

# The Impact of English Learning Experience, Parental Involvement and Socioeconomic Status Differences on Strategy Use of Vocabulary Learning

Ching-Ying Lin, Jin-Wei Ciu

## Abstract

The main purpose of this study was to examine the vocabulary learning strategies used by grade 8 junior high school students in Taiwan. The factors of students' English learning experience, parental involvement and socioeconomic status were explored. The instrument adopted Schmitt's (1997) vocabulary learning strategies. Five categories of vocabulary learning strategies including determination, memory, cognitive, metacognitive and social strategies were involved. There were 47 items in the questionnaire. The researcher recruited 181 grade 8 junior high school students. The results reported that most of the students did not use vocabulary learning strategies often. Significant differences were found among students' English learning experience, parental involvement and socioeconomic status. Pedagogical implications and suggestions were referred.

**Keywords:** vocabulary learning strategies, English learning experience, parental involvement, socioeconomic status.



# 英語學習經驗，父母參與及社經地位對於 字彙學習策略的影響

林青穎、邱矜維

## 摘要

本研究調查台灣國二學生對於字彙策略的使用情形，研究內容包含學生的英語學習經驗，父母的參與與否，父母的社經地位，目的在於探討這些因素是否會影響學生在字彙策略上的使用有所不同。本研究工具採用專家的字彙策略版本，總共包含五大類，決定、記憶、認知、後段認知和社會策略。整份問卷包含了四十七個選項，總計有一百八十一位國二學生參與。調查結果顯示，大部分的學生不常使用字彙策略，並發現在探討學生的英語學習經驗，父母的參與與否及社經地位時，結果顯示出顯著差異存在於這些變數之中。教學上與未來的研究建議也會被提及於文章之中。

**關鍵詞：**字彙策略、英語學習經驗、家長參與、社經地位。



## Introduction

Vocabulary is fundamental to learn any language. Insufficient vocabulary hinders the ability of non-native speakers to express their ideas and converse. Learners with an adequate knowledge of vocabulary are also able to put things into context, thereby deriving a deeper understanding of everything said (Neuman & Dwyer, 2009; Stahr, 2008). English is regarded as a foreign language (EFL) in Taiwan, it is only ever encountered in public classrooms or cram schools. After school, students seldom have the opportunity to use their newly developed language skills, and most students focus on passing tests, instead of applying English to practical situations. In contrast, in an ESL environment, English is not limited to the classroom and can be acquired anywhere. ESL students acquire English and employ it in their daily lives, by concentrating on interaction and practice. The process of learning and the outcomes are totally different in EFL and ESL learning conditions. In addition, the language forms of Chinese and English are completely different and success in English involves a wider range of contingent factors. People who are good at Chinese are not necessarily able to learn English easily.

The ability to use English is very important to the Taiwanese. Enormous English cram schools are ubiquitous and many people are currently enrolled in English classes. Following the boom in internationalization in recent years, the average age of students learning English has been constantly decreasing. To enhance the English ability of students and increase international competitiveness, the Ministry of Education has extended English classes from the fifth grade to the third grade of elementary school. Ball (2009) claimed that learning a wide range of vocabulary early, could be regarded as a predictor of success in reading. Most people have recognized that English is the means with which to connect to the world, and regardless of its importance in school exams, language skills are crucial when searching for a job and conducting business.

The involvement of parents and their socioeconomic status have become noteworthy aspects of English learning in recent years. Most parents must focus on working to support their families, and lack the time to oversee the development of their children or notice problems associated with their studies. In such situations, children from a higher socioeconomic background are often sent to cram schools, providing them greater opportunity to absorb new knowledge.

The purpose of this study was to determine whether learning English early in life or the



involvement of parents in the learning process contribute to the use of strategies for memorizing words. We also addressed the gap between children from high and low socioeconomic backgrounds. We were particularly concerned with the influence of educational resources on the ability of children to learn English. We addressed three research questions:

1. What are the most frequently used strategies for learning vocabulary by individual junior high school students studying EFL in Taiwan?
2. Do the English learning experiences of junior high school students studying EFL in Taiwan influence the use of strategies for learning vocabulary?
3. Does parental involvement or socioeconomic status significantly influence vocabulary learning?

## Literature Review

### Characteristics of Strategies for Learning Vocabulary

Schmitt (2000) noted that vocabulary learning strategies included repeating, memorizing, observing that beginners use shallow strategies such as memorization and repetition, while advanced learners use deeper strategies such as those based on consolidation and determination. Schmitt (1997) identified 58 strategies, and divided them into two categories: discovery and consolidation. Discovery strategies are associated with determination and social strategies. Consolidation strategies are associated with memory, cognitive, metacognitive and various social concerns. Determination strategies are performed independently, in which learners seek the meaning of words by themselves according to context. Social strategies focus on interaction with others in which students ask others to solve their questions. Memory strategies involve learning new words based on their background knowledge. Cognitive strategies resemble drills, such as the repeating of new words. Metacognitive strategies are related to processes including monitoring, decision-making, and evaluation. By analyzing various subjects, researchers determine the means by which to provide students with help specifically designed to facilitate the learning of vocabulary (Catalan, 2003; Huyen & Nga, 2003; Liao, 2004; Wei, 2007).

Wei (2007) indicated a strong correlation between positive attitude and strategies for learning vocabulary. According to Wei (2007), students with a positive attitude are more likely to use strategies for learning vocabulary and less likely to encounter problems. Lee



and Oxford (2008) indicated that a positive attitude influences one's awareness of strategies and subsequent use of them.

Many previous studies have reported that the most frequently used strategies had a significant correlation with what the subjects considered useful (Lip, 2009; Wu, 2005). Wu (2005) showed that all subjects believed the strategies learners employed for learning vocabulary were the same as those they perceived to be useful. Lip (2009) claimed that there is a strong correlation between the frequency with which vocabulary learning strategies are used and the degree of usefulness perceived by students.

### Vocabulary Instruction

Previous studies have proven that learning words related to a topic is more effective than learning lexical sets (Thornbury, 2003). Neuman and Dwyer (2009) claimed that the instruction of vocabulary goes beyond the identification or labeling of words. It should aid learners to fully comprehend the meaning of a word and the notions it represents. Chen and Yeh (2004) indicated that training the skills of spelling, while focusing on meaningful words is effective. Huyen and Nga (2003) suggested that learning vocabulary through games is an efficient way to conduct classes. Broady (2008) submitted that knowledge of vocabulary is not supposed to be limited to memorization or definitions, and the depth of processing should be more fully integrated. Thornbury (2003) pointed out that using short blocks of text was a suitable approach to learning vocabulary with regard to the skills of listening, reading, writing, and speaking. It provided a good model for learners to follow in their language learning. Kindle (2009) found that reading aloud was an efficient way to perform vocabulary instruction, in his discussion of the role of teachers and the methods they employ. Elliott and Olliff (2008) promoted labeling signs products in classrooms as beneficial for children who would thus encounter those words frequently.

### Early Development of Literacy

Literacy is the foundation of the language development of children, extending beyond the skills of reading and writing (Asici, 2009). To become a successful reader, children must be equipped with knowledge of the alphabet, phonology, and letter-sound correspondence. Knowledge of the alphabet is an accurate predictor of later attainments in reading (Ball, 2009; Elliott & Olliff, 2008). Children that develop high level literacy skills



tend to have superior reading and spelling skills as well (Cabell, Justice, Zucker, & Kilday, 2009). Gyovai, Cartledge, Kourea, Yurick and Gibson (2009) found that children need to develop their listening and demonstrate phonemes prior to absorbing letters. Phonological awareness plays an important role in the development of literacy (Crim, Hawkins, Thornton, Rosof, Copley & Thomas, 2008). Asici (2009) found that children learn language easily through imitation in an atmosphere in which it is widely spoken.

### Parental Involvement

Previous researchers have addressed parental involvement and its positive influence on the scholastic achievements of children (Hanafi, 2008; Jeynes, 2007; Jeynes, 2003; Kan & Tsai, 2005; Zellman & Waterman, 1998). The scholastic achievements of children are connected with the school system and the approach taken by the instructor; however, the living environment is also important. Family background could influence the educational performance of children (Hanafi, 2008; Lareau, 1987; Yang, 2007). Parents, and particularly mothers, play a crucial role during the educational life of their children (Fan & Chen, 2001; Fan, 2001). Lareau (1987) and Jeynes (2003) suggested that a higher degree of parental involvement in the educational lives of children, could promote scholastic achievement. If parents paid more attention to the learning processes of their children, the effects would be obvious in the academic achievements of the children (Asici, 2009). During elementary and junior high school, parental involvement is a salient key to facilitate learning in children (Jeynes, 2003; Zellman & Waterman, 1998). There is a positive relationship between the scholastic achievements of children and the educational expectations of parents (Astone & McLanahan, 1991; Fan & Chen, 2001; Fan, 2001; Sirin, 2005; Yang, 2007; Zellman & Waterman, 1998).

### Socio-economic Status

Children from a low socio-economic background lack educational resources (Hanafi, 2008; McLanahan & Bumpass, 1988; Sirin, 2005; Yang, 2007), and their parents spend less time on them. Children from higher socio-economic background have better experience with regard to the development of literacy (Asici, 2009; Lareau, 1987). McLanahan and Bumpass (1988) indicated that the economic situation of parents was related to the



scholastic achievements of children. The socioeconomic status and behavior of parents has a considerable influence on the scholastic performance of children (Kan & Tsai, 2005; Lareau, 1987; Sirin, 2005; Yang, 2007). Sirin (2005) asserted that the educational background of parents has a strong correlation with the academic performance of children; the higher the educational background of the parents, the better the performance of the children. Previous studies have indicated that parents with a stronger educational background have higher expectations of their children (Hanafi, 2008; Yang, 2007). In contrast, parents with weaker educational background pay less attention to their children's learning progress (Lareau, 1987).

## Methods

### Subjects

The subjects of this study were 181 grade 8 junior high school students studying EFL in southern Taiwan, all of whom had been learning English for at least three years. There were two reasons for choosing them: grade 7 students have inadequate knowledge of vocabulary and are unfamiliar with the school textbooks and school tests used in junior high school; grade 9 students feel strong pressure to meet the Basic Competence Test.

### Instruments

The researcher proposed a questionnaire related to strategies for learning vocabulary including 47 items. These were divided into five categories (Schmitt, 1997): memory, cognitive, metacognitive, determination, and social strategies. A five-point frequency scale was used (1= never, 2= seldom, 3= sometimes, 4= usually and 5= always) to rate the questions in the survey. The first part covered demographic data including the name of the school, the student number, gender, educational background of parents, socioeconomic status, and scholastic experience of the students. The second sections covered forty seven items in five categories. Items 1 to 7 dealt with determination strategies. Items 8 to 16 addressed social strategies. Items 17 to 34 looked at memory strategies. Items 35 to 43 discussed cognitive strategies. Items 44 to 47 addressed metacognitive strategies. The final section had an open-ended question: "What other strategies have you employed to remember words?"



## Procedure

The researcher first explained the reasons for the questionnaire, and asked participants to fill in the demographic data. The researcher then informed the students how many items were in the questionnaire and asked them to ensure that all items were completed. The entire procedure was conducted under comfortable conditions. The researcher reassured students that the results would not influence their grades or be published in the future.

## Data Analysis

The data were collected using descriptive statistics and one-way ANOVA. Research question 1 used descriptive statistics to analyze the strategies used by grade 8 EFL students to retain English vocabulary. Research questions 2 and 3 used one-way ANOVA to examine whether there was a correlation between the learning experience of students and parental involvement or socioeconomic status, with regard to strategies for learning vocabulary.

## Results

After collecting and analyzing the data, the findings are described in detail in the following:

1. What are the most frequently used strategies for learning vocabulary by individual junior high school students studying EFL in Taiwan?

It was found that most junior high students did not frequently use strategies for learning vocabulary (Mean = 2.12). The most commonly used category of strategy for learning vocabulary was determination (Mean = 2.42) and the least commonly used category of strategy was social (Mean = 1.81) (see Table 1).

Table 1  
*The ranking of strategy categories use*

Strategy categories	Mean	SD	Ranking
Determination	2.42	0.84	1
Cognitive	2.22	0.81	2
Metacognitive	2.18	0.82	3
Memory	2.11	0.78	4
Social	1.81	0.64	5
Grand Mean	2.12		





The top five strategies used by the students are shown in Table 2. Item “I take notes in class” was found to be the most frequently used strategy (Mean = 3.18) with 27.1 % of the students reporting always using this, 17.1 % usually, 19.9 % sometimes, 18.8 % seldom, and 17.1 % never. The second most frequently used strategy was item “I guess from textual context” (Mean = 3.06) with 13.8 % of the students reporting always using it, 28.7 % usually, 26.0 % sometimes, 12.7 % seldom and 18.8 % never. The third most frequently used strategy was item “I analyze many available pictures or gestures” (Mean = 3.02) with 13.8 % of the students reporting always using it, 23.8 % usually, 30.9 % sometimes, 13.8 % seldom, and 17.7 % never. The fourth most frequently used strategy was item “I notice the sound of a word” (Mean = 2.85) with 19.3 % of the students reporting always using it, 13.8 % usually, 23.8 % sometimes, 18.8 % seldom and 24.3 % never. The fifth most frequently used strategy was item “I notice the spelling of a word” (Mean = 2.81) with 13.3 % of the students reporting always using it, 23.8 % usually, 18.8 % sometimes, 19.3 % seldom, and 24.9 % never.

Table 2  
The top five VLS use by the students

Rank	Strategy items	Mean SD	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
1.	I take notes in class.	3.18 1.45	27.1%	17.1%	19.9%	18.8%	17.1%
2.	I guess from the textual context.	3.06 1.31	13.8%	28.7%	26.0%	12.7%	18.8%
3.	I analyze many available pictures or gestures.	3.02 1.28	13.8%	23.8%	30.9%	13.8%	17.7%
4.	I notice the sound of a word.	2.85 1.43	19.3%	13.8%	23.8%	18.8%	24.3%
5.	I notice the spelling of a word.	2.81 1.38	13.3%	23.8%	18.8%	19.3%	24.9%

The five least commonly used strategies are shown in Table 3. Item “I interact with teachers” was the least frequently used strategy (Mean = 1.29) with 0.0 % of the students



reporting always using it, 2.2 % usually, 3.9 % sometimes, 15.5 % seldom, and 78.5% never. The second least frequently used strategy was item “I interact with native speakers” (Mean = 1.35) with 0.6 % of the students reporting always using it, 0.6 % usually, 8.8 % sometimes, 14.4 % seldom, and 75.7 % never. The third least frequently used strategy was item “I put English labels on objects ex: TV and telephone” (Mean = 1.52) with 0.6 % of the students reporting always using it, 2.2 % usually, 11.0 % sometimes, 21.5 % seldom, and 64.6% never. The fourth least frequently used strategy was item “I ask the teacher for a sentence using the new word” (Mean = 1.53) with 1.1 % of the students reporting always using it, 2.2 % usually, 9.9 % sometimes, 22.1 % seldom, and 64.6% never. The fifth least frequently used strategy was item “I group words together spatially on a page” (Mean = 1.54) with 0.6 % of the students reporting always using it, 1.7 % usually, 9.4 % sometimes, 28.2 % seldom, and 60.2 % never.

Table 3  
*The bottom five VLS used by students*

Rank	Strategy items	Mean SD	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
1.	I interact with teachers.	1.29 0.64	0.0%	2.2%	3.9%	15.5%	78.5%
2.	I interact with native speakers.	1.35 0.71	0.6%	0.6%	8.8%	14.4%	75.7%
3.	I put English labels on objects ex: TV and telephone.	1.52 0.82	0.6%	2.2%	11.0%	21.5%	64.6%
4.	I ask the teacher for a sentence using the new word.	1.53 0.84	1.1%	2.2%	9.9%	22.1%	64.6%
5.	I group words together spatially on a page.	1.54 0.77	0.6%	1.7%	9.4%	28.2%	60.2%

2. Do the English learning experiences of junior high school students studying EFL in Taiwan influence the use of strategies for learning vocabulary?

The results indicate that the three groups had different English learning experiences in Table 4. Students who had been learning English for one to three years had the lowest mean



(Mean = 1.79) in using strategies for learning vocabulary. Students who had been learning English for four to six years had a higher mean (Mean = 2.17) in using strategies for learning vocabulary. Students had been learning English for seven to nine years had the highest mean (Mean = 2.27) in using strategies for learning vocabulary.

Table 4

*Learning experience in use of VLS*

Years	Mean	SD
1~3	1.79	.71934
4~6	2.17	.65612
7~9	2.27	.67370

One-way ANOVA was used to determine whether there were significant differences among the three groups (see Table 5). According to the findings, there was significant difference between the group with 1 to 3 years and the group with 4 to 6 years (mean difference = -.3795,  $p = .013 < .05$ ). There was also significant difference between the group with 1 to 3 years and the group with 7 to 9 years (mean difference = -.4830,  $p = .004 < .05$ ). In contrast, there was no significant difference between the group with 4 to 6 years and the group with 7 to 9 years (mean difference = -.1036,  $p = .655 > .05$ ).

Table 5

*Differences among three groups with different levels of experience learning English*

(I) years	(J) years	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for Difference	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1-3	4-6	-.3795 (*)	.13277	.013	-.6933	-.0656
	7-9	-.4830 (*)	.14902	.004	-.8352	-.1308
4-6	7-9	-.1036	.11802	.655	-.3825	.1754

\* The mean difference was significant at .05

3. Does parental involvement or socioeconomic status significant influence vocabulary learning?

Parental involvement in the learning processes of children between the two groups is shown in Table 6. Students with parental involvement had a higher mean (Mean = 2.41)



in using strategies for learning vocabulary; students with no parental involvement had a lower mean (Mean = 2.04). An independent t-test was used to examine the specific effects. The findings showed a significant difference associated with parental involvement ( $t = -3.085, p = .002 < .05$ ).

Table 6  
*Differences in parental involvement*

Parents' involvement	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error	Independent t-Test		
					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
No	141	2.04	.672	.0566			
Yes	40	2.41	.682	.1079	-3.085	179	.002

Differences were observed with regard to family income, among the three groups. Students with a family income below 10000 NT dollars had the lowest mean (Mean = 1.80) in using strategies for learning vocabulary. Students with a higher family income (between 10000 to 40000 NT dollars) had a higher mean (Mean = 2.16) in using strategies. Students with family income exceeding 40000 NT dollars had the highest mean (Mean = 2.54) in using strategies in their learning (see Table 7).

Table 7  
*Differences in VLS use according to family income*

Salary (a month)	Number	Mean	SD
Under 10000	61	1.80	.567
10000~40000	82	2.16	.692
Over 40000	38	2.54	.633

One-way ANOVA identified a significant difference among the groups (see Table 8). First, there was a significant difference between family income under 10000 and the group with family income of 10000 to 40000 (mean difference =  $-.3572, p = .003 < .05$ ). There was also a significant difference between the group with family income under 10000 and the group with family income exceeding 40000 (mean difference =  $-.7342, p = .000 < .05$ ). There was a significant difference between the group with family income 10000 to 40000



and the group with family income exceeding 40000 ( the mean difference =  $-.3770$ ,  $p = .009 < .05$  ) .

Table 8  
*Family income*

Tukey HSD (I) Salary	(J) Salary	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for Difference	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Under 10000	10000~40000	-.3572 (*)	.10830	.003	-.6132	-.1013
	over 40000	-.7342 (*)	.13237	.000	-1.047	-.4213
10000~40000	over 40000	-.3770 (*)	.12569	.009	-.6740	-.0799

The mean difference was significant at .05

### *Discussion*

For research question 1, the mean of vocabulary learning strategies used by junior high school students was low. This is in agreement with past research (Chen & Yeh, 2004; Lo, Wang, & Hsia, 2006). One reason could be that teachers seldom teach students strategies to enhance their learning achievement. Determination strategies were most commonly used and social strategy was the least commonly used by the junior high school students. This is consistent with the findings of Liao (2004). The most commonly used strategies were, “I take notes in class”, “I guess from textual context”, “I analyze many available pictures or gestures”, “I notice the sound of a word”, and “I notice the spelling of a word”. This is in line with the findings of Wu (2005) and Chen and Yeh (2004). Wu (2005) claimed that “study the sound of word” was most commonly used. Chen and Yeh (2004) found that students often use “take note in class”.

For research question 2, significant differences were observed among the three groups with different experiences learning English. The results show that with a longer period of learning English, the awareness of vocabulary learning strategies was higher. Previous studies have pointed out that learning languages early is crucial to the language development of children, and learning experience influences learning performance. (Elliott & Olliff, 2008; Asici, 2009).



For research question 3, our findings showed a significant difference between students with parental involvement and those without. Students with parental involvement in their English learning showed a greater awareness of using strategies. This is in line with previous research (Lareau, 1987; Jeynes, 2003; Asici, 2009; Zellman & Waterman, 1998). A significant difference was observed among students with different levels of family income. The mean of strategies for learning vocabulary was higher for students with higher family income. One reason could be that children with lower family income had fewer opportunities to receive educational materials (Sirin, 2005; Yang, 2007; Hanafi, 2008). These results are consistent with McLanahan and Bumpass (1988).

## Conclusion

The results reveal that most junior high school students seldom used strategies for learning vocabulary. Although language learners have few opportunities to use their second language outside the classroom, using it during the class time is still necessary. If this process were performed completely and consistently, the environment would be beneficial for learning a second language successfully. Through input and output, students were aware of using second language in right way (Nation, 2003).

The most commonly used category of strategy for learning vocabulary was determination and the least commonly used was the social strategy. Among individual strategies, "I take notes in class" was the most frequently used, followed by "I guess from textual context", and "I analyze many available pictures or gestures". "I notice the sound of a word" was the fourth frequently strategy and "I notice the spelling of a word" was the fifth. "I interact with teachers" was the least frequently strategy used. The second least frequently strategy used was "I interact with native speakers" followed by "I put English labels on objects ex: TV and telephone" and "I ask the teacher for a sentence including the new word". The fifth least frequently strategy used was "I group words together spatially on a page".

In terms of English learning experience, significant differences were observed among the three groups with different experiences learning English. Students that had learned English longer were more likely to use strategies for learning vocabulary. Parental involvement had a significant influence on scholastic outcome and whether students employed learning strategies. Significant differences were observed among the three groups with different levels of income. Students with lower family income had lower awareness of



using strategies for learning vocabulary; students with higher family income were more aware of using strategies for learning vocabulary.

### Pedagogical implications

The junior high school students in this study demonstrated a lack of awareness of strategies for learning. Rote drilling appeared to be the most common way to retain words. Teachers should teach students how to use strategies and avoid drills. Parental involvement was also important, and parents should be reminded to pay more attention to their children's learning. Teachers could encourage parents to pay more attention to their children's learning process. If necessary, parents could help children to answer their questions and give them advice based on their own learning experiences. Doing so will not only enhance students' learning achievements but also improve the relationship between parents and their children. As for the students with low family income, the government should provide sufficient educational resources to support all students with low family incomes. In addition, educational resources should be equally distributed.

### Suggestions

The subjects in this study were from southern Taiwan, and the sample was not representative of all students in Taiwan. Different regions, such as urban areas and rural areas, might influence the final results. The roles of parents in the learning process of children should be further examined. The teaching style of teachers would be worth observing. The researcher suggests that future studies could analyze other factors to compare. The size of the sample could be increased and students from different grades could be recruited.

### References

- Asici, M. (2009). Determination of foundational literacy knowledge and skills of students attending preschool education. *Reading Improvement*, 46 (3), 147-167.
- Astone, N. M. & McLanahan, S. S. (1991). Family structure, parental practices and high school completion. *American Sociological Review*, 56 (3), 309-220.
- Ball, C. (2009). Monitoring children growth in early literacy skills: effects of feedback on performance and classroom environments. *Education and treatment of children*,



32 ( 2 ) , 189-212.

- Cabell, S. Q., Justice, L. M., Zucker, T. A., & Kilday, C. R. ( 2009 ). Validity of teacher report for assessing the emergent literacy skills of at-risk preschools. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 40*, 161-173.
- Catalan, R. M. J. ( 2003 ) . Sex differences in L2 vocabulary learning strategies. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 13* ( 1 ) , 55-77.
- Chen, H. C., & Yen, H. C. ( 2004 ) . College student's difficulties and strategies in EFL vocabulary learning. *Journal of Wu Fen, 12*, 107-114.
- Crim, C., Hawkins, J., Thornton, J., Rosof, H. B., Copley, J., & Thomas, E. ( 2008 ) . Early childhood educators' knowledge of early literacy development. *Issues in Teaching Education. 17* ( 1 ) , 17-30.
- Elliot, E. M., & Olliff, C. B. ( 2008 ) . Development appropriate emergent literacy activities for young children: adapting the early literacy and learning model. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 35* ( 6 ) , 551-556.
- Fan, M. Y. ( 2003 ) . Frequency of use, perceived usefulness, and actual usefulness of second language vocabulary strategies: a study of Hong Kong learners. *The Modern Language Journal, 87*, 222-241.
- Fan, X., & Chen, M. ( 2001 ) . Parental involvement and students' academic achievement: a meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review, 13* ( 1 ) , 1-22.
- Fan, X. ( 2001 ) . Parental involvement and students' academic achievement: a growth modeling analysis. *The journal of Experimental Education, 70* ( 1 ) , 27-61.
- Gyovai, L. K., Cartledge, G., Kourea, L., Yurick, A., & Gibson, L. ( 2009 ) . Early reading intervention: responding to the learning needs of young at-risk English language learners. *Learn Disable, 32* ( 3 ) , 143-162.
- Hanafi, Z. ( 2008 ) . The relationship between aspects of socioeconomic factors and academic achievement. *Journal Pendidikan, 33*, 95-105.
- Huyen, N. T. T., & Nga, K. T. T. ( 2003 ) . The effectiveness of learning vocabulary through games. *The Asian EFL Journal, 5* ( 4 ) , 1-15.





- Jeynes, W. H. (2003). A meta-analysis: the effects of parental involvement on minority children's academic achievement. *Education and Urban Society*, 35 (2), 202-218.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2007). The relationship between parental involvement and urban secondary school student academic achievement: a meta-analysis. *Urban Education*, 42 (1), 82-110.
- Kan, K., & Tsai, W. D. (2005). Parenting practices and children's education outcomes. *Economics of Education Review*, 24 (1), 29-43.
- Lareau, A. (1987). Social class differences in family-school relationships: the importance of cultural capital. *Sociology of Education*, 60 (2), 73-85.
- Lee, K. R., & Oxford, R. (2008). Understanding EFL learner's strategy use and strategy awareness. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 10 (1), 7-32.
- Liao, Y. F. (2004). A survey study of Taiwan EFL freshmen's vocabulary learning strategies. *Journal of National Pingtung University of Education*, 21, 271-288.
- Lip, C. H. P. (2009). Investigating the most frequently used and most useful vocabulary language learning strategies among Chinese EFL postsecondary students in Hong Kong. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 6 (1), 77-87.
- Lo, M. L., Wang, D. C., & Hsia, C. S. (2006). An investigation of technical college EFL students' vocabulary learning concepts. *English Teaching and Culture*, 2, 30-41.
- McLanahan, S., & Bumpass, L. (1988). Intergenerational consequences of family disruption. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94 (1), 130-152.
- Nation, P. (2003). The role of the first language in foreign language learning. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 1-8.
- Neuman, S. B., & Dwyer, J. (2009). Missing in action: vocabulary instruction in pre-k. *The Reading Teacher*, 62 (5), 384-392.
- Schmitt, N. (1997). Vocabulary in language teaching. In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition, and pedagogy*, 199-227.



- Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Schmitt, N. (2000). Vocabulary in language teaching. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Sirin, S. R. (2005). Socioeconomic status and academic achievement: a meta-analytic review of research. *Review of Educational Research*, 75 (3), 417-453.
- Stahr, L. S. (2008). Vocabulary size and the skills of listening, reading and writing. *Language Learning Journal*, 36 (2), 139-152.
- Thornbury, S. (2003). Teaching vocabulary using short texts 1. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 5 (4), 1-6.
- Wei, M. (2007). An examination of vocabulary learning of college-level learners of English in China. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 9, 93-114.
- Wu, W. S. (2005). Use and helpfulness rankings of vocabulary learning strategies employed by EFL learners in Taiwan. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1 (2), 7-13.
- Yang, C. (2007). Social class differences in parent educational expectations: the relationship between parents' social status and their expectations for children's education. *Front Educ. China*, 2 (4), 568-578.
- Yang, M. N. (2007). Language learning strategies for junior college students in Taiwan: investing ethnicity and proficiency. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 9, 35-57.
- Zellman, G. L., & Waterman, J. M. (1998). Understanding the impact of parent school involvement on children's educational outcomes. *The journal of Educational Research*, 91 (6), 370-381.

