you cannot trust them.
   a. Yes ☑
   b. No ☐

3. If you found out that your dentist was an **imposter**, you would be shocked.
   a. Yes ☑
   b. No ☐

4. On April’s Fool’s Day, it’s okay to be a **trickster**.
   a. Yes ☑
   b. No ☐
5. It’s good to drop a *delicate* gift.
   a. Yes 😊
   b. No 😞

6. If you *raved* about your new dog, you talked excitedly about it.
   a. Yes 😊
   b. No 😞
Name ___________________________ Pre/Post
Moles’ Hill

Directions: I will read some sentences that make sense and some that don’t make sense. You decide—if the sentence makes sense circle yes. If it doesn’t make sense, circle no.

1. The racers **strolled** to the finish line.
   a. Yes ☺
   b. No ☹

2. Popcorn kernels **burst** when they are heated.
   a. Yes ☺
   b. No ☹

3. If you and your teacher **compromise** about when your homework is due, you don’t ever have to do your homework.
   a. Yes ☺
   b. No ☹

4. After an earthquake, there are many **obstacles** in the streets.
   a. Yes ☺
   b. No ☹
5. If you quivered when you went outside, you were probably warm.

   a. Yes ☃

   b. No ☹

6. If all your friends gathered at your house, you could have a party.

   a. Yes ☃

   b. No ☹
Directions: I will read some sentences that make sense and some that don't make sense. You decide—if the sentence makes sense circle yes. If it doesn't make sense, circle no.

1. If you **accomplish** something, you feel proud.
   a. Yes ☺
   b. No ☹

2. After a movie **concludes**, everyone stays in their seats.
   a. Yes ☺
   b. No ☹

3. If you are **snug**, you are uncomfortable.
   a. Yes ☺
   b. No ☹

4. **Autumn** weather is cooler than summer weather.
   a. Yes ☺
   b. No ☹
5. A car is a **creature**.
   a. Yes 😊
   b. No 😞

6. Farmers work hard during the **harvest**.
   a. Yes 😊
   b. No 😞
Mice Make Trouble

Directions: I will read some sentences that make sense and some that don’t make sense. You decide—if the sentence makes sense circle yes. If it doesn’t make sense, circle no.

1. A garbage dump would be **orderly**.
   a. Yes ☑
   b. No ☐

2. Someone with dogs, cats, and fish has an **assortment** of pets.
   a. Yes ☑
   b. No ☐

3. If you **contributed** money to a charity, you would be helping others.
   a. Yes ☑
   b. No ☐

4. If you act **civilized**, your parents will be embarrassed.
   a. Yes ☑
   b. No ☐
5. Students never **concoct** stories about why they didn’t do their homework.

   a. Yes ☺

   b. No ☹

6. Yelling out an answer in class without being called on first would be **inappropriate**.

   a. Yes ☺

   b. No ☹
Vocabulary Posttest

Sample: Read the word. Circle one answer.

**curious**

Sample: What does *curious* mean?

a. to cause bad things to happen  
b. wanting to find out more  
c. wandering around

1. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**coincidence**

What does *coincidence* mean?

a. things that do not happen at the same time  
b. things that happen by chance at the same time  
c. things that happen by accident

2. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**loyal**

What does *loyal* mean?

a. always being there for someone or a group  
b. to have a feeling of belonging to something or someone  
c. to do good things for others

3. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**bitter**

What does *bitter* mean?

a. things that do not happen at the same time  
b. when one thing is better than another  
c. a feeling you have when you stay very angry
4. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**murmured**

What does *murmured* mean?

a. shouting loudly  
b. to be startled by something  
c. say something softly

5. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**recited**

What does *recited* mean?

a. read or say something out loud  
b. share a story  
c. to be happy or joyful

6. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**sensitive**

What does *sensitive* mean?

a. to be like someone else  
b. understand the feelings of others  
c. angry

7. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**drafty**

What does *drafty* mean?

a. to be creative  
b. to float down a river  
c. a place with a cold breeze
8. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**delicate**

What does *delicate* mean?

a. handle carefully  
b. small or tiny  
c. a substance that is runny

9. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**imposter**

What does *imposter* mean?

a. to hang paper on the wall  
b. feeling sad  
c. someone who pretends to be someone else

10. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**trickster**

What does *trickster* mean?

a. someone who plays tricks  
b. someone who sneaks around  
c. someone who loses a game

11. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**rave**

What does *rave* mean?

a. having fun at a park  
b. an up and down motion  
c. speak excitedly about something
12. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**genuine**

What does *genuine* mean?

- a. to wait for something
- b. worth a lot of money
- c. honest or real

13. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**quivered**

What does *quivered* mean?

- a. to be tired
- b. shook a little bit
- c. a large hole in the ground

14. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**strolled**

What does *strolled* mean?

- a. to push something
- b. walked in a relaxed way
- c. walked in an angry way

15. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**compromise**

What does *compromise* mean?

- a. lying to someone
- b. to promise something to another person
- c. reach an agreement by giving up something
16. Read the word. Circle one answer.

gathered

What does *gathered* mean?

a. came or brought together  
b. mixed up  
c. run across a field

17. Read the word. Circle one answer.

burst

What does *burst* mean?

a. break open suddenly  
b. diving into water  
c. planted a bunch of seeds

18. Read the word. Circle one answer.

obstacle

What does *obstacle* mean?

a. to run around  
b. something blocking your path  
c. an open door

19. Read the word. Circle one answer.

autumn

What does *autumn* mean?

a. winter  
b. summer  
c. fall
20. Read the word. Circle the answer.

**harvest**

What does *harvest* mean?

a. find a lot of animals  
b. pick the fruits and vegetables  
c. make a lot of food

21. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**accomplished**

What does *accomplished* mean?

a. reach your goal  
b. to find the answer  
c. hurry to finish

22. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**creature**

What does *creature* mean?

a. any living thing  
b. a box under your bed  
c. strange noises at night

23. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**snug**

What does *snug* mean?

a. slow  
b. warm and comfortable  
c. still and silent
24. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**conclude**

What does *conclude* mean?

- a. finish first
- b. throwing a far distance
- c. to come to an end

25. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**assortment**

What does *assortment* mean?

- a. many different kinds of things
- b. choose between many things
- c. a pile of white socks

26. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**civilized**

What does *civilized* mean?

- a. behave badly in public
- b. to live in a lonely place
- c. act in a polite kind way

27. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**orderly**

What does *orderly* mean?

- a. a single file line
- b. be in the proper place
- c. being altogether
28. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**contributed**

What does *contributed* mean?

a. took part in something  
   b. take a piece  
   c. not taking care of a responsibility

29. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**inappropriate**

What does *inappropriate* mean?

a. describes how to act at dinner  
   b. describes something kind and pleasant  
   c. describes something you shouldn't do

30. Read the word. Circle one answer.

**concoct**

What does *concoct* mean?

a. painting a house  
   b. mixing ingredients for a cake  
   c. create
Answer Key

1. b
2. a
3. c
4. c
5. a
6. b
7. c
8. a
9. c
10. a
11. c
12. c
13. b
14. b
15. c
16. a
17. a
18. b
19. c
20. b
21. a
22. a
23. b
24. c
25. a
26. c
27. b
28. a
29. c
30. c