

Sulzby, E. (1985). Children's emergent reading of favorite storybooks: A developmental study. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 20(4), 458–481.

Summers, E.G. (1983). Bradford's law and the retrieval of reading research journal literature. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 19(1), 102–109. doi:10.2307/747340

Thomson Reuters. (2012). *Journal Citations Reports*. Retrieved from thomsonreuters.com/journal-citation-reports

Tunmer, W.E., Herriman, M.L., & Nesdale, A.R. (1988). Metalinguistic abilities and beginning reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 23(2), 134–158.

Weintraub, S. (1979). In retrospect... [Editorial]. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 14(4), 475–477.

Wolf, M. (1991). Naming speed and reading: The contribution of the cognitive neurosciences. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 26(2), 123–141.

Yopp, H.K. (1988). The validity and reliability of phonemic awareness tests. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 23(2), 159–177.

Submitted July 29, 2014
Accepted August 20, 2014

D. RAY REUTZEL (corresponding author) is the Emma Eccles Jones Distinguished Professor of Early Literacy in the Department of Teacher Education and Leadership at Utah State University, Logan; e-mail ray.reutzels@usu.edu.

KATHLEEN A.J. MOHR is an associate professor of language and literacy in the Department of Teacher Education and Leadership at Utah State University, Logan; e-mail kathleen.mohr@usu.edu.

Supporting Information

Additional supporting information may be found in the online version of this article:

Article S1. “Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy” by Keith E. Stanovich.

Erratum

In Table 2 of the article “Evidence for Prosody in Silent Reading” by J. Gross, A.L. Millett, B. Bartek, K.H. Bredell, and B. Winegard that appeared in the April/May/June 2014 issue of *Reading Research Quarterly*, 49(2), the statistics were presented incorrectly. The table below is correct.

TABLE 2
Descriptive Statistics for Preference Ratings^a in Focus Congruous and Incongruous Conditions in Experiment 1

	Mean	Standard deviation
<i>Focus incongruous</i>		
SAM fell.	2.54	0.89
Sam FELL.	2.31	0.76
<i>Focus congruous</i>		
SAM fell.	3.83	0.94
Sam FELL.	3.36	0.70

^a5-point rating scale, with 5 as most helpful.