Bull. Grad. School Educ. Hiroshima Univ., Part Ⅲ, No. 66, 2017, 169－178

Attempting to Develop Transferrable Oral Fluency in Storybook Reading: A *Yomikikase* Case Study

Aaron C. Sponseller
(Received. October 4, 2017)

Abstract: A popular component of family literacy programs consists of encouraging parents to read stories to/with their children. Reading together has been linked with considerable improvements in literacy in L1 contexts, however reading together in an L2 remains under-explored. In Japan this area is practically unexplored altogether. Given most Japanese parents of elementary-age children today have been through six years of compulsory English in JHS and HS, as well as the fact that the storybooks used in such programs are typically comprised of low-level vocabulary and accompanied by pictures that support the story, it is reasonable to wonder if a storybook reading intervention for Japanese parents presents a feasible option for augmenting young Japanese English learners' English language development. Specifically, this study investigated two things. First, are oral fluency gains in storybook reading possible for a Japanese reader of English storybooks over just 10 days? Second, do hypothetical fluency gains in reading one storybook aloud transfer to a storybook of similar difficulty? This case study followed one participant over the course of ten days as she practiced reading a single storybook aloud. She spent three days reading aloud, three more days listening to a native speaker model of the text and then reading aloud, and finally three days shadowing that native speaker model. The results showed excellent gains on the text practiced for over 10 days, however no transferrable fluency gains were observed for the second storybook. The case study participant offers her thoughts on the texts and activities. Limitations of the study and implications for future research in this area are briefly discussed.

Key words: fluency, storybook reading, case study

INTRODUCTION

Research on Storybook Reading

Family literacy is an umbrella term covering a variety of educational objectives across diverse communities. Family literacy programs often aim to support parental engagement in their child(ren)'s education. In linguistically diverse and economically impoverished communities such interventions can prove critical in helping children reach key literacy outcomes in cases where the language of the school and the home differ. Most research conducted on family literacy programs has been conducted primarily in the United States and Europe where many researchers have investigated low SES or at-risk communities where English is the L1 (Barbour, 1998; Bus, Ijzendoorn, & Pellegrini, 1995; Dever & Burts, 2002; Dickinson & De Temple, 1998; Hindman & Morrison, 2012; Jacobs et al., 2011; Sénéchal & LeFevre, 2002; Sénéchal, LeFevre, Thomas, & Daley, 1998; Weigel, Martin, & Bennett, 2005, 2006). Other researchers have sampled at-risk populations for whom English was not the L1, typically immigrant

communities in either rural or inner-city contexts (Jordan et al., 2000; Shanahan, Mulhern, & Rodriguez-Brown, 1995).

In practice, family literacy programs can provide a range of offerings; from survival English courses all the way to English language civics or other forms of English for specific purposes. A popular form of intervention in these communities involves populating the participants' homes with appropriate texts to build a richer home literacy environment (HLE). This has been shown to correlate with positive literacy development outcomes. In a meta analysis of 33 empirical research articles published between 1960 and 1994, Bus, Ijzendoorn, and Pellegrini (1995) found that approximately 8% of the variance in various outcome measures was due to home-based book reading. The researchers concluded that the effect size (d = .59) was medium to strong. The authors calculated a fail-safe number to further augment the case for the beneficial nature of shared reading: 1,834. At least 1,834 studies with null results would need to be produced to reduce the results of their meta-analysis to statistical insignificance (p. 17). It is unsurprising, therefore, that most researchers agree parent-child book reading is beneficial.

Most of these studies, however, have been in English L1 contexts. There is evidence of Spanish L1 mothers reading to their children in English (Dever & Burts, 2002; Jordan et al., 2000; Shanahan et al., 1995) with successful outcomes. Similar outcomes have been shown in Taiwan (Wu & Honig, 2010) and Singapore (Yeo, Ong, & Ng, 2014). No such research seems to have been conducted in Japan. Writing about their *Family Reading Project* at an elementary school in Osaka, Ferguson, Sponseller, and Yamada (2017) reported that they have implemented a family storybook reading (*yomikikase* in Japanese) project, but have not yet measured the impact of the program on the English proficiency of the children of participating parents. The Japanese context certainly seems ripe for such an intervention. The vast majority of Japanese citizens are literate in their L1. With few exceptions, Japanese parents with young children today experienced six years of English education between junior high and high school. Considering the objective of a shared reading intervention would be to read children's stories comprised of simple, high-frequency vocabulary, it can theoretically be argued Japanese parents potential for helping their children learn to read in English is a vastly underestimated and untapped resource.

Building Storytelling Fluency

Assessing L2 speaking proficiency typically involves measuring some combination of complexity, accuracy, fluency, and lexis. These measures are appropriate for measuring on-line, naturalistic speaking. When reading a children's story aloud, however, complexity, accuracy, and lexis are no longer speaker-generated. Therefore fluency is the main element left to focus upon. Oral fluency is often measured as the number of syllables uttered per second.

There are some popular fluency-building tasks. Certain research indicates task repetition assists in fluency development (De Jong & Perfetti, 2013). B.F. Skinner's (2014) audiolingual method, much-maligned in recent times, emphasizes repetition. Another repetition and speed-focused activity, the well-known 4/3/2 task (Maurice, 1983) is often used to promote fluency development in language classrooms. The use of word cards, something most people probably consider almost definitively repetitious, has been encouraged (Nation & Webb, 2011; Fitzpatrick, Al Qarni, & Meara, 2008), with Nation and Webb (2011) having described word cards as "an extremely effective way of learning" (p. 30). Repetition has a place in language learning, and lends itself particularly well to practicing storytelling.

The purpose of the research presented here is to explore the possibility of building transferable fluency gains in reading aloud through a short-term intervention consisting of repetition and speed-focused repetition. The research questions are as follows:

1. Does a sequential combination of reading aloud, listening followed by reading aloud, and shadowing of the same reading passage over ten days result in more fluent oral production of that passage?
2. Assuming the answer to RQ1 is affirmative, is there evidence of transferability of oral fluency to a new passage of similar length and difficulty?

METHOD

Participant

The participant was a 32 year old Japanese woman named Chika (pseudonym). Like most Japanese her age she completed six years of compulsory English language education in junior high school and high school. She holds a bachelor's degree in English education from a private university in Western Japan. The participant is married to a 32 year old American whose L1 is English; the language of the home has always been English, though some Japanese vocabulary and common phrases are often used. They are parents of an 18 month old child.

More quantifiable measures of Chika's English ability are her performances on the TOEIC, on which she scored a 910, and on a 140 item online version of the *Vocabulary Size Test* (Nation & Beglar, 2007), which indicated she knew approximately 7,600 word families at the time of her participation in this research. 7,600 word families is well above the level of the texts used in this study.

Chika was informed that her participation was entirely voluntary and that she could, at any time and for any reason, withdraw from the project. She agreed to these conditions verbally.

The Books

Two children's texts were used: *The Berenstain Bears and the Week at Grandma's* (Berenstain & Berenstain, 1986), and *The Berenstain Bears Go to Camp* (Berenstain & Berenstain, 1982). The vocabulary profile of the books indicates that, allowing some wiggle room for high-frequency words specific to these particular texts, the vocabulary should not have presented any challenge to the participant. As Table 1 indicates, at least 85% of the vocabulary in both books is words from the General Service List (GSL) (West & West, 1953) and/or New General Service List (NGSL) (Browne, C., Culligan, B. & Phillips, J., 2013). Considering there is a general consensus among researchers of reading and vocabulary to use texts with comprehensible lexis being closer to Hu and Nation's (2000) 95 to 98% mark, this 85% level of coverage seemed low at first. However, upon further examination the texts, the majority of off-list vocabulary consisted of pronouns or nouns that were heavily repeated throughout the texts. For example, in *Week at Grandma's*, the following words, which AntWordProfiler (Anthony, 2014) indicated were off-list for both the GSL and NGSL, explaining more than half of the 172 (GSL) or 187 (NGSL) off-list items: *Mama* (13), *papa* (16), *cubs* (11), *grandparents* (3), *gran* (14), *gramps* (22), *grandma's* (3), *honeymoon* (11), *grizzly* (2), *grandcubs* (2). These 10 tokens appear 97 times in total, and it seems unlikely such frequently appearing words would remain unknown for long, particularly considering how integral they are for story comprehension. For *Go to Camp*, the following words explain over one-third (43) of the 126 (GSL) or 125 (NGSL) off-list tokens: *Grizzly* (6), *Bob* (11), *papa* (3), *mama* (7), *cubs* (10), *Jane* (2), *vacation* (4). With this in mind it seemed acceptable to proceed with these texts for this small-scale study.

Table 1. Lexical Profiles of the Texts

		Token (Count)	Token (%)	Token (cumulative %)
Book 1: *Week at Grandma's*	GSL 1	1075	81.50	81.50
	GSL 2	72	5.46	86.96
	(off list)	172	13.04	100
	Total	1319		
	NGSL 1	1064	80.67	80.67
	NGSL 2	54	4.09	84.76
	NGSL 3	14	1.06	85.82
	(off list)	187	14.18	100
	Total	1319		

		Token (Count)	Token (%)	Token (cumulative %)
Book 2: *Go to Camp*	GSL 1	841	80.40	80.40
	GSL 2	79	7.55	87.95
	(off list)	126	12.05	100
	Total	1046		
	NGSL 1	840	80.31	80.31
	NGSL 2	67	6.41	86.72
	NGSL 3	14	1.34	88.06
	(off list)	125	11.95	100
	Total	1046		

Sample Recording

The researcher, a native speaker of English, provided a sample recording of Book 1 (*Week at Grandma's*). This recording was made using a smartphone and sent to the participant, who checked it to make certain it was suitably audible and sufficient for use in the activities. The recording was 2m 41s long, and was only of the first eight pages of Book 1. No sample recording was provided for Book 2 (*Go to Camp*).

Research Design

The primary aim of this project was identifying those activities that provide the greatest impact upon reading aloud fluency. Implicit here is the notion of finding activities with a high return on investment. Therefore three activities that are both fast and not materially demanding were selected: Reading aloud without any model, reading aloud after listening to a model, and shadowing a model recording. The activities were introduced in that order due to their being progressively more demanding in terms of support materials required. Reading aloud without a model amounts to someone simply reading book aloud; all that is needed is the book itself. Creating and/or recording a model requires slightly more time on behalf of the researcher/teacher, and accessing/listening to it prior to reading aloud requires slightly more time for the participant, too. Therefore the two activities which required a recording were implemented accordingly. Shadowing was last based upon the belief it would be the most beneficial activity and may have moderated the impact of the other activities. Speeded shadowing, something that would in theory look like a blended 4/3/2 shadowing activity, was considered as a fourth activity. Ultimately it was not included because I was not confident that chasing speed in storytelling was the same as chasing a storybook-appropriate level of fluency. Speed is certainly a part of such fluency, but when reading to children it seemed placing undue emphasis on speed may have been counterproductive. The final decision was to stop the activity at shadowing in order to see how closely the participant managed to converge to the natural speed provided by the model recording. See Table 2 for a visualization of the research design.

Chika had access to Book 1 on all days of the study, but she was asked to engage the text just once per day and only for the predetermined activity. While book 1 is 29 pages long, I asked her to

read only the first eight pages for days 1-10. The participant read Book 2 (*Go to Camp*) on days 1 and 12. She did not have access to it days 2-11. On day 1 she read 12 pages (of a total of 29) of book 2 and on day 12 she read the entire book. By leaving a portion of each book unread until the final day of the study, transferability within the same text and/or beyond it was potentially observable.

Analytic Procedures

Fluency was calculated page-by-page. First, the total syllables present per page were calculated. The elapsed time between the onset of the first syllable and the completion of the final syllable on that page was recorded. This was done for all recordings on Days 1 (excerpts from both books), 3 (book 1 only), 6 (book 1 only), 10 (book 1 only), and 12 (both books in their entirety). Time was measured to the tenth of a second. The number of seconds it took the Chika to complete the text on that page was then divided by the number of syllables on that page. The resulting figure is the average number of seconds per syllable. This approach of dividing the time spent speaking by the number of syllables uttered is a common manner of measuring fluency and/or speed (Iwashita, et al, 2008; Revesz, et al, 2014; De Jong, et al, 2013).

Table 2. Research Design

	Book		Activity		
	Book 1: *Week at Grandma's*	Book 2: *Go to Camp*	read aloud	listen to model, then read aloud	shadowing
Day 1	✔	✔	✔		
Day 2	✔		✔		
Day 3	✔		✔		
Day 4	✔			✔	
Day 5	✔			✔	
Day 6	✔			✔	
Day 7	✔				✔
Day 8	✔				✔
Day 9	✔				✔
Day 10	✔				✔
Day 11					
Day 12*	✔	✔	✔		

*Note: Participant read both books all the way through on this day. Other days only eight pages (book 1) or 12 pages (book 2) were read.

RESULTS

A paired-samples *t* test was used to determine whether there was a difference in fluency between pre-intervention and post-intervention read-alouds. The fluency of participant's performance on the post-intervention reading aloud of book 1 (*Week at Grandma's*) (M = .310, SE = .011) was statistically significant against the pre-intervention reading aloud of book 1 (M = .390, SE = .022, $t(7)$ = 5.318, p < .005). The effect size (r = .802) was very large, indicating the cumulative impact of the activities was highly beneficial in increasing fluency for reading this portion of the text aloud.

A second paired-samples *t* test was conducted to determine whether there was a significant change between the pre-intervention and post-intervention read aloud of book 2, the non-treatment book. The fluency of the participant's performance on the post-intervention reading aloud of book 2 (*Go to Camp*) (M = .372, SE = .019) did not show statistical significance against the pre-intervention reading aloud of book 2 (M = .374, SE = .021, $t(9)$ = .159, p = .877). Effect size was not calculated due to the results being statistically insignificant. The fluency gains seen with book 1 did not exhibit transferability to book 2.

The descriptive statistics shown in Table 3 suggest that the 10-day intervention moved the participant toward convergence to the model recording. The final day of shadowing (Day10) and the post-test (Day 12 (Book 1)) had average syllable times of roughly .3 seconds each, approaching the

speed of the native speaker model which was .275 seconds per syllable. As mentioned above, the post-intervention fluency for the first eight pages of Book 2 (Day 12 (Book 2)) showed no statistical difference from the pre-intervention reading of those same eight pages. The reading of new material (*Day 12 (Book 1) (new*) and *Day 12 (Book 2) (new)*) from the same books exhibited some of the slowest read aloud times measured in the study.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for All Measures

	N	Min	Max	*M*	*SD*
GranModel	8	.241	.338	.275	.030
Day1 (Book 1)	8	.315	.472	.391	.062
Day3 (Book 1)	8	.313	.425	.362	.043
Day6 (Book 1)	8	.300	.424	.355	.047
Day10 (Book 1)	8	.261	.390	.301	.040
Day 12 (Book 1)	8	.280	.360	.309	.031
Day 12 (Book 1) (new)*	21	.321	.497	.405	.047
Day 1 (Book 2)	10	.300	.470	.375	.065
Day 12 (Book 2)	10	.305	.475	.372	.062
Day 12 (Book 2) (new)*	16	.317	.454	.378	.043

* (new) refers to the portions of the books that had not been read by the participant until day 12.

DISCUSSION

The first research question asked if a combination of reading aloud, listening followed by reading aloud, and shadowing of the same reading passage over ten days would result in more fluent oral production of that passage. As expected, the answer was yes. The significance, and effect size, of the intervention was substantial for the portion of the book that was practiced for ten days straight. This study illustrates that the activities employed here can be extremely effective at increasing storytelling fluency over 10 days. Ten straight days might seem like quite a bit. However, the total time that the participant spent reading that passage was under an hour total. While the participant was only reading eight pages of a 29-page book, the return for time invested seems significant.

The second research question, regarding the transferability of oral fluency from one passage to a passage of similar length and difficulty, cannot be answered in the affirmative. There was no indication that the fluency gains exhibited on the first eight pages of book 1 transferred to the remaining 21 pages of that same book, let alone to book 2. As soon as the Chika began reading new portions of these books her average seconds per syllable returned to pre-intervention levels.

Chika's Comments Regarding the Books

The participant felt very confident that she understood everything in the books. This is in-line with my own assessment of her comprehension level as measured by having her summarize/paraphrase the stories in her own words using just the pictures as a prompt. Unsurprisingly, the she did not find these books particularly interesting. She did, however, indicate that "Kids might be interested in joining these activities during the vacation after they read the book." It may be interesting to follow up with her to see exactly what she meant by this comment, as it seems to indicate that reading the book at home would be contingent upon both having free time and having read it previously. These qualifications could be investigated further in another study. Regarding the

Berenstain Bears books specifically, she indicated that they would probably be good choices to read aloud to her son, stating "I've read only one other [Berenstain Bears] book, but I assume many kids would have the same experiences, spending time with your grandpa and grandma, going camping" So it seems like she views these books as potential candidates for *yomikikase* in her home.

Chika indicated that while she has never attempted to read aloud to her son. The process of reading aloud during the intervention was both easy and difficult for her. She did not recall struggling to pronounce any of the vocabulary. Her confidence in reading aloud remained low, however. "I'm not confident. I can understand the story, but to read aloud is hard and I always have to stop." She specifically identified speed and fluency as areas she would like to improve, elaborating that "I always have to stop, I want to read more naturally like I read aloud in Japanese."

Chika's Comments Regarding the Practice Activities

Chika reported that the nine days spent reading aloud had improved her ability to read the book aloud more smoothly. "Listening and reading aloud helped me most. I'm the person who can do better by listening and then speaking, so when I heard how you read or how you paused for long sentences, and tried to mimic it, I felt I could read smoothly and use my brain better to break long sentences into small sections." Of the three types of activities in which she engaged, she indicated that shadowing was the one she enjoyed the most because it allowed her to maximize uses of her listening ability, which she considers the strongest of her four skills. She believes the activities used in this study can be helpful for other Japanese parents with lower levels of English proficiency, she warned that the speed of the model recording(s) is critical. "You should be careful of the speed of shadowing. You should understand their level of English and change your model speed. Otherwise, some of them can't follow at all and might quit." This seems like intuitive, highly practical advice. Allowing future participants to manipulate the speed of the recording is worth considering. She also indicated that while she found the process enjoyable overall, she did feel a bit bored after nine days and suggested reducing the activities to just two days each instead of three.

Addressing transferability of fluency gains, she (correctly) surmised that the repeated practice with Book 1 helped little with Book 2. "I didn't feel it helped so much for the other book. The only way that it helped me is it told me what kind of story it is, because I didn't have any ideas for this series before." This is unsurprising. She only practiced a single book, and only for nine days. A larger pilot study with multiple participants over several months could more adequately answer this question. Moreover, this response is not completely bad news. As the discussion surrounding the vocabulary used in these texts indicated (see the materials section), there were many words such as *mama*, *papa*, *grizzly*, and cubs that are exceedingly common in these books. Familiarity and fluency gains with these words is better than nothing and lends support for the idea of using a series of children's books that recycle key characters.

Limitations

The manner in which fluency was measured in this study (average number of seconds per syllable) might not be an appropriate approach for assessing the quality of reading stories aloud. Future studies should consider integrating the measurement of prosodic features alongside fluency measures in order to arrive at a more complete and balanced view of what elements are involved in making a storybook reading aloud more or less successful. Moreover, a greater number of native speaker models should be collected in future iterations of this type of study in order to see what range of fluency and variety of prosodic features might be considered acceptable. It is also critical to remember that case studies, by their very nature, typically do not produce generalizable results. This is particularly the case with this study, as the participant was not the typical Japanese parent the Family Reading Project

is likely to attract. Future versions of this study should increase the sample size considerably and expand the number and variety of texts used. The duration of the study was also problematic. Though quick activities are desirable given the goal(s) of programs like Ferguson, Sponseller, and Yamada's (2017) *Family Reading Project*, the cumulative impact of engaging in these kinds of practice activities over several more weeks or months is advisable. Extending the research to incorporate a variety of texts by different authors is certainly necessary before drawing any conclusions regarding the transferability of the fluency gains through engagement in the activities in the present study to children's books at large.

CONCLUSION

Ultimately the research presented here failed to reveal evidence of transferability of fluency gains from one text to a similar text. Such transferability may be possible, but, given the single participant, limited number of texts, and condensed timeframe, it was unlikely to be revealed in this study. Future research should address such issues to more adequately investigate the potential for such transferability. The project successfully demonstrated that repetition of activities such as reading aloud, listening to a model followed by reading aloud, and shadowing can quickly produce significant and positive fluency gains in storybook reading. These findings support the use of these activities in the face-to-face training sessions hosted by the *Family Reading Project*. These activities also support the notion of providing access to audio recordings of texts for parents to use as models. I hope this case study will inform future studies related to the *Family Reading Project* and support Japanese parents by fostering their potential for being good second-language models for their children.

REFERENCES

Anderson, J., Purcell-Gates, V., Lenters, K., & McTavish, M. (2012). Real-World Literacy Activity in Preschool. *Community Literacy Journal*, **6**(2), 75-95. http://doi.org/10.1353/clj.2012.0022

Anthony, L. (2014). AntWordProfiler (Version 1.4.1) [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. Available from http://www.laurenceanthony.net/

Auerbach, E. R. (1989). Toward a social-contextual approach to family literacy. *Harvard Educational Review*, **59**(2), 165-182.

Barbour, A. C. (1998). Home Literacy Bags Promote Family Involvement. *Childhood Education*, **75**(2), 71-75. http://doi.org/10.1080/00094056.1999.10521986

Berenstain, S., & Berenstain, J. (1982). *The Berenstain Bears Go to Camp*. New York: Random House Books for Young Readers.

Berenstain, S., & Berenstain, J. (1986). *The Berenstain Bears and the Week at Grandma's*. New York: Random House Books for Young Readers.

Browne, C., Culligan, B. & Phillips, J. (2013). The New General Service List. Retrieved from http://www.newgeneralservicelist.org.

Bus, A. G., Ijzendoorn, M. H. van, & Pellegrini, A. D. (1995). Joint Book Reading Makes for Success in Learning to Read: A Meta-Analysis on Intergenerational Transmission of Literacy. *Review of Educational Research*, **65**(1), 1-21. http://doi.org/10.2307/1170476

De Jong, N., & Perfetti, C. A. (2011). Fluency training in the ESL classroom: An experimental study of fluency development and proceduralization. *Language Learning*, **61**, 533-568.

De Jong, N., M. P. Steinel, A. F. Florijn, R. Schoonen, and J. Hulstijn. 2013. Linguistic skills and speaking fluency in a second language. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, **34**, 893-916.

De Temple, J. M., & Beals, D. E. (1991). Family talk: sources of support for the development of

decontextualized language skills. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, **6**(1), 11-19. http://doi.org/10.1080/02568549109594818

Dever, M., & Burts, D. (2002). An evaluation of family literacy bags as a vehicle for parent involvement. *Early Child Development and Care*, **172**(4), 359-370. http://doi.org/10.1080/03004430212721

Dickinson, D. K., & De Temple, J. (1998). Putting parents in the picture: Maternal reports of preschoolers' literacy as a predictor of early reading. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, **13**(2), 241-261. http://doi.org/10.1016/S0885-2006(99)80037-4

Ferguson, P., Sponseller, A., & Yamada, A. (2017). Introducing the Family Reading Project. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & H. Brown (Eds.), *Transformation in Language Learning*. Tokyo: JALT.

Fitzpatrick, T., Al-Qarni, I., & Meara, P. (2008). Intensive vocabulary learning: A case study. *Language Learning Journal*, **36**(2), 239-248.

Hindman, A. H., & Morrison, F. J. (2012). Differential contributions of three parenting dimensions to preschool literacy and social skills in a middle-income sample. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, **58**(2), 191-223.

Hu, M., & Nation, I. S. P. (2000). Vocabulary density and reading comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, **13**(1), 403-430.

Iwashita, N., Brown, A., McNamara, T., & O'Hagan, S. (2008). Assessed levels of second language speaking proficiency: How distinct? *Applied Linguistics*, **29**, 24-49.

Jacobs, G. M., Newland, L. A., Gapp, S. C., Cambetas Syed, D., Reisetter, M. F., & Wu, C.-H. (2011). Mothers' beliefs and involvement: Links with preschool literacy development. *Tarptautinis Psichologijos Žurnalas: Biopsichosocialinis Požiūris*, (9), 67-90.

Jordan, G. E., Snow, C. E., & Porche, M. V. (2000). Project EASE: The effect of a family literacy project on kindergarten students' early literacy skills. *Reading Research Quarterly*, **35**(4), 524-546.

Maurice, K. (1983). The fluency workshop. *TESOL Newsletter*, **17**(4), 29.

Mazzoni, D. (2015). Audacity (Version 2.1.1) [computer software]. Available from http://audacityteam.org/

Nation, I. S. P. & Beglar, D. (2007). A vocabulary size test. *The Language Teacher*, **31**(7), 9-13.

Nation, I. S. P. & Webb, S. A. (2011). *Researching and Analyzing Vocabulary*. Heinle, Cengage Learning.

Revesz, A., Ekiert, M., & Torgensen, E. N. (2014). The effects of complexity, accuracy, and fluency on communicative adequacy in oral task performance. *Applied Linguistics*, 1-22.

Sénéchal, M., & LeFevre, J.-A. (2002). Parental involvement in the development of children's reading skill: A five-year longitudinal study. *Child Development*, **73**(2), 445-460.

Sénéchal, M., LeFevre, J.-A., Thomas, E. M., & Daley, K. E. (1998). Differential effects of home literacy experiences on the development of oral and written language. *Reading Research Quarterly*, **33**(1), 96-116.

Shanahan, T., Mulhern, M., & Rodriguez-Brown, F. (1995). Project FLAME: Lessons learned from a family literacy program for linguistic minority families. *The Reading Teacher*, **48**(7), 586-593.

Skinner, B. F. (2014). *Verbal Behavior*. BF Skinner Foundation.

Weigel, D. J., Martin, S. S., & Bennett, K. K. (2005). Ecological influences of the home and the child-care center on preschool-age children's literacy development. *Reading Research Quarterly*, **40**(2), 204-233.

Weigel, D. J., Martin, S. S., & Bennett, K. K. (2006). Contributions of the home literacy environment to preschool - aged children's emerging literacy and language skills. *Early Child Development and Care*, **176**(3-4), 357-378. http://doi.org/10.1080/0300443050006374

West, M., & West, M. P. (Eds.). (1953). *A general service list of English words: With semantic frequencies and a supplementary word-list for the writing of popular science and technology*. Addison-Wesley Longman Limited.

Wu, C., & Honig, A. S. (2010). Taiwanese mothers' beliefs about reading aloud with preschoolers: findings from the parent reading belief inventory. *Early Child Development and Care*, **180**(5), 647-669. http://doi.org/10.1080/03004430802221449

Yeo, L. S., Ong, W. W., & Ng, C. M. (2014). The home literacy environment and preschool children's reading skills and interest. *Early Education and Development*, **25**(6), 791-814. http://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2014.862147