This paper discusses a study performed on the various trends that exist among the 260 articles published in the "Journal of Research and Development in Education" between 1990 and 1999. The study's results showed 36 (13.8%) of the Journal articles published within this 9-year span focused on literacy. Information was categorized for each article with respect to authors' gender, multiple versus single authorship, study design, use of statistics, age of subjects, number of subjects, and kind of research. There was no significant trend by year for the number of articles published by men, women, or male/female co-authors. There was a significant trend by year for the number of articles with single versus multiple authors. From 1995, no single-authored articles focused on literacy were published in the Journal. There were also changes in predominant approaches to study design during the decade. The majority of the studies analyzed were experimental or descriptive. From 1990 to 1994, more study designs were experimental, while in 1995 more were descriptive. The majority of the studies primarily used ANOVA or MANOVA. None of the articles published after 1995 were applied research; all were basic research. The majority of the studies focused on elementary school-age children and on college students. Approximately half the studies had fewer than 100 subjects. Most of the articles had multiple questions/foci. (Contains 37 references and 5 tables of data.) (Author/RS)
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Abstract

Two hundred sixty articles were published in JRDE from 1990-1999. Thirty-six (13.8%) focused on literacy. Information was categorized for each article with respect to the authors’ gender, multiple versus single authorship, study design, use of statistics, age of subjects, number of subjects, and kind of research. There was no significant trend by year for the number of articles published by men, women, or male/female co-authors. There was a significant trend by year for the number of articles with single versus multiple authors. From 1995, no single-authored articles focused on literacy were published in JRDE. There were also changes in predominant approaches to design during the decade. The majority of the studies analyzed were experimental or descriptive. From 1990 to 1994, more designs were experimental while from 1995 more were descriptive.

The majority of the studies primarily used ANOVA or MANOVA. None of the articles published after 1995 were applied research; all were basic research. The majority of the studies focused on elementary school-age children and on college students. Approximately half the studies had fewer than 100 subjects. Most of the articles had multiple questions/foci.
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When a key word search on the Internet for “Educational Research Journals in Literacy Education” yields more than 350 hits, it is apparent that researchers and teachers have become consumers of educational research with a literacy focus. It is obvious that the journals published by the major professional organizations (i.e., International Reading Association, National Reading Conference, National Council of Teachers of English) are not the only sources of information for literacy professionals. Professional organizations’ journals are, however, devoted to publishing only literacy research so scholars consult them for knowledge in a specific area.

The purpose of this study is to identify research in the *Journal of Research and Development in Education* from 1990-1999 focused on literacy. In addition to identifying the literacy-related articles, information about the articles is categorized to describe the work published and to determine trends in literacy research, including single versus multiple authors, focus of the study, design, statistics used if any, age of subjects, number of subjects, applied versus basic research, and gender of authors.

**Methods and/or Techniques**

Two university faculty, each with a Ph.D. with a literacy focus, who are also credentialed public school teachers, read every abstract in the *JRDE*, 1990-1999. Each separately decided if the article focused on literacy and should be included in the study. They agreed on 93% of the articles after reading the abstracts. The other 7% were included/excluded following their discussion. Collectively, the researchers defined literacy and applicable abstracts as those dealing with some aspect of reading, writing, and speaking with subjects who were students in kindergarten through graduate school.
A Decade of Literacy Research in the
*Journal of Research and Development in Education*

Following the work of Nelson and Coorrough (1994), the following information was identified and categorized on each study: 1) gender of authors; 2) multiple versus single authorship; 3) design of study (e.g., experimental, descriptive, correlational, analytical, program evaluation, historical, and qualitative; 4) statistics (e.g., ANOVA model, frequencies and percentages, correlation, nonparametric, multivariate, and no statistics; 5) age of subjects; 6) number of subjects; and 7) type of research (applied versus basic). If the researchers could not obtain the information from the abstracts, the entire article was used. The researchers also categorized information pertaining to the topic(s) of the studies. They agreed on 96% of the categories; the other 4% were decided through discussion.

**Data Source**

The data source were the abstracts from the articles, 1990-1999. The articles themselves were used when necessary.

**Results and/or Conclusions**

Two hundred sixty articles were published in the *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 1990-1999. Thirty-six (13.8%) of the articles focused on literacy. The number of articles focusing on literacy is presented in Table 1 by year.

*Insert Table 1 here.*

Nine articles (25%) were authored by men, 11 (31%) by women, and 16 (44%) had male and female co-authors. Ten of the articles (28%) were single-authored and 26 of the articles (72%) were co-authored. There was no significant trend by year concerning the number of articles published by men, women, or male/female co-authors. There was a significant trend by year for the number of articles with single versus multiple authors. This is depicted in Table 2.

*Insert Table 2 here.*
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Thus, from 1995 no single-authored articles focused on literacy were published in *JRDE*.

There were changes in predominant approaches to design during the decade, which is depicted in Table 3.

**Insert Table 3 here.**

Thus, 7 (19%) of the studies were correlational, 16 (44%) were experimental, 11 (31%) were descriptive, and 2 (6%) were analytical. From 1995 fewer designs were experimental and more were descriptive than between 1990 and 1994.

The majority of the studies primarily used ANOVA or MANOVA. (See Table 4.) Seven (19 1/3%) used correlation (with or without regression), 5 (14%) used MANOVA, 11 (31%) used ANOVA, 8 (22%) used frequencies and descriptive statistics, 3 (8 1/3%) used no statistics, 1 (2 2/3%) used meta-analysis, and 1 (2 2/3%) used chi-square primarily. Twenty-four (66 2/3%) were basic research and 12 (33 1/3%) were applied research. None of the articles focusing on literacy after 1995 were applied. Thus, from 1996-1999, 50% of the studies were basic; 50%, applied.

**Insert Table 4 here.**

The majority of the studies focused on elementary school-age children (12, 33 1/3%) and on college students (11, 31 1/3%). The other studies focused on grades 4-8 (2, 5%); grades 1-8 (3, 9 1/3%), multi-age (2, 5%), high school (4, 11%), no human subjects (1, 2/12%), or adults (1, 2 1/2%). Six of the studies (16 1/2%) involved 1-25 subjects, 2 (5 1/2%) had 26-49 subjects, 6 (16 1/2%) had 50-74 subjects, 4 (11%) had 75-99 subjects, 4 (11%) had 100-125 subjects, 2 (5 17 1/2%) had 150-200 subjects, 1 (5 1/2%) had 300-500 subjects, 4 (11%) had 500-1000 subjects, and 5 (14%) had more than 1000 subjects. One study had no human subjects. (See Table 4.)
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Most of the articles had multiple questions/foci. Thus, articles were categorized for each focus. See Table 5.

**Insert Table 5 here.**

Twelve articles included work on writing/fluency/the effects of handwriting on writing; 7 on attitudes/perceptions/beliefs contributing toward literacy; 7 on content area literacy; 5 on comprehension; 5 on sign systems; 5 on literature-based literacy; 5 on technology-related studies; 4 on assessment; 4 on gender-related studies; 3 on vocabulary; 2 on reading strategies; 2 on phonological awareness; 2 on special education populations; 1 on parts of speech; and 1 on spelling.

**Conclusions**

As expectations of workload and scholarly publications continue to be demanding for many researchers and teachers, this study provides a venue for obtaining large amounts of information with ease and accuracy by highlighting significant trends in literacy research. As we understand our own work and value, we need to look at what designs, foci, and tools we and others are using to conduct research. This is a timely study, one that seeks to identify reliable sources of information for literacy researchers and teachers. This particular journal reports both conceptual and empirical work with an emphasis on the latter. Both the editors and reviewers are well known and experts in their respective fields.

Specific trends were identified. First, there were more multiple-authored papers in the latter half of the decade than the first. Second, experimental designs were less prevalent in the last half of the decade; descriptive studies became more prominent during this time period. Third, the majority of the studies employed MANOVA and/or ANOVA. Fourth, topics were varied, but were well-focused research on major topics in literacy. Fifth, the most studied
populations were elementary school-age children and college students. Sixth, from the mid-point in the decade on, all studies were basic research, not applied.

The authors concluded the work published was a significant contribution to what is known about literacy and the JRDE made a valuable contribution during the last decade of this 20th century.
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Table 1  Number of Articles by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Decade of Literacy Research in the *Journal of Research and Development in Education*

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Single Author</th>
<th>Multiple Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3  Design of Study by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Correlational</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>Analytical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.114DE Literacy-Related Articles by Author, Kind of Research, Design, and Use of Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Date</th>
<th>Single or Multiple Authors</th>
<th>M, F or Applied</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Age of Subjects</th>
<th>Significant Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alspaugh, 1991</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>grade 2</td>
<td>Over 50% of the variance in second-grade mathematics achievement could be attributed to the following factors: (a) percentage of students eligible for free or reduced lunch, (b) percentage of students living with two parents, (c) percentage of student mobility, and (d) percentage of minority students. The percentage of minority students appeared to be minimally related to the achievement levels within the 39 schools included in the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blohm &amp; Benton, 1991</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>college students</td>
<td>A significant main effect was found for composing cue. Regardless of question level, results indicated that writing could be enhanced if questions were generated prior to writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collis &amp; Ollila, 1990</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>grade 1</td>
<td>Young children do not perceive reading as a female activity. There was no consistent gender association for writing. Computer use was seen as a masculine activity by all children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig &amp; Yore, 1996</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>grades 4-8</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics of the quantitative data suggested that the typical middle school student interviewed had a rather limited view of science reading. They also had understanding of declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge related to strategic planning, comprehension monitoring, and regulation strategies. Student responses indicated that they used text and social context to resolve difficulties understanding science text. On the other hand, they were largely unaware of the use of prior knowledge for the same purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farr &amp; Jongsma, 1993</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>grades 1-8</td>
<td>There is strong support for both the convergent and discriminant validity of the three factors (Response to Reading, Management of Content, and Command of Language).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Experiment 1, children in the trained group showed significantly greater gains in phonological awareness, as measured by two different tests, than a comparable group of children who did not receive training. In Experiment 2, after an average of 4.9 hours of training with DaisyQuest, the experimental group significantly outperformed a matched, no-treatment control group of 35 children on three different measures of phonological awareness. Training with DaisyQuest produced an average effect size of 1.05 standard deviations on measures of phonological awareness, which compares favorably with effect sizes obtained from teacher-led programs of longer duration that have been evaluated in previous research.

The macro-level training group exceeded the other two groups (micro-level training and a control group) on comprehension, immediate, and delayed passage recall assessments. The same group more frequently used the top-level structure in their summaries.

The purpose of this paper was to present a discussion of the issues in equating large-scale writing assessments and the implications for performance assessments in other disciplines. The issues include: defining the underlying construct to be assessed, the nature and effects of the assessment tasks, the influence of the assessment context on performance, the nature of the scoring system, the size of the scale, judge characteristics, and student characteristics.

In this comparative study of classroom instructors scoring speeches with analytical and holistic methods, both methods produced similar and acceptable levels of reliability and concurrent validity. Means of analytic method raw scores were slightly higher than means of holistic method raw scores. Holistic method scores more closely followed the pattern of expert scores in representing differences between speeches.

In Canada and China there were gender and developmental differences in the choice of the animal. Chinese and Canadian girls chose animals characterized as weak, tame, and safe. The boys in both cultural settings
likened themselves to animals which were strong, wild, and dangerous. Although both cultural groups picked similar animals, there were different choices related to the Chinese (e.g., pandas and dragons) and Canadian (e.g., cougars and unicorns) settings.

The experimental treatments were computer-assisted instruction, the keyword method, semantically-linked visual imagery, and writing activities. While the keyword method resulted in moderate positive effect sizes on immediate posttests, dramatic declines in performance were found on delayed posttests. For low-ability students, computer-assisted instruction and semantically-linked imagery appeared to be particularly effective.

Older students wrote better than younger ones. Better readers wrote better than poorer readers. All writers improved in writing regardless of the writing experience they had. However, they did not demonstrate increased fluency on the final writing prompts.

Fluency scores are not significantly different for sixth graders or for fourth graders or for a simple vs. a complex task. However, fourth graders do write significantly longer responses for the Complex Task than for the Simple Task.

There were no statistically significant posttest differences among the groups.

The preservice teachers opted for safe answers. Their lesson plans showed culturally neutral images and used “cute” materials and activities rather than authentic ones. The main barriers listed were fear of going counter to parents’ values, offending children whose culture is or is not presented, and not knowing enough about specific cultures.

Six dimensions of class climate were examined: teacher-student relations, peer relations, writing processes, the role of the computer, classroom management, and student responsibility. The results showed that for all climate dimensions students in the experimental group perceived their classroom in a more positive light than did students in
the control group. The most meaningful differences between the two groups were observed in the climate dimensions involving the writing processes and the nature of student-teacher relations. Differences between boys and girls were also established in the study. Girls have more positive attitude towards the social relations in the class, the classroom setting, and the teacher, whereas boys hold more positive attitudes toward the instructional use of computers.

Participants were given a weekly spelling test under three instructional conditions: (a) Active Peer Tutoring; (b) Passive Peer Tutoring; and (c) Teacher-Mediated Instruction. The results of the present study showed that the tutoring conditions yielded a significantly higher rate of correct spelling responses than Teacher-Mediated Instruction.

The participants engaged in vibrant and lengthy novel discussions, and they also used the novel to bring understanding to the typology. In addition, through this experience, the participants reflected on their own ethnic identity development.

Results of analysis of variance indicated that groups did not differ significantly on the 25 items that covered content contained in both books. The two groups taught with the children's books differed significantly from the group taught with the textbook on the 15 items covered only in the children's book. The authors concluded that children who are taught with children's books may learn more because more content can be included in a book than in a unit within a textbook. Although attitudes improved for all groups, the group taught with the textbook only showed the most dramatic improvement.

Results generally agreed with findings reported in earlier studies demonstrating a propensity among the American populace in favor of permitting free flow of information while objecting to censorship. However, a majority favored restricting the free flow of information concerning (a) words considered offensive to Christians, (b) information about aid to the Contras in Nicaragua, (c) magazines with sexually explicit words and/or pictures, (d) racist political groups, (e) slang with sexual referents, (f) sex role stereotypes, (g) flag burning, (h) descriptions how to commit criminal acts.
A hierarchical loglinear model determined that group classification contributed to the significance between groups in passing the Junior Level Essay (JLE) examination. Results of a Chi Square test of independence found that significantly more than the expected number of males requested transcribing services or attempted the JLE multiple times.

Results revealed that students viewed mothers as being more likely to read books, read to young children, and read magazines. Fathers were more likely to read newspapers.

The results of this study suggested that there were important differences between students with learning disabilities and regular education students in the way they perceived their comprehension instruction in the classroom.

The total word recognition score accounted for approximately 79% of the comprehension variance for the 6-7 age group, approximately 82% for the 8-9 age group, and approximately 63% for the 10-12 age group. When predicting comprehension from the individual predicted structural features of words, the total squared multiple correlation was approximately .12 for the 10-12 year-old-group. The results supported a model in which for younger children, a small number of structural features themselves are predictors of reading comprehension for each child.

Sixth graders used a variety of context-creating elements to provide helpful background information for their audiences. They also relied heavily on logical reasons as a persuasive strategy. While letters were short and relatively unsophisticated, they provided evidence indicating that young writers had some understanding of the text elements which were necessary for written persuasion.
The results suggested that parental involvement (regardless of the child's gender or socioeconomic background) was indeed a dynamic influencing students' academic achievement and application of mathematics concepts. This research supported school program for at-risk students that encouraged a multifaceted method of parent involvement.

Though the quantitative results revealed no significant differences between the two groups, the qualitative data supported that the prediction activities augmented classroom participation, promoted critical analysis, and enhanced student interest in the lesson. Regression analyses performed on all of the pre- and posttest quantitative measures showed significantly positive correlations between attitude toward science and achievement motivation for both the experimental and control groups.

Differences in attitude among different educational and occupational groups were found. Those adults with the most education and in higher-status jobs had the most positive attitudes toward reading. Positive attitude was also associated with high reading test scores.

The findings indicated that left-brain preference thinkers benefited more than right-brain preference thinkers from the inclusion of images, that copying the images was more beneficial than studying a supplied handout, and that nouns, verbs, and adjectives were learned equally well by students in all groups.

No significant differences were noted between groups for either immediate learning or delayed recall. These generative learning strategies (e.g., vocabulary log, imagery, and suggestology) could be considered viable alternative approaches (when compared with a traditional approach) for vocabulary instruction within the additive context of a college developmental reading course.

Split-plot repeated measures analysis and Scheffe post hoc tests revealed a significant bias for good handwriting among both the
There were no significant differences in internal consistency reliabilities between the STOPA and an individually administered test of phonological awareness, and level of performance on both tests was similar. It was concluded that it was feasible to screen for phonological awareness using a group administered test, and that a test composed of two different item tests was optimal.

The structure of an economics course can influence student achievement. A course with more contact hours appears to increase student knowledge of economics because more contact gives teachers more time to teach and students more time to learn the subject. The focus of a course also influences what students learn. A course that focuses on economics theory and principles, as opposed to a course where the focus is on the practical or "how to" dimensions of economics for daily life, will improve student understanding of basic economics concepts. Third, factors affecting teacher training had a positive effect on student learning. All else being equal, the greater the number of economics courses taken by a teacher, the better the performance of that teacher's students. Finally, textbooks seemed to improve economics learning and change attitudes toward economics.

At the completion of the two-year study, two conclusions were drawn: (a) more than half of the students in the study experienced no changes in theoretical orientation throughout the course of the study; and (b) for those who did experience a change, the course work appeared to have had a greater influence than did the student teaching experience.

The following question guided the study: Are pupils' attitudes toward multicultural diversity enhanced by exposure to multicultural literature?

At the beginning and at the end of the study, all participants responded to a survey which examined their attitudes toward aspects of diversity. Administration of the instrument at posttest time indicated that positive gains occurred in the Storybook Reading Groups at Grades 2 and 4.
| Yeager & Davis, 1995 | Multiple M/F | Basic | Descriptive | college students |

For kindergartners, positive gains occurred on six of the nine survey items. A different pattern occurred in the control groups where there was overall negative change at all three grade levels. These findings suggest that without a diversity program children's appreciation of diversity may actually decrease across the school year.

This study examined how secondary social studies teachers in history read and interpreted historical texts, constructed truthful accounts, and approached an epistemology of history. Subjects read and thought about the same eight documents. Results indicated that the nature of student teaching may not lend itself well to reflection on epistemological matters.
Table 5

Studies by Topic

**Assessment:**
- Farr and Jongsma, 1993
- Gordon, Englehard, Gabrielson, and Bernknopf, 1996
- Goulden, 1994
- Plata, Zelhart, and House, 1995

**Belief Systems:**
  **Attitudes and perceptions about literacy**
- Collis and Ollila, 1990
- Levine, Donitsa-Schmidt, Zellermayer, 1996
- McKinney and Jones, 1993
- Naylor, Dwyer, and Blis, 1995
- Pottorff, Phelps-Zientarski, and Skovera, 1996
- Sinclair, 1994
- Smith, 1990
- Walstasd and Van Scyoc, 1990

  **Genres:**
  **Content Area Literacy**
- Craig and Yore, 1996
- Gallini, Spires, Terry, and Gleaton, 1993
- Lechner and Barry, 1997
- McKinney and Jones, 1993
- Sinclair, 1994
- Walstasd and Van Scyoc, 1990
- Yeager and Davis, 1995

  **Literature-based**
- Lechner and Barry, 1997
- Mallette, Bean, and Readance, 1998
- McKinney and Jones, 1993
- Naylor, Dwyer, and Blis, 1995
- Wham, Barnhart, and Cook, 1996

**Literacy Mediums:**
  **Sign Systems**
- Alsquaugh, 1991
- Klesius and Searls, 1990
- Shave and Walls, 1998
- Smith, Miller, Grossman, and Valeri-Gold, 1994
- Stahl, Brozo, Smith, Henk, and Commander, 1991

  **Technology-related studies**
- Collis and Ollila, 1990
- Foster, Erickson, Foster, Brinkman, and Torgesen, 1994
- Klesius and Searls, 1990
- LaFramboise, 1991
- Levine, Donitsa-Schmidt, and Zellermayer, 1996
Reading:

Comprehension
Craig and Yore, 1990
Gallini, Spries, Terry, and Gleaton, 1993
Rabren and Drch, 1996
Rupley and Wilson, 1997
Shaver and Walls, 1998

Parts of speech
Smith, Miller, Grossman, and Valeri-Gold, 1994

Phonological Awareness
Foster, Erickson, Foster, Brinkman, and Torgesen, 1994
Torgeson, Wagner, Bryant, and Pearson, 1992

Reading Strategies
Craig and York, 1996
Sinclair, 1994

Vocabulary
Klesius and Sears, 1990
Smith, Miller, Grossman, and Valeri-Gold, 1994
Stahl, Brozo, Smith, Henk, and Commander, 1991

Specific Populations:

Culturally-driven studies
Harvey, Ollila, Baxter, and Guo, 1997
Lechner and Barry, 1997
Mallette, Bean, and Readance, 1998
Wham, Barnhart, and Cook, 1996

Gender-related studies
Collis and Ollila, 1990
Harvey, Ollila, Baxter, and Guo, 1997
Levine, Donitsa-Schmidt, and Zellermayer, 1996
Pottorff, Phelps-Zientarski, and Skovera, 1996

Parental influences
Alspaugh, 1991
Pottorff, Phelps-Zientarski, and Skovera, 1996
Shaver and Walls, 1998

Preservice pedagogy
Lechner and Barry, 1997
Wham, 1993
Yeager and Davis, 1995

Special education populations
Plata, Zelhart, and House, 1995
Rabren and Darch, 1996

Writing:

Products and Processes:
Blohm and Benton, 1991
Farr and Jongsma, 1993
Gordon, Englehard, Gabrielson, and Bernknopf, 1996
Harvey, Ollila, Baxter, and Guo, 1997
Knudson, 1991
Knudson, 1992
LaFramboise, 1991
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