# Appendix

## Appendix A1 Extent of evidence for the alphabetics, fluency, comprehension, and general reading achievement domains

| Intervention name | Number of studies | Sample size (schools/students) | Extent of evidence |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Alphabetics* | | | |
| Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance | 0 | 0 | na |
| Auditory Discrimination in Depth/Lindamood Phonemic Sequencing® | 1 | 5/146 | Small |
| Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition® | 0 | 0 | na |
| Corrective Reading | 1 | 8/over 70 | Small |
| ClassWide Peer Tutoring | 0 | 0 | na |
| Daisy Quest | 3 | nr/187 | Small |
| Early Intervention in Reading® | 1 | 2/56 | Small |
| Earobics® | 2 | 4/104 | Small |
| Failure-Free Reading | 1 | 8/93 | Small |
| Fast ForWord® | 3 | 5/295 | Small |
| Fluency Formula™ | 0 | 0 | na |
| Kaplan SpellRead | 2 | over 9/139 | Small |
| Ladders to Literacy | 4 | over 14/760 | Medium to large |
| Little Books | 0 | 0 | na |
| Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies | 3 | 17/295 | Small |
| Read Naturally | 0 | 0 | na |
| Read, Write, Type™ | 1 | 5/146 | Small |
| Reading Recovery® | 3 | over 14/226 | Small |
| Start Making a Reader Today® | 1 | 6/84 | Small |
| Stepping Stones to Literacy | 2 | 17/120 | Small |
| Success for All® | 7 | 67/3,103 | Medium to large |
| Voyager Universal Literacy System® | 3 | 14/719 | Medium to large |
| Waterford Early Reading Program™ | 1 | 6/76 | Small |

*(continued)*

## Appendix A1 Extent of evidence for the alphabetics, fluency, comprehension, and general reading achievement domains *(continued)*

| Intervention name | Number of studies | Sample size (schools/students) | Extent of evidence |
|---|---|---|---|
| Wilson Reading System® | 1 | 8/71 | Small |
| ***Fluency*** | | | |
| Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance | 0 | 0 | na |
| Auditory Discrimination in Depth/Lindamood Phonemic Sequencing® | 0 | 0 | na |
| Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition® | 0 | 0 | na |
| Corrective Reading | 1 | 8/over 70 | Small |
| ClassWide Peer Tutoring | 0 | 0 | na |
| Daisy Quest | 0 | 0 | na |
| Early Intervention in Reading® | 0 | 0 | na |
| Earobics® | 1 | 1/74 | Small |
| Failure-Free Reading | 1 | 8/93 | Small |
| Fast ForWord® | 0 | 0 | na |
| Fluency Formula™ | 1 | 5/128 | Small |
| Ladders to Literacy | 1 | over 1/66 | Small |
| Kaplan SpellRead | 2 | over 9/139 | Small |
| Little Books | 0 | 0 | na |
| Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies | 3 | 5/295 | Small |
| Read Naturally | 2 | 2/106 | Small |
| Read, Write, Type™ | 0 | 0 | na |
| Reading Recovery® | 1 | nr/74 | Small |
| Start Making a Reader Today® | 1 | 6/84 | Small |
| Stepping Stones to Literacy | 0 | 0 | na |
| Success for All® | 0 | 0 | na |
| Voyager Universal Literacy System® | 0 | 0 | na |
| Waterford Early Reading Program™ | 0 | 0 | na |
| Wilson Reading System® | 1 | 8/71 | Small |
| ***Comprehension*** | | | |
| Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance | 1 | nr/178 | Small |

*(continued)*

## Appendix A1 Extent of evidence for the alphabetics, fluency, comprehension, and general reading achievement domains *(continued)*

| Intervention name | Number of studies | Sample size (schools/students) | Extent of evidence |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Auditory Discrimination in Depth/Lindamood Phonemic Sequencing®** | 1 | 5/146 | Small |
| **Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition®** | 2 | over 8/702 | Medium to large |
| **Corrective Reading** | 1 | 8/over 70 | Small |
| **ClassWide Peer Tutoring** | 0 | 0 | na |
| **Daisy Quest** | 0 | 0 | na |
| **Early Intervention in Reading®** | 1 | 2/57 | Small |
| **Earobics®** | 0 | 0 | na |
| **Failure-Free Reading** | 1 | 8/93 | Small |
| **Fast ForWord®** | 3 | over 11/292 | Small |
| **Fluency Formula™** | 1 | 5/128 | Small |
| **Kaplan SpellRead** | 2 | over 9/139 | Small |
| **Ladders to Literacy** | 3 | over 6/489 | Medium to large |
| **Little Books** | 0 | 0 | na |
| **Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies** | 2 | 6/99 | Small |
| **Read Naturally** | 1 | 1/94 | Small |
| **Read, Write, Type™** | 1 | 5/146 | Small |
| **Reading Recovery®** | 2 | nr/156 | Small |
| **Start Making a Reader Today®** | 1 | 6/84 | Small |
| **Stepping Stones to Literacy** | 0 | 0 | na |
| **Success for All®** | 6 | 65/2,565 | Medium to large |
| **Voyager Universal Literacy System®** | 2 | 6/321 | Small |
| **Waterford Early Reading Program™** | 1 | 6/76 | Small |
| **Wilson Reading System®** | 1 | 8/71 | Small |
| ***General reading achievement*** | | | |
| **Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance** | 1 | nr/394 | Small |
| **Auditory Discrimination in Depth/Lindamood Phonemic Sequencing®** | 0 | 0 | na |
| **Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition®** | 0 | 0 | na |
| **Corrective Reading** | 0 | 0 | na |

*(continued)*

## Appendix A1 Extent of evidence for the alphabetics, fluency, comprehension, and general reading achievement domains *(continued)*

| Intervention name | Number of studies | Sample size (schools/students) | Extent of evidence |
|---|---|---|---|
| ClassWide Peer Tutoring | 1 | 6/218 | Small |
| Daisy Quest | 0 | 0 | na |
| Early Intervention in Reading® | 0 | 0 | na |
| Earobics® | 0 | 0 | na |
| Failure-Free Reading | 0 | 0 | na |
| Fast ForWord® | 0 | 0 | na |
| Fluency Formula™ | 0 | 0 | na |
| Kaplan SpellRead | 0 | 0 | na |
| Ladders to Literacy | 0 | 0 | na |
| Little Books | 1 | 6/314 | Small |
| Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies | 0 | 0 | na |
| Read Naturally | 0 | 0 | na |
| Read, Write, Type™ | 0 | 0 | na |
| Reading Recovery® | 5 | over 14/452 | Medium to large |
| Start Making a Reader Today® | 0 | 0 | na |
| Stepping Stones to Literacy | 0 | 0 | na |
| Success for All® | 6 | 31/1,767 | Medium to large |
| Voyager Universal Literacy System® | 0 | 0 | na |
| Waterford Early Reading Program™ | 0 | 0 | na |
| Wilson Reading System® | 0 | 0 | na |

na = not applicable/not studied
nr = not reported

Note: A rating of "medium to large" requires at least two studies and two schools across studies in one domain and a total sample size across studies of at least 350 students or 14 classrooms. Otherwise, the rating is "small."

## Appendix A2 Targeted populations

| Intervention name | Targeted students (grades) | Students in studies reviewed (grades) |
|---|---|---|
| Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance | All levels | K–3 |
| Auditory Discrimination in Depth/Lindamood Phonemic Sequencing® | K–12 | 1 |
| Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition® | 2–8 | 3 |
| Corrective Reading | 3–9 | 3 |
| ClassWide Peer Tutoring | K–6 | 1 |
| Daisy Quest | PK–2 | K–2 |
| Early Intervention in Reading® | K–6 | 1 |
| Earobics® | PK–3 | K–3 |
| Failure-Free Reading | K–12 | 3 |
| Fast ForWord® | PK–12 | K–3 |
| Fluency Formula™ | 1–6 | 2 |
| Kaplan SpellRead | K–12 | 1–3 |
| Ladders to Literacy | K | K |
| Little Books | K–12 | K |
| Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies | K–12 | 1–3 |
| Read Naturally | 1–8 | 1–2 |
| Read, Write, Type™ | K–3 | 1 |
| Reading Recovery® | 1 | 1 |
| Start Making a Reader Today® | K–2 | 1 |
| Stepping Stones to Literacy | PK–K | K |
| Success for All® | PK–8 | K–3 |
| Voyager Universal Literacy System® | K–3 | K |
| Waterford Early Reading Program™ | K–2 | K |
| Wilson Reading System® | 2–12 | 3 |

Note: This table presents a comparison of targeted grade levels and the grade levels in the studies reviewed by the WWC. Grade levels are related to student age and may affect outcomes due to differences in the students' developmental stages as well as differences in school size and organization.

## Appendix A3.1 Summary of statistically significant[1] or substantively important[2] positive findings

| Intervention name | Positive findings | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Alphabetics | Fluency | Comprehension | General reading achievement |
| ***Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance*** | | | | |
| Ross, Nunnery, & Goldfeder, 2004 (randomized controlled trial) | na | na | ns | STAR Early Literacy test |
| ***Auditory Discrimination in Depth/Lindamood Phonemic Sequencing®*** | | | | |
| Torgesen et al., 2003 *[ADD vs. Read, Write, Type intervention]* (randomized controlled trial) | ns | na | ns | na |
| Torgesen et al., 2003 *[ADD vs. regular instruction]* (randomized controlled trial) | CTOPP: Phoneme Elision Subtest; CTOPP Phoneme Segmenting Subtest; Woodcock Reading Mastery Test: Word Attack Subtest; Woodcock Reading Mastery Test: Word Identification Subtest | na | ns | na |
| ***Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition®*** | | | | |
| Bramlett, 1994 (quasi-experimental design) | na | na | ns | na |
| Skeans, 1991 (quasi-experimental design) | na | na | ns | na |
| ***Corrective Reading*** | | | | |
| Torgesen et al., 2006 (randomized controlled trial) | WRMT-R: Word Identification Subtest; TOWRE: Sight Word Efficiency Subtest | Oral Reading Fluency | ns | na |
| ***ClassWide Peer Tutoring*** | | | | |
| Greenwood et al., 1993 (randomized controlled trial) | na | na | na | ns |
| ***DaisyQuest*** | | | | |
| Baker & Torgensen, 1995 *[DaisyQuest vs. Hint and Hunt software]* (randomized controlled trial) | Undersea Challenge; Production Test of Segmenting | na | na | na |
| Baker & Torgensen, 1995 *[DaisyQuest vs. math software]* (randomized controlled trial) | Undersea Challenge; Production Test of Segmenting | na | na | na |
| Foster et al., 1994 *[Experiment 1: Child-care Facility]* (randomized controlled trial) | Phonological Awareness Test (PAT) (b); Screening Test of Phonological Awareness: Experimental Version (STOPA-E) | na | na | na |

*(continued)*

## Appendix A3.1 Summary of statistically significant[1] or substantively important[2] positive findings *(continued)*

| Intervention name | Positive findings | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Alphabetics | Fluency | Comprehension | General reading achievement |
| Foster et al., 1994 *[Experiment 2: Kindergarten Classrooms]* (randomized controlled trial) | Undersea Challenge; Production Test of Segmenting; Production Test of Blending | na | na | na |
| Mitchell & Fox, 2001 *[DaisyQuest vs teacher-delivered phonological awareness instruction]* (randomized controlled trial) | ns | na | na | na |
| Mitchell & Fox, 2001 *[DaisyQuest vs other software programs group]* (randomized controlled trial) | Phonological Awareness Test (PAT) (a): total | na | na | na |
| ***Early Intervention in Reading®*** | | | | |
| Taylor, Frye, Short, & Shearer, 1991 (randomized controlled trial) | Segmentation and blending; Vowel sounds | na | ns | na |
| ***Earobics®*** | | | | |
| Cognitive Concepts, 2003 (randomized controlled trial) | ORAL-J: Blending into Words Subtest; ORAL-J: Segmenting into Sounds; ORAL-J: Rhyming Words | ns | na | na |
| Valliath, 2002 (quasi-experimental design) | CTOPP: Sound Matching | na | na | na |
| ***Failure-Free Reading*** | | | | |
| Torgesen et al., 2006 (randomized controlled trial) | ns | ns | ns | na |
| ***Fast ForWord®*** | | | | |
| Borman & Benson, 2006 (randomized controlled trial) | na | na | ns | na |
| Scientific Learning Corporation, 2005a (randomized controlled trial) | TOPA: Phonological Awareness Subtest; TOPA: Letter Sounds Subtest | na | na | na |
| Scientific Learning Corporation, 2005b (randomized controlled trial) | ns | na | na | na |
| Scientific Learning Corporation, 2005c (randomized controlled trial) | na | na | Degrees of Reading Power | na |
| Scientific Learning Corporation, 2006 (randomized controlled trial) | ns | na | na | na |

*(continued)*

## Appendix A3.1 Summary of statistically significant[1] or substantively important[2] positive findings *(continued)*

| Intervention name | Positive findings | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Alphabetics | Fluency | Comprehension | General reading achievement |
| Overbay & Baenen, 2003 (quasi-experimental design) | na | na | ns | na |
| ***Fluency Formula™*** | | | | |
| Sivin-Kachala & Bialo, 2005 (randomized controlled trial) | na | ns | ns | na |
| ***Kaplan SpellRead*** | | | | |
| Rashotte, MacPhee, & Torgesen, 2001 (randomized controlled trial) | CTOPP: Blending Words Subtest; CTOPP: Segmenting Words Subtest; TOWRE: Phonetic Decoding Efficiency Subtest; WRMT-R: Word Attack Subtest | ns | GORT-3: Comprehension Subtest; WDRB: Comprehension Subtest | na |
| Torgesen et al., 2006 (randomized controlled trial) | TOWRE: Phonetic Decoding Efficiency Subtest; WRMT-R: Word Attack Subtest | ns | ns | na |
| ***Ladders to Literacy*** | | | | |
| O'Connor, 1999 (Study A: Intensive Professional Development) (quasi-experimental design) | Short Term Memory; Segmentation; Blending; Woodcock Johnson Tests of Achievement: Letter-Word Identification Subtest | na | ns | na |
| O'Connor, 1999 (Study B: Traditional Professional Development) (quasi-experimental design) | Segmentation | na | ns | na |
| O'Connor et al., 1996 (quasi-experimental design) | ns | ns | ns | na |
| Fuchs et al., 2001 (randomized controlled trial with randomization problems) | ns | na | na | na |
| ***Little Books*** | | | | |
| Phillips, Norris, Mason, & Kerr, 1990 (randomized controlled trial) | na | na | na | ns |
| ***Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies*** | | | | |
| Fuchs, Fuchs, Kazdan, & Allen, 1999 (randomized controlled trial with randomization problems) | na | na | Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test III: Reading Comprehension | na |

*(continued)*

## Appendix A3.1 Summary of statistically significant[1] or substantively important[2] positive findings *(continued)*

| Intervention name | Positive findings | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Alphabetics | Fluency | Comprehension | General reading achievement |
| Mathes & Babyak, 2001 (randomized controlled trial with randomization problems) | ns | ns | na | na |
| Mathes, Howard, Allen, & Fuchs, 1998 (quasi-experimental design) | ns | ns | na | na |
| Mathes, Torgesen, Clancy-Minchetti et al., 2003 *[Comparison #1: PALS vs. Usual Reading Curriculum Group]* (quasi-experimental design) | CTOPP Phonemic Segmentation; WRMT: Word Attack Subtest | ns | ns | na |
| Mathes, Torgesen, Clancy-Minchetti et al., 2003 *[Comparison #2: PALS vs. Teacher-Directed Instruction Group]* (quasi-experimental design) | ns | ns | ns | na |
| ***Read Naturally*** | | | | |
| Hancock, 2002 (randomized controlled trial) | na | ns | ns | na |
| Mesa, 2004 (quasi-experimental design) | na | ns | na | na |
| ***Read, Write & Type!*** | | | | |
| Torgesen et al., 2003 *[Read, Write & Type! vs. ADD intervention]* (randomized controlled trial) | ns | na | ns | na |
| Torgesen et al., 2003 *[Read, Write & Type! vs. Regular instruction]* (randomized controlled trial) | CTOPP Phoneme Segmenting Subtest; Woodcock Reading Mastery Test: Word Attack Subtest | na | ns | na |
| ***Reading Recovery®*** | | | | |
| Baenen et al., 1997 (randomized controlled trial) | na | na | na | ns |
| Pinnell, DeFord, & Lyons, 1988 (randomized controlled trial) | Observation Survey: Concepts about Print Subtest | na | CTBS: Reading Comprehension Subtest; CTBS: Reading Vocabulary Subtest | Observation Survey: Dictation Subtest; Observation Survey: Writing Vocabulary Subtest |
| Pinnell et al., 1994 (randomized controlled trial) | na | na | na | Gates-MacGinitie; Observation Survey: Dictation Subtest; Woodcock Reading Mastery Test-Revised |

*(continued)*

## Appendix A3.1 Summary of statistically significant[1] or substantively important[2] positive findings *(continued)*

| Intervention name | Positive findings | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Alphabetics | Fluency | Comprehension | General reading achievement |
| Schwartz, 2005 (randomized controlled trial) | Observation Survey: Concepts about Print Subtest; Observation Survey: Word Recognition Subtest | SORT-R3; Observation Survey: Text Reading Level Subtest | ns | Observation Survey: Dictation Subtest; Observation Survey: Writing Vocabulary Subtest |
| Iverson & Tunmer, 1993 (quasi-experimental design) | Phoneme Deletion Task; Yopp-Singer Phoneme Segmentation Test; Observation Survey: Concepts about Print Subtest; Observation Survey: Letter Identification Subtest; Dolch Word Recognition Test; Observation Survey: Word Recognition Subtest; Pseudoword Decoding Task | na | na | Observation Survey: Dictation Subtest; Observation Survey: Writing Vocabulary Subtest |
| ***Start Making a Reader Today®*** | | | | |
| Baker, Gersten, & Keating, 2000 (randomized controlled trial) | Woodcock Reading Mastery Test-Revised: Word Identification Subtest | Oral Reading Fluency First-Grade Passage; Oral Reading Fluency Second-Grade Passage | ns | na |
| ***Stepping Stones to Literacy*** | | | | |
| Nelson, Benner, & Gonzalez, 2005 (randomized controlled trial) | CTOPP: Phonological Awareness; DIBELS: Phoneme Segmentation Fluency; DIBELS: Initial Sound Fluency; DIBELS: Letter Naming Fluency; DIBELS: Nonsense Words Fluency | na | na | na |
| Nelson, Stage, Epstein, & Pierce, 2005 (randomized controlled trial) | CTOPP: Phonological Awareness; DIBELS: Letter Naming Fluency; WRMT-R: Word Identification Subtest; WRMT-R: Word Attack Subtest | na | na | na |
| ***Success for All®*** | | | | |
| Borman et al., 2006 (randomized controlled trial) | WRMT: Word Identification Subtest; WRMT: Word Attack Subtest | na | WRMT: Passage Comprehension Subtest | na |
| Dianda & Flaherty, 1995 (quasi-experimental design) | ns | na | ns | ns |
| Madden et al., 1993 (quasi-experimental design) | ns | na | ns | ns |

*(continued)*

## Appendix A3.1 Summary of statistically significant[1] or substantively important[2] positive findings *(continued)*

| Intervention name | Positive findings | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Alphabetics | Fluency | Comprehension | General reading achievement |
| Ross, Alberg, & McNelis, 1997 (quasi-experimental design) | ns | na | ns | ns |
| Ross & Casey, 1998 (quasi-experimental design) | ns | na | ns | ns |
| Ross et al., 1998 (quasi-experimental design) | ns | na | ns | ns |
| Smith et al., 1993 (quasi-experimental design) | ns | na | ns | ns |
| ***Voyager Universal Literacy System®*** | | | | |
| Frechtling, Zhang, and Silverstein, 2006 (quasi-experimental design) | ns | na | na | na |
| Hecht, 2003 (quasi-experimental design) | ns | na | ns | na |
| Hecht & Torgesen, 2002 (quasi-experimental design) | ns | na | ns | na |
| ***Waterford Early Reading Program™*** | | | | |
| Hecht & Close, 2002 (quasi-experimental design) | ns | na | ns | na |
| ***Wilson Reading®*** | | | | |
| Torgesen et al., 2006 (randomized controlled trial) | TOWRE: Phonetic Decoding Efficiency Subtest; WRMT-R: Word Attack Subtest | ns[3] | ns[3] | na |

na = not studied
ns = not statistically significant
nsi = not substantively important

1. According to WWC criteria, if a program finds a statistically significant effect, there is less than a 5% chance that this difference is due to chance. The level of statistical significance was calculated by the WWC and, where necessary, corrects for clustering within classrooms or schools and for multiple comparisons. For an explanation about the clustering correction, see the WWC Tutorial on Mismatch. For the formulas the WWC used to calculate the statistical significance, see the Technical Details of WWC-Conducted Computations.
2. For rating purposes, the WWC considered the statistical significance of the findings and the magnitude of the effect, also called the effect size. An average effect size is the sum of all the effect sizes of the student outcomes in a study in a single domain divided by the number of those outcomes. The WWC considers an average effect size across all student outcomes in one study in a given domain to be substantively important if it is equal to or greater than 0.25.
3. The fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary components of *Wilson Reading System®* were eliminated from instruction at the request of Torgeson et al. for the purposes of the study. For further information about the program implemented, please see the research and findings sections of the *Wilson Reading System®* report.

## Appendix A3.2 Summary of statistically significant[1] or substantively important[2] average effect across outcomes by domain

| Intervention name | Average effect across outcomes | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Alphabetics | Fluency | Comprehension[3] | General reading achievement |
| ***Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance*** | | | | |
| Ross, Nunnery, & Goldfeder, 2004 (randomized controlled trial) | na | na | ns, Substantively important | Statistically significant, Substantively important |
| ***Auditory Discrimination in Depth/Lindamood Phonemic Sequencing®*** | | | | |
| Torgesen et al., 2003 *[ADD vs. Read, Write, Type intervention]* (randomized controlled trial) | Statistically significant, Substantively important | na | ns, nsi | na |
| Torgesen et al., 2003 *[ADD vs. Regular instruction]* (randomized controlled trial) | Statistically significant, Substantively important | na | ns, nsi | na |
| ***Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition®*** | | | | |
| Bramlett, 1994 (quasi-experimental design) | na | na | ns, nsi | na |
| Skeans, 1991 (quasi-experimental design) | na | na | ns, nsi | na |
| ***Corrective Reading*** | | | | |
| Torgesen et al., 2006 (randomized controlled trial) | ns, nsi | Statistically significant, Substantively important | ns, nsi | na |
| ***ClassWide Peer Tutoring*** | | | | |
| Greenwood et al., 1993 (randomized controlled trial) | na | na | na | ns, Substantively important |
| ***DaisyQuest*** | | | | |
| Baker & Torgensen, 1995 *[DaisyQuest vs. Hint and Hunt software]* (randomized controlled trial) | Statistically significant, Substantively important | na | ns, nsi | na |
| Baker & Torgensen, 1995 *[DaisyQuest vs. math software]* (randomized controlled trial) | Statistically significant, Substantively important | na | ns, nsi | na |
| Foster et al., 1994 *[Experiment 1: Child-care Facility]* (randomized controlled trial) | Statistically significant, Substantively important | na | na | na |
| Foster et al., 1994 *[Experiment 2: Kindergarten Classrooms]* (randomized controlled trial) | Statistically significant, Substantively important | na | na | na |
| Mitchell & Fox, 2001 *[DaisyQuest vs. teacher-delivered phonological awareness instruction]* (randomized controlled trial) | ns, nsi | na | na | na |
| Mitchell & Fox, 2001 *[DaisyQuest vs other software programs group]* (randomized controlled trial) | ns, nsi | na | na | na |

*(continued)*

## Appendix A3.2 Summary of statistically significant[1] or substantively important[2] average effect across outcomes by domain *(continued)*

| Intervention name | Average effect across outcomes | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Alphabetics | Fluency | Comprehension[3] | General reading achievement |
| ***Early Intervention in Reading®*** | | | | |
| Taylor, Frye, Short, & Shearer, 1991 (randomized controlled trial) | Statistically significant, Substantively important | na | ns, Substantively important | na |
| ***Earobics®*** | | | | |
| Cognitive Concepts, 2003 (randomized controlled trial) | ns, Substantively important | ns, nsi | na | na |
| Valliath, 2002 (quasi-experimental design) | ns, Substantively important | na | na | na |
| ***Failure-Free Reading*** | | | | |
| Torgesen et al., 2006 (randomized controlled trial) | ns, nsi | ns, nsi | ns, Substantively important | na |
| ***Fast ForWord®*** | | | | |
| Borman & Benson, 2006 (randomized controlled trial) | na | na | ns, nsi | na |
| Scientific Learning Corporation, 2005a (randomized controlled trial) | Statistically significant, nsi | na | na | na |
| Scientific Learning Corporation, 2005b (randomized controlled trial) | Statistically significant, Substantively important | na | na | na |
| Scientific Learning Corporation, 2005c (randomized controlled trial) | na | na | Statistically significant, Substantively important | na |
| Scientific Learning Corporation, 2006 (randomized controlled trial) | ns, nsi | na | na | na |
| Overbay & Baenen, 2003 (quasi-experimental design) | na | na | ns | na |
| ***Fluency Formula™*** | | | | |
| Sivin-Kachala & Bialo, 2005 (randomized controlled trial) | na | ns, Substantively important | ns, Substantively important negative effect | na |
| ***Kaplan SpellRead*** | | | | |
| Rashotte, MacPhee, & Torgesen, 2001 (randomized controlled trial) | ns, Substantively important | ns, nsi | ns, nsi | na |
| Torgesen et al., 2006 (randomized controlled trial) | Statistically significant, Substantively important | ns, Substantively important | Statistically significant, Substantively important | na |
| ***Ladders to Literacy*** | | | | |
| O'Connor, 1999 (Study A: Intensive Professional Development) (quasi-experimental design) | Statistically significant, Substantively important | na | ns, Substantively important | na |

*(continued)*

## Appendix A3.2 Summary of statistically significant[1] or substantively important[2] average effect across outcomes by domain *(continued)*

| Intervention name | Average effect across outcomes | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Alphabetics | Fluency | Comprehension[3] | General reading achievement |
| O'Connor, 1999 (Study B: Traditional Professional Development) (quasi-experimental design) | Statistically significant, Substantively important | na | ns, nsi | na |
| O'Connor et al.,1996 (quasi-experimental design) | ns, Substantively important | ns, Substantively important | ns, nsi | na |
| Fuchs et al., 2001 | ns, na[4] | na | na | na |
| ***Little Books*** | | | | |
| Phillips, Norris, Mason, & Kerr, 1990 (randomized controlled trial) | na | na | na | ns, Substantively important |
| ***Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies*** | | | | |
| Fuchs, Fuchs, Kazdan, & Allen, 1999 (randomized controlled trial with randomization problems) | na | na | Statistically significant, Substantively important | na |
| Mathes & Babyak, 2001 (randomized controlled trial with randomization problems) | Statistically significant, Substantively important | ns, Substantively important | na | na |
| Mathes, Howard, Allen, & Fuchs, 1998 (quasi-experimental design) | Statistically significant, Substantively important | ns, Substantively important | na | na |
| Mathes, Torgesen, Clancy-Minchetti et al., 2003 *[Comparison #1: PALS vs. Usual Reading Curriculum Group]* (quasi-experimental design) | ns, Substantively important | ns, nsi | ns, nsi | na |
| Mathes, Torgesen, Clancy-Minchetti et al., 2003 *[Comparison #2: PALS vs. Teacher-Directed Instruction Group]* (quasi-experimental design) | ns, Substantively important | ns, nsi | ns, nsi | na |
| ***Read Naturally*** | | | | |
| Hancock, 2002 (randomized controlled trial) | na | ns, nsi | ns, nsi | na |
| Mesa, 2004 (quasi-experimental design) | na | ns, nsi | na | na |
| ***Read, Write & Type!*** | | | | |
| Torgesen et al., 2003 *[Read, Write & Type! vs. ADD intervention]* (randomized controlled trial) | ns, nsi | na | ns, nsi | na |
| Torgesen et al., 2003 *[Read, Write & Type! vs. Regular instruction]* (randomized controlled trial) | ns, nsi | na | ns, nsi | na |

*(continued)*

## Appendix A3.2 Summary of statistically significant[1] or substantively important[2] average effect across outcomes by domain *(continued)*

| Intervention name | Average effect across outcomes | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Alphabetics | Fluency | Comprehension[3] | General reading achievement |
| ***Reading Recovery®*** | | | | |
| Baenen et al., 1997 (randomized controlled trial) | na | na | na | ns, nsi |
| Pinnell, DeFord, & Lyons, 1988 (randomized controlled trial) | ns, Substantively important | na | Statistically significant, Substantively important | Statistically significant, Substantively important |
| Pinnell et al., 1994 (randomized controlled trial) | na | na | na | Statistically significant, Substantively important |
| Schwartz, 2005 (randomized controlled trial) | Statistically significant, Substantively important | Statistically significant, Substantively important | ns, nsi | Statistically significant, Substantively important |
| Iverson & Tunmer, 1993 (quasi-experimental design) | Statistically significant, Substantively important | na | na | Statistically significant, Substantively important |
| ***Start Making a Reader Today®*** | | | | |
| Baker, Gersten, & Keating, 2000 (randomized controlled trial) | Statistically significant, Substantively important | Statistically significant, Substantively important | ns, Substantively important | na |
| ***Stepping Stones to Literacy*** | | | | |
| Nelson, Benner, & Gonzalez, 2005 (randomized controlled trial) | Statistically significant, Substantively important | na | na | na |
| Nelson, Stage, Epstein, & Pierce, 2005 (randomized controlled trial) | Statistically significant, Substantively important | na | na | na |
| ***Success for All®*** | | | | |
| Borman et al., 2006 (randomized controlled trial) | Statistically significant, Substantively important | na | Statistically significant, nsi | na |
| Dianda & Flaherty, 1995 (quasi-experimental design) | ns, Substantively important | na | ns, Substantively important | ns, Substantively important |
| Madden et al., 1993 (quasi-experimental design) | ns, Substantively important | na | na | ns, Substantively important |
| Ross, Alberg, & McNelis, 1997 (quasi-experimental design) | ns, nsi | na | ns, nsi | ns, nsi |
| Ross & Casey, 1998 (quasi-experimental design) | ns, nsi | na | ns, nsi | ns, nsi |
| Ross et al., 1998 (quasi-experimental design) | ns, Substantively important | na | ns, nsi | ns, nsi |
| Smith et al., 1993 (quasi-experimental design) | ns, Substantively important | na | ns, nsi | ns, Substantively important |
| ***Voyager Universal Literacy System®*** | | | | |
| Frechtling, Zhang, and Silverstein, 2006 (quasi-experimental design) | ns, Substantively important | na | na | na |

*(continued)*

## Appendix A3.2 Summary of statistically significant[1] or substantively important[2] average effect across outcomes by domain *(continued)*

| Intervention name | Average effect across outcomes | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Alphabetics | Fluency | Comprehension[3] | General reading achievement |
| Hecht, 2003 (quasi-experimental design) | ns, nsi | na | ns, Substantively important negative effect | na |
| Hecht & Torgesen, 2002 (quasi-experimental design) | ns, Substantively important | na | ns, nsi | na |
| ***Waterford Early Reading Program™*** | | | | |
| Hecht & Close, 2002 (quasi-experimental design) | ns, Substantively important | na | ns, nsi | na |
| ***Wilson Reading®*** | | | | |
| Torgesen et al., 2006 (randomized controlled trial) | ns, Substantively important | ns, nsi[5] | ns, nsi[5] | na |

na = not studied
ns = not statistically significant
nsi = not substantively important

1. According to WWC criteria, if a program finds a statistically significant effect, then there is less than a 5% chance that this difference is due to chance. The level of statistical significance was calculated by the WWC and, where necessary, corrects for clustering within classrooms or schools, and for multiple comparisons. For an explanation about the clustering correction, see the WWC Tutorial on Mismatch. For the formulas the WWC used to calculate the statistical significance, see the Technical Details of WWC-Conducted Computations.
2. For rating purposes, the WWC considered the statistical significance of the findings and the magnitude of the effect, also called the effect size. An average effect size is the sum of all the effect sizes of the student outcomes in a study in a single domain divided by the number of those outcomes. The WWC considers an average effect size across all student outcomes in one study in a given domain to be substantively important if it is equal to or greater than 0.25.
3. Two interventions each had a study that showed a substantively important negative effect in the comprehension domain (see *Fluency Formula* and *Voyager*).
4. This study reported findings at the cluster level and student-level effect size could not be calculated.
5. The fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary components of the *Wilson Reading System®* were eliminated from instruction at the request of Torgesen et al. for the purposes of the study. For further information about the program implemented, please see the research and findings sections of the *Wilson Reading System®* report.

## Appendix A4 Methodology

Eight hundred eighty-seven studies provided data on 153 programs and were classified according to the strength of their design. To be fully reviewed, a study had to be a randomized controlled trial or quasi-experimental design.[1]

### Eligibility for review

Quasi-experiments eligible for review include those equating through matching or statistical adjustment; regression discontinuity, and single case designs are also included. No studies based on the regression discontinuity designs were identified for the beginning reading review; several single case designs were identified. The WWC is currently developing evidence standards for regression discontinuity designs and single-case designs.

The review considered the properties of measurement instruments, the percentage of students, classrooms, or schools in the study sample that were not included in the reported results, and any sample characteristics or events that might serve as alternative explanations for the observed effect. For details please see the WWC Evidence Standards.

The research evidence for programs that have at least one study meeting WWC evidence standards with or without reservations is summarized in individual intervention reports posted on the WWC website. See http://www.whatworks.ed.gov. So far, 51 studies of 24 beginning reading programs have met evidence standards with or without reservations. The lack of evidence for the remaining programs does not mean that those programs are ineffective. Some programs have not yet been studied using a study design that permits the WWC to draw any conclusions about their effectiveness. For some studies, not enough data were reported (such as descriptive statistics of the findings) to enable us to confirm statistical findings.

### Rating of effectiveness

Among the prioritized interventions, each beginning reading program that had at least one study meeting WWC standards with or without reservations received a rating of effectiveness for beginning reading achievement. The rating of effectiveness aims to characterize the existing evidence base in a given domain. The intervention effects based on the research evidence can be rated as having positive, potentially positive, mixed, no discernible, potentially negative, or negative effects.

The rating of effectiveness takes into account four factors: the quality of the research design; the statistical significance of the findings; the size of the difference between participants in the intervention and comparison conditions; and the consistency in findings across the studies (see the WWC Intervention Rating Scheme).

The level of statistical significance was reported by the study authors or, where necessary, calculated by the WWC to correct for clustering within classrooms or schools and for multiple comparisons. Because of these corrections, the level of statistical significance as calculated by the WWC may differ from the one originally reported by the study authors. For an explanation, see the WWC Tutorial on Mismatch. For the formulas that we used to calculate statistical significance, see Technical Details of WWC-Conducted Computations. If the average effect size across all outcome measures in one study in a single domain is at least 0.25, it is considered substantively important, contributing toward the rating of effectiveness. See the technical appendices of the beginning reading intervention reports for further details.

### Extent of evidence

The WWC categorizes the extent of evidence in each domain as small or medium to large (see the What Works Clearinghouse Extent of Evidence Categorization Scheme). The extent of evidence takes into account the number of studies and the

1. Thirty-two interventions (involving 36 quasi-experimental design studies) passed the initial screening criteria but were not included in this wave of Beginning Reading reviews. These interventions were those that on initial screening had only one eligible study that met WWC evidence standards with reservations (i.e., had the fewest numbers of studies, which also used less rigorous designs). Seven additional single-case studies have dispositions pending. The WWC is currently developing standards for the review of single case studies.

total sample size across the studies that met WWC evidence standards with or without reservations.[2]

### Improvement Index

The WWC computes an improvement index for each individual finding. In addition, within each outcome domain, the WWC computes an average improvement index for each domain and each study as well as a domain average improvement index across studies of the same intervention (see the Technical Details of WWC-Conducted Computations). The improvement index represents the difference between the percentile rank of the average student in the intervention condition and the percentile rank of the average student in the comparison condition. The improvement index can take on values between –50 and +50, with positive numbers denoting results favorable to the intervention group. Unlike the rating of effectiveness, the improvement index is based only on the size of the difference between the intervention and the comparison conditions.

2. The Extent of Evidence Categorization was developed to tell readers how much evidence was used to determine the intervention rating, focusing on the number and size of studies. Additional factors associated with a related concept, external validity—such as the students' demographics and the types of settings in which studies took place—are not taken into account in the categorization.

## Appendix A5 References

### Studies that met WWC standards

***Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance***


Ross, S. M., Nunnery, J., & Goldfeder, E. (2004). *A randomized experiment on the effects of Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance in an urban school district: Preliminary evaluation report.* Memphis, TN: The University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

***Additional source:***

Nunnery J., Ross, S., & McDonald A. (2006). A randomized experimental evaluation of the impact of *Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance* implementation on reading achievement in grades 3 to 6. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 11*(1), 1–18.


***Auditory Discrimination in Depth (ADD)®/Lindamood Phonemic Sequencing (LiPS)®***


Torgesen, J., Wagner, R., Rashotte, C., & Herron, J. (2003). *Summary of outcomes from first grade study with Read, Write and Type and Auditory Discrimination in Depth Instruction and software with at-risk children* (FCRR Tech. Rep. No. 2). Retrieved from Florida Center for Reading Research Web site: http://www.fcrr.org/TechnicalReports/RWTfullrept.pdf


***ClassWide Peer Tutoring (CWPT)***


Greenwood, C. R., Terry, B., Utley, C. A., Montagna, D., & Walker, D. (1993). Achievement placement and services: Middle school benefits of ClassWide Peer Tutoring used at the elementary school. *School Psychology Review*, *22*(3), 497–516.

***Additional sources:***

Greenwood, C. R. (1991). Longitudinal Analysis of Time, Engagement and Achievement in At-Risk versus Non-Risk Students. *Exceptional Children*, *57*(6), 521–535.

Greenwood, C. R., Delquadri, J., & Hall, R. V. (1989). Longitudinal effects of classwide peer tutoring. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 81*, 371–383.


***DaisyQuest***


Barker, T., & Torgesen, J. K. (1995). An evaluation of computer-assisted instruction in phonological awareness with below average readers. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 13*(1), 89–103.

Foster, K. C., Erickson, G. C., Foster, D. F., Brinkman, D., & Torgesen, J. K. (1994). Computer administered instruction in phonological awareness: Evaluation of the *DaisyQuest* program. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 27*(2), 126–137. **(Experiment 1: Child-care Facility)**

Foster, K. C., Erickson, G. C., Foster, D. F., Brinkman, D., & Torgesen, J. K. (1994). Computer administered instruction in phonological awareness: Evaluation of the *DaisyQuest* program. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 27*(2), 126–137. **(Experiment 2: Kindergarten Classrooms)**

Mitchell, M. J., & Fox, B. J. (2001). The effects of computer software for developing phonological awareness in low-progress readers. *Reading Research and Instruction, 40*(4), 315–332.


***Direct Instruction/Corrective Reading***


Torgesen, J., Myers, D., Schirm, A., Stuart, E., Vartivarian, S., Mansfield, W., et al. (2006). National assessment of Title I interim report—Volume II: Closing the reading gap: First year findings from a randomized trial of four reading interventions for striving readers. Retrieved from Institute of Education Sciences, U. S. Department of Education Web site: http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/disadv/title1interimreport/index.html


***Early Intervention in Reading®***


Taylor, B. M., Frye, B. J., Short, R., & Shearer, B. (1991). *Early Intervention in Reading: Preventing reading failure among low-achieving first grade students.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Center for Urban and Regional Affairs and Office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


***Additional sources:***

Taylor, B. M. (2001). *The Early Intervention in Reading Program (EIR®): Research and development spanning twelve years* (Tech. Rep.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Taylor, B. M., Short, R., Frye, B., & Shearer, B. (1992). Classroom teachers prevent reading failure among low achieving first-grade students. *The Reading Teacher, 45*(8), 592–597.

***Earobics®***

Cognitive Concepts (2003). *Outcomes Report: Los Angeles Unified School District, California*. Retrieved from http://www.cogcon.com/research/proven/LAUSD.pdf

***Failure-Free Reading***

Torgesen, J., Myers, D., Schirm, A., Stuart, E., Vartivarian, S., Mansfield, W., et al. (2006). National assessment of Title I interim report—Volume II: Closing the reading gap: First year findings from a randomized trial of four reading interventions for striving readers. Retrieved from Institute of Education Sciences, U. S. Department of Education Web site: http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/disadv/title1interimreport/index.html

***Fast ForWord®***

Borman, G. D. & Benson, J. (2006). *Can brain research and computers improve literacy? A randomized field trial of the Fast ForWord® Language computer-based training program* (WCER Working Paper No. 2006-5). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Madison, Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

***Additional source:***

Borman, G. D. & Benson, J. *Can brain research and computers improve literacy? A randomized field trial of the Fast ForWord® Language computer-based training program.* Unpublished report.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005a). Improved early reading skills by students in three districts who used Fast ForWord® to Reading 1. *MAPS for Learning: Product Reports*, *9*(1), 1–5.

***Additional source:***

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005d). Improved early reading skills by students in the Springfield City School District who used Fast ForWord® to Reading 1. *MAPS for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(25), 1–5.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005b). Improved reading skills by students in the Lancaster County School District who used Fast ForWord® to Reading 2. *MAPS for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(8), 1–4.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005c). Improved Reading Skills by Students in Seminole County School District who used Fast ForWord® to Reading 1 and 2. *MAPS for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(17), 1–6.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2006). Improved Reading Skills by Students who used Fast ForWord® to Reading Prep. *MAPS for Learning: Product Reports*, *10*(1), 1–6.

***Fluency Formula***

Sivin-Kachala, J., & Bialo, E. (2005). *Fluency Formula second grade study, Long Island, New York 2003–2004: Evaluation research on the effectiveness of Fluency Formula*. Retrieved from Scholastic Education Web site: http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/fluencyformula/pdfs/FF_EffectivessReport.pdf

***Additional source:***

Sivin-Kachala, J., & Bialo, E. (2005). Fluency Formula second grade study, Long Island, New York 2003–2004: A summary of the effectiveness research for Fluency Formula. Retrieved from Scholastic Education Web site: http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/fluencyformula/pdfs/FF_EffectivenessSummary.pdf

***Kaplan SpellRead P.A.T. (Phonological Auditory Training)***

Rashotte, C. A., MacPhee, K., & Torgesen, J. K. (2001). The effectiveness of a group reading instruction program with poor readers in multiple grades. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 24*(2), 119–134.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


Torgesen, J., Myers, D., Schirm, A., Stuart, E., Vartivarian, S., Mansfield, W., et al. (2006). National assessment of Title I interim report—Volume II: Closing the reading gap: First year findings from a randomized trial of four reading interventions for striving readers. Retrieved from Institute of Education Sciences, U. S. Department of Education Web site: http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/disadv/title1interimreport/index.html

***Little Books***

Phillips, L. M., Norris, S. P., Mason, J. M., & Kerr, B. M. (1990). *Effect of early literacy intervention on kindergarten achievement* (Tech. Rep. No. 520). Champaign: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Center for the Study of Reading.

***Read, Write & Type!™***

Torgesen, J., Wagner, R., Rashotte, C., & Herron, J. (2003). *Summary of outcomes from first grade study with Read, Write and Type and Auditory Discrimination in Depth Instruction and software with at-risk children* (FCRR Tech. Rep. No. 2). Retrieved from Florida Center for Reading Research Web site: http://www.fcrr.org/TechnicalReports/RWTfullrept.pdf

***Read Naturally***

Hancock, C. M. (2002). Accelerating reading trajectories: The effects of dynamic research-based instruction. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63*(06), 2139A. (UMI No. 3055690)

***Reading Recovery®***

Baenen, N., Bernhole, A., Dulaney, C., & Banks, K. (1997). Reading Recovery: Long-term progress after three cohorts. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 2*(2), 161.

***Additional sources:***

Donley, J., Baenen, N., & Hundley, S. (1993, April). *A study of the long-term effectiveness of the Reading Recovery program.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Wake County Public School System. (1995). *Evaluation Report: WCPSS Reading Recovery 1990–94.* E&R Report No. 95.09A. Winston-Salem, NC: Wake County Public School System.

Pinnell, G. S., DeFord, D. E., & Lyons, C. A. (1988). *Reading Recovery: Early intervention for at-risk first graders* (Educational Research Service Monograph). Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

***Additional sources:***

Pinnell, G. S. (1988, January). *Success of at-risk children in a program that combines writing and reading* (Technical Report No. 417). Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, Center for the Study of Reading.

Pinnell, G. S. (1989a). Reading Recovery: Helping at-risk children learn to read. *The Elementary School Journal, 90,* 161–183.

Pinnell, G. S. (1989b). Success of at-risk children in a program that combines writing and reading. In J. M. Mason (Ed.), *Reading and Writing Connections* (pp. 237–259). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Pinnell, G. S., Short, K. G., Lyons, C. A., & Young, P. (1986). *The Reading Recovery Project in Columbus, OH Year 1: 1985–1986.* Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.

Pinnell, G. S., Lyons, C. A., DeFord, D. E., Bryk, A. S., & Seltzer, M. (1994). Comparing instructional models for the literacy education of high-risk first graders. *Reading Research Quarterly, 29*(1), 8–39.

Schwartz, R. M. (2005). Literacy learning of at-risk first-grade students in the Reading Recovery early intervention. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 97*(2), 257–267.

***Start Making a Reader Today® (SMART®)***

Baker, S., Gersten, R., & Keating, T. (2000). When less may be more: A two-year longitudinal evaluation of a volunteer tutoring program requiring minimal training. *Reading Research Quarterly, 35*(4), 494–519.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


***Stepping Stones to Literacy (SSL)***

Nelson, J. R., Benner, G. J., & Gonzalez, J. (2005). An investigation of the effects of a prereading intervention on the early literacy skills of children at risk of emotional disturbance and reading problems. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, *13*(1), 3–12.

***Additional source:***

Nelson, J. R., Cooper, P., & Gonzales, J. (2003). *Stepping Stones to Literacy: What Works Clearinghouse submission*. (Available from the Center for At-Risk Children's Services, 202 Barkley Center, Lincoln, NE 68583-0732)

Nelson, J. R., Stage, S. A., Epstein, M. H., & Pierce, C. D. (2005). Effects of a prereading intervention on the literacy and social skills of children. *Exceptional Children*, *72*(1), 29–45.

***Success for All***

Borman, G. D., Slavin, R. E., Cheung, A., Chamberlain, A., Madden, N., & Chambers, B. (2006). *Final reading outcomes of the national randomized field trial of Success for All*. Retrieved from Success for All Web site: http://www.successforall.net/_images/pdfs/Third_Year_Results_06.doc

***Additional sources:***

Borman, G. D., Slavin, R. E., Cheung, A. C. K., Chamberlain, A. M., Madden, N. A., & Chambers, B. (2005, Winter). The national randomized field trial of Success for All: Second-year outcomes. *American Educational Research Journal, 42(4),* 673–696.

Borman, G. D., Slavin, R. E., Cheung, A., Chamberlain, A., & Madden, N. (2004). *Success for All: Preliminary first-year results from the national randomized field trial*. Baltimore, MD: Success for All Foundation.

Chambers, B., Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Cheung, A., & Gifford, R. (2004). *Effects of Success for All with embedded video on the beginning reading achievement of Hispanic children*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk.

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Cheung, A., Chamberlain, A., Chambers, B., & Borman, G. (2005). *A randomized evaluation of Success for All: Second-year outcomes*. Baltimore, MD: Success for All Foundation.

***Wilson Reading System®***

Torgesen, J., Myers, D., Schirm, A., Stuart, E., Vartivarian, S., Mansfield, W., et al. (2006). *National assessment of Title I interim report—Volume II: Closing the reading gap: First year findings from a randomized trial of four reading interventions for striving readers*. Retrieved from Institute of Education Sciences, U. S. Department of Education Web site: http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/disadv/title1interimreport/index.html


### Studies that met WWC standards with reservations


***Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC®)***

Bramlett, R. K. (1994). Implementing Cooperative Learning: A field study evaluating issues for school-based consultants. *Journal of School Psychology, 32*(1), 67–84.

Skeans, S. E. S. (1991). The effects of Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition: Fidelity of implementation, and teacher concerns on student achievement. *Dissertation Abstracts International. 53*(02), 0455A. (UMI No. 9217026).

***Earobics®***

Valliath, S. (2002). An evaluation of a computer-based phonological awareness training program: Effects on phonological awareness, reading and spelling. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *63*(04), 1291A. (UMI No. 3050601)

***Fast ForWord®***

Overbay, A. & Baenen, N. (2003). *Fast ForWord® evaluation, 2002–03* (Eye on Evaluation, E&R Report No. 03.24). Raleigh, NC: Wake County Public School System.

***Ladders to Literacy***

O'Connor, R. E. (1999). Teachers Learning Ladders to Literacy. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 14*(4), 203–214. **(Study A: Intensive Professional Development)**

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


O'Connor, R.E. (1999). Teachers Learning Ladders to Literacy. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 14*(4), 203–214.

**(Study B: Traditional Professional Development)**

O'Connor, R., Notari-Syverson, A., & Vadasy, P. F. (1996). The effect of kindergarten phonological intervention on the first grade reading and writing of children with mild disabilities. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED394129)

***Additional sources:***

O'Connor, R., Notari-Syverson, A., & Vadasy, P F. (1998). Ladders to literacy: The effects of teacher-led phonological activities for kindergarten children with and without disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, *63*(1), 117–130.

O'Connor, R. E., & Notari-Syverson, A. (1995, April). *Ladders to Literacy: The effects of teacher-led phonological activities for kindergarten children with and without disabilities.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED385378)

Fuchs, G., Fuchs, L. S., Thompson, A., Al Otaiba, S., Yen, L., Yang, N. J., Braun, M., and O'Conner, R. E. (2001). Is reading important in reading-readiness programs? A randomized field trial with teachers as program implementers. *Journal of Educational Psychology 93*(2), 251–267.

***Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS)***

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Kazdan, S., & Allen, S. (1999). Effects of peer-assisted learning strategies in reading with and without training in elaborated help giving. *The Elementary School Journal*, *99*(3), 201–219.

Mathes, P. G., & Babyak, A. E. (2001). The effects of peer-assisted literacy strategies for first-grade readers with and without additional mini-skills lessons. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *16*(1), 28–44.

Mathes, P. G., Howard, J. K., Allen, S. H., & Fuchs, D. (1998). Peer-assisted learning strategies for first-grade readers: Responding to the needs of diverse learners. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *33*(1), 62–94.

Mathes, P. G., Torgesen, J. K., Clancy-Menchetti, J., Santi, K., Nicholas, K., Robinson, C., et al. (2003). A comparison of teacher-directed versus peer-assisted instruction to struggling first-grade readers. *The Elementary School Journal*, *103*(5), 459–479.

***Read Naturally***

Mesa, C. L. (2004). *Effect of Read Naturally software on reading fluency and comprehension*. Unpublished master's thesis, Piedmont College, Demorest, GA.

***Additional source:***

Read Naturally. (n.d.). Case 3: First graders, South Forsyth County, Ga. Retrieved April 25, 2007, from http://www.readnaturally.com/why/case3.htm

***Reading Recovery®***

Iverson, S., & Tunmer, W. E. (1993). Phonological processing skills and the Reading Recovery program. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 85*(1), 112–126.

***Additional source:***

Tunmer, W. E., & Hoover, W. A. (1993). Phonological recoding skills in beginning reading. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 5,* 161–179.

***Success for All***

Dianda, M., & Flaherty, J. (1995, April). *Effects of Success for All on the reading achievement of first graders in California bilingual programs*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

***Additional sources:***

Livingston, M., & Flaherty, J. (1997). *Effects of Success for All on reading achievement in California schools*. San Francisco: CA: WestEd.

Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. A. (1999). Effects of bilingual and English as a second language adaptations of Success for All on the reading achievement of students acquiring

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


English. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, *4*(4), 393–416. **(Study: California)**

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L. J., & Wasik, B. A. (1996). Success for All: A summary of research. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, *1*(1), 41–76. **(Study: California)**

Ross, S. M., Alberg, M., & McNelis, M. (1997). *Evaluation of elementary school school-wide programs: Clover Park School District, year 1: 1996–97*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

***Additional source:***

Ross, S. M., Alberg, M., McNelis, M., & Smith, L. J. (1998). *Evaluation of elementary school-wide programs: Clover Park School District year 2: 1997–98*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Ross, S. M., & Casey, J. (1998). *Longitudinal study of student literacy achievement in different Title I school-wide programs in Fort Wayne Community Schools year 2: First grade results*. Memphis, TN: The University of Memphis, Center for Research in Education Policy.

***Additional sources:***

Casey, J., Smith, L. J., & Ross, S. M. (1994). *1993–1994 Fort Wayne, Indiana SFA Results*. Memphis, TN: Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., & Casey, J. (1995). *Final Report: 1994–95 Success for All Program in Fort Wayne, Indiana.* Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., Casey, J., & Johnson, B. (1993). *Final Report: 1992–93 Success for All Program in Ft. Wayne, Indiana*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., Casey, J., Johnson, B., & Bond, C. (1994, April). *Using Success for All to restructure elementary schools: A tale of four cities*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. **(Study: Ft. Wayne, IN)**

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L. J., & Wasik, B. A. (1996). Success for All: A summary of research. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, *1*(1), 41–76. **(Study: Ft. Wayne, IN)**

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L., Wasik, B. A., Ross, S. M., & Smith, L. J. (1994, April). *Success for All: Longitudinal effects of systemic school-by-school reform in seven districts*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. **(Study: Ft. Wayne, IN)**

Smith, L. J., Ross, S. M., & Casey, J. (1996). Multi-site comparison of the effects of Success for All on reading achievement. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *28*(3), 329–353. **(Study: Ft. Wayne, IN)**

Smith, L. J., Ross, S. M., Faulks, A., Casey, J., Shapiro, M., & Johnson, B. (1993). *Final report: 1991–92 Success for All Program in Ft. Wayne, Indiana*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Ross, S. M., McNelis, M., Lewis, T., & Loomis, S. (1998). *Evaluation of Success for All programs: Little Rock School District year 1: 1997–1998*. Memphis, TN: The University of Memphis, Center for Research in Education Policy.

***Additional sources:***

Wang, L. W., & Ross, S. M. (1999). *Evaluation of Success for All program: Little Rock School District year 2: 1998–1999*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Wang, L. W., & Ross, S. M. (1998). *Evaluation of Success for All programs: Little Rock School District year 1: 1997–1998*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Karweit, N. L., Dolan, L., and Wasik, B. A. (1990). *Success for All: Second year report*. Baltimore, MD: Baltimore Public Education Institute and Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students, Johns Hopkins University.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


***Additional sources:***

Borman, G. D., & Hewes, G. M. (2002). The long-term effects and cost effectiveness of Success for All. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *24*(4), 243–266.

Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B. A. (1993). Success for All: Longitudinal effects of a restructuring program for inner-city elementary schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, *30*(1), 123–148.

Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B. A. (1991). *Success for All: Multi-year effects of a school-wide elementary restructuring program*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students. **(Study: Baltimore, MD)**

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L. J., & Wasik, B. A. (1993). *Success for All in the Baltimore City Public Schools: Year 6 report*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research in Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L. J., & Wasik, B. A. (1996). Success for All: A summary of research. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, *1*(1), 41–76. **(Study: Baltimore, MD)**

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L., Wasik, B. A., Ross, S. M., & Smith, L. J. (1994). 'Whenever and wherever we choose': The replication of 'Success for All'. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *75*(8), 639–647. **(Study: Baltimore, MD)**

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L., Wasik, B. A., Ross, S. M., & Smith, L. J. (1994, April). *Success for All: Longitudinal effects of systemic school-by-school reform in seven districts*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. **(Study: Baltimore, MD)**

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Karweit, N., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B. A. (1993). *Success for All in the Baltimore City Public Schools: Year 5 report*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Smith, L. J., Ross, S. M., Faulks, A., Casey, J., Shapiro, M., & Johnson, B. (1993). *1991–1992 Ft. Wayne, Indiana SFA results*. Memphis, TN: The University of Memphis, Center for Research in Education Policy.

***Voyager Universal Literacy System***

Frechtling, J. A., Zhang, X., Silverstein, G. (2006). The Voyager Universal Literacy System: Results from a study of kindergarten students in inner-city schools. *Journal of Education for Students Placed At-Risk*, *11*(1), 75–95.

***Additional sources:***

Frechtling, J., Silverstein, G., & Zhang, X. (2003). *Evaluation of the Voyager Universal Literacy System*. Retrieved from Voyager Expanded Learning Web site: http://www.voyagerlearning.com/docs/difference/report_studies/Westat.pdf

Frechtling, J., Zhang, X., & Wang, L. W. (2004). *Evaluation of the Voyager Universal Literacy System: Year 2*. Retrieved from Voyager Expanded Learning Web site: http://www.voyagerlearning.com/docs/difference/report_studies/WESTAT_Voyager_2004_3.pdf

Hecht, S. A. (2003). *A study between Voyager and control schools in Orange County, Florida 2002–2003*. Retrieved from Voyager Expanded Learning Web site: http://www.voyagerlearning.com/docs/difference/report_studies/ocps_2002_03.pdf

Hecht, S. A., & Torgesen, J. K. (2002). *Within school treatment and control study: Voyager Universal Literacy System: Orange County, Florida 2001–2002*. Retrieved from Voyager Expanded Learning Web site: http://www.voyagerlearning.com/ResearchStudyDocuments/OrangeCounty_FL_Treatment_Control_Study_2001-2002.pdf

***Waterford Early Reading Program™***

Hecht, S. A., & Close, L. (2002). Emergent literary skills and training time uniquely predict variability in responses to phonemic

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


awareness training in disadvantaged kindergartners. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *82*(2), 93–115.

***Additional source:***

Hecht, S. A. (2000). Study: Waterford Early Reading program in Ohio. *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101).


### Studies that did not meet evidence screens

***100 Book Challenge***


Akron Public Schools. (2000). *100 Book Challenge results: Essex Elementary School*. Akron, OH: Author. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Akron Public Schools. (2004). *100 Book Challenge results: Lincoln Elementary School*. Akron, OH: Author. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Binghamton City School District. (2001). *100 Book Challenge results: Roosevelt Elementary School*. Binghamton, NY: Author. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Bristol Township School District (2001). *100 Book Challenge results: Abraham Lincoln*. Levittown, PA: Author. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Bristol Township School District (2003). *Report to parents: Abraham Lincoln Elementary School*. Levittown, PA: Author. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

D'Apuzzo, B. (2003). *Stafford Township School District*. Manahawkin, NJ. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

DuCette, J. (1999). *An evaluation of the '100 Book Challenge Program'*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University. Does not use a strong causal design: this study, which uses a quasi-experimental design, does not use equating measures to ensure that the comparison group is equivalent to the treatment group.

DuCette, J. (2001). *An evaluation of the 100 Book Challenge program in the schools funded by the William Penn Foundation*. Philadephia, PA: Temple University, Department of Educational Psychology. Does not use a strong causal design: this study, which uses a quasi-experimental design, does not use equating measures to ensure that the comparison group is equivalent to the treatment group.

Harrisburg City School District (2001). *100 Book Challenge results: Woodward Elementary School*. Harrisburg, PA: Author. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Philadelphia School District. (1997). *100 Book Challenge results: Two Philadelphia elementary schools*. Philadelphia, PA: Author. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Philadelphia School District. (2003). *Penrose Elementary*. Philadelphia, PA: Author. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Underwood, G. (2000). *Closing the gap: An answer to enhancing classroom access to a large quantity of appropriate books*. SC: Hilton Head Elementary School. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.


***Accelerated Reader/Reading Renaissance***


DiLuzio, M. (1999). *California students achieve 28 percent higher Stanford reading scores after only one semester of Accelerated Reader implementation.* Madison, WI: Renaissance Learning, Inc. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Facemire, N. E. (2000). *The effect of the Accelerated Reader on the reading comprehension of third graders.* Unpublished master's thesis, Salem-Teikyo University, Salem, WV. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED442097) Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Friesen, C. (2001). *Improving reading in grade three students.* Unpublished master's thesis, San Diego State University, San Diego, CA. Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Ganter, J. (2000). Capture the power of reading. *Illinois Libraries, 82*(3), 176–180. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Goodman, G. (1999). *The Reading Renaissance/Accelerated Reader Program. Pinal county school-to-work evaluation report.* Tucson, AZ: Creative Research, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED427299) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Hagerman, T. E. (2003). A quasi-experimental study on the effects of Accelerated Reader at middle school. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64*(06), 2027A. (UMI No. 3095250) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Holman, G. G. (1998). Correlational study to determine the effects of the Accelerated Reader Program on the reading comprehension of fourth and fifth-grade students in Early County, Georgia (Fourth-Grade, Blakely, Reading Practice). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 59*(03), 0771A. (UMI No. 9826801) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Holmes, C. T., & Brown C. L. (2002). *A controlled evaluation of a total school improvement process, School Renaissance.* Athens: University of Georgia. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED474261) Does not use a strong causal design: in this study, which uses a quasi-experimental design, the comparison group schools also uses the intervention, which does not provide a direct test of the intervention.

Johnson, R. A. (2003). The effects of the Accelerated Reader program on the reading comprehension of pupils in grades three, four, and five. *The Reading Matrix, 3*(3), 87–96. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Kambarian, V. N., Jr. (2001). *The role of reading instruction and the effect of a reading management system on at-risk students.* Doctoral digest, Saint Louis University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED461835) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Knox, M. L. (1996). An experimental study of the effects of 'the Accelerated Reader Program' and a teacher directed program on reading comprehension and vocabulary of fourth and fifth grade students. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 57*(10), 4208A. (UMI No. 9710798) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Kohel, P. R. (2003). Using Accelerated Reader: Its impact on the reading levels and Delaware state testing scores of 10th grade students in Delaware's Milford High School. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63*(10), 3507A. (UMI No. 3067785) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


Lawson, S. (2000). Accelerated Reader boosts student achievement. *California School Library Association Journal, 23*(2), 11–12. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Mallette, M. H., Henk, W. A., & Melnick, S. A. (2004). The influence of Accelerated Reader on the affective learning orientations of intermediate grade students. *Journal of Literacy Research, 36*(1), 72–75. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify student achievement outcomes but this study does not focus on achievement.

McDurmon, A. (2001). *The effects of guided and repeated reading on English Language Learners.* Unpublished master's thesis, Berry College, Mount Berry, GA. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Melton, C. M., Smothers, B. C., & Anderson, E. (2004). A study of the effects of the Accelerated Reader program on fifth grade students' reading achievement growth. *Reading Improvement, 41*(1), 18–23. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Nunnery, J. A., Ross, S. M., & Goldfeder, E. (2003). *The effect of School Renaissance on TAAS scores in the McKinney ISD.* Retrieved from University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy Web site: http://crep.memphis.edu/web/research/pub/McKinney_Renaissance_CR_09-09-03.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Paul, T. D. (2003). *Guided independent reading: An examination of the reading practice database and the scientific research supporting guided independent reading as implemented in Reading Renaissance.* Retrieved from Renaissance Learning Web site: http://research.renlearn.com/research/pdfs/165.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Peak, J., & Dewalt, M. W. (1994). Reading achievement: Effects of computerized reading management and enrichment. *ERS Spectrum, 12*(1), 31–34. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Putman, S. M. (2004). Effects of Accelerated Reader on reading motivation and achievement of fourth-grade students. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65*(02), 415A. (UMI No. 3123939) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Renaissance Learning. (2002). *Results from a three-year statewide implementation of Reading Renaissance in Idaho: Including a review of the first two years of Reading Renaissance implementation.* Retrieved from http://research.renlearn.com/research/pdfs/106.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Ross, S. M., & Nunnery, J. A. (2005). *The effect of School Renaissance on student achievement in two Mississippi school districts.* Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design that uses achievement pretests but it does not establish that the comparison group is comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


***Additional source:***

Ross, S., Nunnery, J., Avis, A., & Borek, T. (2005). The effects of School Renaissance on student achievement in two Mississippi school districts: *A longitudinal quasi-experimental study.* Retrieved from University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy Web site: http://crep.memphis.edu/web/research/pub/School%20Ren%20Year2%20FINAL%207-25-05.pdf

Sadusky, L. A., & Brem, S. K. (2002). *The integration of Renaissance programs into an urban Title I elementary school, and its effect on school-wide improvement.* Madison, WI: Renaissance Learning, Inc. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Samuels, S. J., & Wu, Y. C. (2003). *The effects of immediate feedback on reading achievement.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Department of Educational Psychology. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Samuels, S. J., Lewis, M., Wu, Y. C., Reininger, J., & Murphy, A. (2004). *Accelerated Reader vs. non-Accelerated Reader: How students using the Accelerated Reader outperformed the control condition in a tightly controlled experimental study.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota. Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

School Renaissance Institute. (2000). *South Bay Union School District, Imperial Beach California: Informational report on Accelerated Reader.* Retrieved from http://research.renlearn.com/research/pdfs/73.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

School Renaissance Institute. (2001). *Early literacy survey: How Renaissance supports Reading Excellence Act (REA) goals.* Madison, WI. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED454496) The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify student outcome measures but this study does not focus on students.

Scott, L. S. (1999). *The Accelerated Reader program, reading achievement, and attitudes of students with learning disabilities.* Atlanta: Georgia State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED434431) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Steele, C. T. (2003). The effectiveness of the Accelerated Reader program on the reading level of second-grade students as measured by the student test for assessment of reading. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64*(03), 845A. (UMI No. 3080207) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Topping, K. J., & Paul, T. (1999). Computer-assisted assessment of practice at reading: A large scale survey using Accelerated Reader data. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 15*(3), 213–231. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Topping, K. J., & Sanders, W. L. (2000). Teacher effectiveness and computer assessment of reading: Relating value added and learning information system data. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 11*(3), 305–337. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Additional source:***

Renaissance Learning. (2000). Accelerated Reader and Reading Renaissance lead to increased teacher effectiveness. Retrieved from Renaissance Learning Web site: http://research.renlearn.com/research/pdfs/19.pdf

Vollands, S. R., Topping, K. J., & Evans, R. M. (1999). Computerized self-assessment of reading comprehension with the

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


Accelerated Reader: Action research. *Reading and Writing Quarterly, 15,* 197–211. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Walberg, H. J. (2001). *Final evaluation of the reading initiative.* Retrieved from Waterford Institute Web site: http://www.waterford.org/corporate_pages/IdahoStudy.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Watts, B. D. (2004). Accelerated Reader: Its motivational effects on advanced adolescent readers. *Masters Abstracts International, 43* (02), 386. (UMI No. 1423331) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

***Alpha-Time***

Froniabarger, E. W. (1983). A comparison of the Crossties, Alpha-Time, Sullivan, and Bookmark reading readiness programs in kindergarten. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *44*(08), 2349A. (UMI No. 8325590) Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

***AlphabiTunes***

Cameron, I. J. (2002). *Evaluation of the AlphabiTunes computer program for teaching beginning literacy*. Victoria, BC: University of Victoria. Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

***America's Choice***

New American Schools. (1997). *Working towards excellence: Examining the effectiveness of New American Schools designs*. Arlington, VA: Author. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Athen's Tutorial Program***

Powell, J. V., Wisenbaker, J., Connor, R. (1987). Effects of intergenerational tutoring and related variables on reading and mathematics achievement of low socioeconomic children. *Journal of Experimental Education*, *55*(4), 206–211. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

***Auditory Discrimination in Depth (ADD)®/Lindamood Phonemic Sequencing (LiPS)®***

Adair, J., Nadeau, S., Conway, T., Gonzalez-Rothi, L., Heilman, P., Green, I., et al. (2000). Alterations in the functional anatomy of reading induced by rehabilitation of an alexic patient. *Neuropsychiatry, Neuropsychology and Behavioral Neurology, 13*(4), 303–311. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Alexander, A., Anderson, H., Heilman, P., Voeller, K., & Torgesen, J. (1991). Phonological awareness training and the remediation of analytic decoding deficits in a group of severe dyslexics. *Annals of Dyslexia, 41,* 193–206. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Conway, T., Heilman, P., Gonzalez-Rothi, L., Alexander, A., Adair, J., Crosson, B., & Heilman, K. (1998). Treatment of a case of phonological alexia with agraphia using the Auditory Discrimination in Depth (ADD) program. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society, 4,* 608–620. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Howard, M. P. (1986). Effects of pre-reading training in auditory conceptualization on subsequent reading achievement. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 47*(03), 847A. (UMI No. 8612677) **(Study: Arco, Indiana first-grade longitudinal)** Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Howard, M. P. (1986). Effects of pre-reading training in auditory conceptualization on subsequent reading achievement. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 47*(03), 847A. (UMI No. 8612677) **(Study: Arco, Indiana kindergarten)** Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Howard, M. P. (1986). Effects of pre-reading training in auditory conceptualization on subsequent reading achievement. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 47*(03), 847A. (UMI No. 8612677) **(Study: Arco, Indiana and Santa Maria, California)** Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Kennedy, K., & Backman, J. (1993). Effectiveness of the Lindamood Auditory Discrimination in Depth Program with students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 8*(4), 253–259. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes. (2003). *Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes: Beginning reading submissions.* (Available from the Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes, 416 Higuera Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401) **(Study: Intervention in kindergarten through 2nd grade)** Complete data are not reported: the WWC cannot evaluate the design or data because complete study details are not reported.

Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes. (2003). *Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes: Beginning reading submissions.* (Available from the Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes, 416 Higuera Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401) **(Study: Kindergarten results from school project in Oregon)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes. (2003). *Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes: Beginning reading submissions.* (Available from the Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes, 416 Higuera Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401) **(Study: Kindergarten through 3rd grade results from learning centers across the United States)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes. (2003). *Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes: Beginning reading submissions.* (Available from the Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes, 416 Higuera Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401) **(Study: Kindergarten through 3rd grade results from school project in Colorado)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes. (2004). Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes: *Interventions for beginning reading evidence report–Report 1, Book I of II.* (Available from the Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes, 416 Higuera Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401) **(Study: K–3 Lindamood Bell focus students 2002 summary)** Complete data are not reported: the WWC cannot evaluate the design or data because complete study details are not reported.

Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes. (2004). *Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes: Interventions for beginning reading evidence report–Report 1, Book I of II.* (Available from the Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes, 416 Higuera Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401) **(Study: Kindergarten students in Oregon 2001–02)** Complete data are not reported: the WWC cannot evaluate the design or data because complete study details are not reported.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes. (2004). *Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes: Interventions for beginning reading evidence report–Report 1, Book I of II.* (Available from the Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes, 416 Higuera Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401) **(Study: Pueblo, Colorado 2001–02 summary)** Complete data are not reported: the WWC cannot evaluate the design or data because complete study details are not reported.

Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes. (2004). *Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes: Interventions for beginning reading evidence report–Report 1, Book I of II.* (Available from the Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes, 416 Higuera Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401) **(Study: Second grade students in Idaho)** Complete data are not reported: the WWC cannot evaluate the design or data because complete study details are not reported.

McGuinness, C., McGuinness, D., & Donohue, J. (1995). Phonological training and the alphabet principle: Evidence for reciprocal causality. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30*(4), 830–852. Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Olson, R. K., Wise, B. W., Ring, J., & Johnson, M. (1997). Computer-based remedial training in phoneme awareness and phonological decoding: Effects on the posttraining development of word recognition. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 1*(3), 235–253. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Pokorni, J. L., Worthington, C. K., & Jamison, P. J. (2004). Phonological awareness intervention: Comparison of Fast ForWord, Earobics, and LiPS. *The Journal of Educational Research, 97*(3), 147–157. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Sadoski, M., & Willson, V. L. (2006). Effects of a theoretically based large-scale reading intervention in a multicultural urban school district. *American Educational Research Journal, 43*(1), 137–154. Does not use a strong causal design: this study, which uses a quasi-experimental design, has a confounding factor. The ADD/LiPS intervention is combined with other interventions, making it difficult to attribute study outcomes to ADD/LiPS.

Simos, P., Fletcher, J., Bergman, E., Breier, J., Foorman, B., Castillo, E., et al. (2002). Dyslexia-specific brain activation profile becomes normal following successful remedial training. *Neurology, 58,* 1203–1212. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: this study does not focus on one of the domains specified for this WWC review.

Torgesen, J. K., Alexander, P. A., Wagner, R. K., Rashotte, C. A., Voeller, K. K. S., Conway, T., & Rose, E. (2001). Intensive remedial instruction for children with severe reading disabilities: Immediate and long-term outcomes from two instructional approaches. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 34*(1), 33–58. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

***Additional source:***

Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes. (2004). Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes: Interventions for beginning reading evidence report–Report 1, *Book I of II.* (Available from the Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes, 416 Higuera Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401) **(Study: Longitudinal Florida study summary)**

Torgesen, J. K., Wagner, R. K., Rashotte, C. A., Rose, E., Lindamood, P., Conway, T., et al. (1999). Preventing reading failure in young children with phonological processing disabilities: Group and individual responses to instruction. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*(4), 579–593. Does not use a strong causal design: this study, which uses a randomized control trial design, had a confounding factor. The ADD/LiPS

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*

intervention was combined with other interventions, making it difficult to attribute study outcomes to ADD/LiPS.

Truch, S. (1994). Stimulating basic reading processes using auditory discrimination in depth. *Annals of Dyslexia, 44,* 60–80. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Wise, B. W., Ring, J., & Olson, R. K. (2000). Individual differences in gains from computer-assisted remedial reading. J*ournal of Experimental Child Psychology, 77*(3), 197–235. Does not use a strong causal design: this study, which uses a quasi-experimental design, has a confounding factor. The ADD/LiPS intervention is combined with other interventions, making it difficult to attribute study outcomes to ADD/LiPS.

***Balanced Early Literacy Initiative***

Sterbinsky, A., Ross, S. M., & Redfield, D. (2002). *The effects of implementing comprehensive school reform models in 12 elementary schools: Year 3 study results*. Charleston, SC: Appalachia Educational Laboratory. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

***Additional source:***

Sterbinsky, A., Ross, S., & Redfield, D. (2003, April). *Comprehensive school reform: A multi-site replicated experiment*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. The sample is not appropriate to this review: The parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

***Barton Reading & Spelling System***

Research evidence of the effectiveness of the Barton Reading & Spelling system. (n. d.). Retrieved from Barton Reading Web site: http://www.bartonreading.com/pdf/Barton%20Research.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Benchmark Word Recognition Program***

Roberts, E. (1996). The relationship between reading by analogy and independent word recognition. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *57*(11), 4689A. (UMI No. 9713226) Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

***Book Buddies***

Invernizzi, M., Rosemary, C., Juel, C., & Richards, H. C. (1997). At-risk readers and community volunteers: A 3-year perspective. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, *1*(3), 277–300. Does not use a causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Bookmark***

Froniabarger, E. W. (1983). A comparison of the Crossties, Alpha-Time, Sullivan, and Bookmark reading readiness programs in kindergarten. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *44*(08), 2349A. (UMI No. 8325590) Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

***Bradley Reading and Language Arts***

Tupper, A. T. (2000). A comparison of two systematic decoding programs for developing reading skills in beginning readers. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *61*(11), 4326A. (UMI No. 9995925) Does not use a strong causal design: there is only

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

***Breakthrough to Literacy***

Bompadre, C. E. (2002). The effectiveness of systematic reading programs on the achievement of students in grades K–2. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *63*(03), 890A. (UMI No. 3045848) Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2002). The new three Rs: Research, reading and results. Retrieved from http://www.breakthroughtoliteracy.com/pdf/3Rs_2.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Breakthrough to Literacy (2003). *Results with Breakthrough to Literacy*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Bowling Green City Schools 1999–2000)** The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* Retrieved from http://www.breakthroughtoliteracy.com/index.html?SID&page=df_lr_studies_mcneill_1 **(Bowling Green City Schools 2001–2002)** Does not use a strong causal design: A historical cohort was used as the comparison group. WWC conventions allow for historical control cohorts in studies that have a broad unit of analysis (school or higher). This study analyzes at the student level and therefore does not fulfill the WWC requirement.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Campbell County School District)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Breakthrough to Literacy. *(2003*). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Charlotte-Mecklenburg Public School District)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003*). Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Copperas Cove Independent School District)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Daviess County School District)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(De Zavala Elementary School Fort Worth Independent School District 1998–99)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(De Zavala**

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


**Elementary School Fort Worth Independent School District 1999–00)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Fort Worth Independent School District 1999–2000)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Breakthrough to Literacy. *(2003). Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Fulton County Schools)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Glynn County Schools)** The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Hawaii Department of Education)** Does not use a strong causal design. A historical cohort was used as the comparison group. WWC conventions allow for historical control cohorts in studies that have a broad unit of analysis (school or higher). This study analyzes at the student level and therefore does not fulfill the WWC requirement.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(I.M. Terrell Elementary School Fort Worth Independent School District)** The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Jersey City Public Schools)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Johnson County School District)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Lawrence Public Schools 2000–01)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Lawrence Public Schools 2001–02)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Breakthrough to Literacy. *(2003). Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with*

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


*beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) (Lebanon Community School Corporation) Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Leon County School District)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Logan County School District)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Massillon City School District)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Muscatine Community School District)** The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(New Haven Public Schools)** The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Norfolk Public Schools)** Does not use a strong causal design: A historical cohort was used as the comparison group. WWC conventions allow for historical control cohorts in studies that have a broad unit of analysis (school or higher). This study analyzes at the student level and therefore does not fulfill the WWC requirement.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Northampton County Public Schools)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Ohio County School District)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Public School 10 Community School District 15)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Public School 27 Community School District 15)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Public School 57 New York City Public Schools)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Pulaski County Schools)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Richmond City Schools)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(San Ysidro School District)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(School City of East Chicago)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(School District of Palm Beach County)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Sumpter County School District)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Tussey Mountain School District)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Union County Public Schools 2001–2002)** Does not use a strong causal design: A historical cohort was used as the comparison group. WWC conventions allow for historical control cohorts in studies that have a broad unit of analysis (school or higher). This study analyzes at the student level and therefore does not fulfill the WWC requirement.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Whitley County School District. Siley, KY)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Breakthrough to Literacy. (2003). *Submission to the What Works Clearinghouse, topic 1: Interventions for students with beginning reading difficulties.* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) **(Union County Public Schools 2000–2001)** The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Delacruz, S. J. (2003). *The impact of a first year, first grade balanced literacy approach on reading and language achievement*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Loyola University, Chicago, IL. (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) Does not use a causal design: there was only one intervention unit, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Grimes School. (1998, January). *Computer assisted reading for children at-risk*. (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Hughey, J. H., & Olivarez, R. D. (1998, January). *Final report of the 1997–98 Breakthrough to Literacy computer instructional program*. (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Jones, K., & Weinhold, C. (2000, January). *What effect does the incorporation of breakthrough to literacy into the language arts have on the early literacy development of Grove kindergartners?* (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

MESSA. (1998). *Breakthrough to literacy program evaluation 1997–98*. (Available from Breakthrough to Literacy, 2662 Crosspark Road, Coralville, IA 52241) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

***Bridge***

Biemiller, A., & Siegel, L. S. (1997). A longitudinal study of the effects of the Bridge reading program for children at risk for reading failure. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, *20*(2), 83–92. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

***California Early Literacy Learning (CELL)***

Swartz, S. L. (1999, December). California Early Literacy Learning and Reading Recovery: Two innovative programs for teaching children to read and write. Paper presented at the Claremont Reading Conference, CA. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Swartz, S. L. (2003). *California Early Literacy Learning (CELL): Research report 1994–2003.* (Available from the Foundation for California Early Literacy Learning, 104 East State St., Suite M, Redlands, CA 92373) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Swartz, S. L., Shook, R. E., & Klein, A. F. (2003). *Foundation for California Early Literacy Learning.* (Available from the Foundation for California Early Literacy Learning, 104 East State St., Suite M, Redlands, CA 92373) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


***Carbo Reading Styles Program***

Atchison, M. K. (1988, November). *The relationship between the learning styles and reading achievement of sixth-grade students in the state of Alabama*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Gatlinburg, TN. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Carbo, M. (2004, May). *Reading results with the Carbo Reading Styles Program*. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Reading Styles Institute, Chicago, IL. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Duhaney, L. M. G., & Ewing, N. J. (1998). An investigation of the reading styles of urban Jamacian middle-grade students with learning disabilities. *Reading Improvement*, *35*(3), 114–119. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Langford, D. (2000). *Two-year results of the Carbo Reading Styles Program: Patterson Elementary School, Montgomery Alabama*. Montgomery, AL. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Mohrmann, S. R. (1990, January). *Learning styles of poor readers*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Austin, TX. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify student outcome measures but this study does not focus on students.

Skipper, B. (1997). Reading with style. *American School Board Journal*, *184*(2), 36–37. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Wilson, I. G. (1993). Reading styles of Hispanic students with learning disabilities in third, fourth, and fifth grade. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *55*(11), 3462A. (UMI No. 9505375) The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify student outcome measures but this study does not focus on students.

***CIERA School Change Project***

Taylor, B. M., Pearson, P. D., Peterson, D., & Rodriguez, M. C. (2002). *The CIERA School Change Project: Supporting schools as they implement home-grown reading reform* (CIERA Rep. No. 2-016). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***ClassWide Peer Tutoring (CWPT)***

Abbott, M., Greenwood, C. R., Buzhardt, J., & Tapia, Y. (2006). Using technology-based teacher support tools to scale up the ClassWide Peer Tutoring program. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, *22*, 47–64. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Bradley, D., Bjorlykke, L., Mann, E., Homon, C., & Lindsay, J. (1993, October). *Empowerment of the general educator through effective teaching strategies*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Conference on Learning Disabilities, Baltimore, MD. Does not use a strong causal design: this study, which uses a quasi-experimental design, does not use equating measures to ensure that the comparison group is equivalent to the treatment group.

Burks, M. (2004). Effects of Classwide Peer Tutoring on the number of words spelled correctly by students with LD. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 39*(5), 301–384. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review.

Buzhardt, J., Abbott, M., Greenwood, C. R., & Tapia, Y. (2005). Usability testing of the ClassWide Peer Tutoring-Learning Management System. *Journal of Special Education Technology*, *20*(1), 19–31. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


students should be in grades kindergarten through 3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Buzhardt, J., Greenwood, C. R., Abbott, M., & Tapia, Y. (2006). Research on scaling up effective instructional intervention practice: Developing a measure of the rate of implementation. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *54*(5), 467–492. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades kindergarten through 3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Greenwood, C. R., Dinwiddie, G., Bailey, V., Carta, J. J., Dorsey, D., Kohler, F. W., Nelson, C., Rotholtz, D., & Schulte, D. (1987). Field replication of classwide peer tutoring. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, *20*, 151–160. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades kindergarten through 3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Moore, A. R. (1993). Effects of strategy training and classwide peer tutoring on the reading comprehension of students with learning disabilities. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *54*(11), 4041A. (UMI No. 9410387) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades kindergarten through 3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Neddenriep, C. E. (2003). Classwide peer tutoring: Three experiments investigating the generalized effects of increased oral reading fluency to silent reading comprehension. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *64*(09), 3192A. (UMI No. 3104401) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Sideridis, G. D., Utley, C., Greenwood, C. R., & Delquadri, J. et al., (1997). Class-wide Peer Tutoring: Effects on the spelling performance and social interactions of students with mild disabilities and their typical peers in an integrated instructional setting. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, *7*(4), 203–212. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades kindergarten through 3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Simmons, D., Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., Hodge, J. P., & Mathes, P. G. (1994). Importance of instructional complexity and role reciprocity to Classwide Peer Tutoring. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *9* (4), 203–212. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Veerkamp, M. B. (2001). The effects of Classwide Peer Tutoring on the reading achievement of urban middle school students. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *63*(04), 2047B. (UMI No. 3049533) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

***CompassLearning***

Compass Learning, Inc. (2003). *An independent study done by the Odyssey Charter Middle School (2001–2002).* (Available from CompassLearning, 9920 Pacific Heights Blvd., San Diego, CA 92121) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Compass Learning, Inc. (2003). *CompassLearning® Report: What Works Clearinghouse*. San Diego, CA: Author. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Compass Learning, Inc. (2003). *Partnered study one, a study of grade 3 and grade 5 reading and math performance in a rural*

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


*school district in the SE, 2002*. San Diego, CA: Author. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Hartley, C. L. (2003). *Partnered study two: Comparative study in a large inner city school district in the Midwest, 2001–2002.* San Diego, CA: CompassLearning, Inc. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

***Compensatory Language Experiences and Reading Program (CLEAR)***

Chamberlain, E., Beck, D., & Johnson, J. (1983). *Language development component, compensatory language experiences and reading program*. Columbus, OH: Columbus Public Schools, Department of Evaluation Services. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction (CORI)***

Guthrie, J. T., Van Meter, P., McCann, A., & Wigfield, A. (1996). Growth of literacy engagement: Changes in motivations and strategies during Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *31*(3), 306–332. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC®)***

Calderon, M., Hertz-Lazarowitz, R., & Slavin, R. E. (1998). Effects of bilingual cooperative integrated reading and composition on students making the transition from Spanish to English reading. *The Elementary School Journal*, *99*(2), 153–165. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not focus on students learning to read in English, one of the parameters for this WWC review.

Jenkins, J. R., Jewell, M., Leicester, N., O'Connor, R. E., Jenkins, L. M., & Troutner, N. M. (1994). Accommodations for individual differences without classroom ability groups: An experiment in school restructuring. *Exceptional Children*, *60*(4), 344–358. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Nath, L. R. (1996). A peer tutoring training model for cooperative groupings: Is the effectiveness of cooperative groupings enhanced by students obtaining peer tutoring skills? *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *57*(12), 5051A. (UMI No. 9717224) The outcome measures are not shown to be valid or reliable: the outcome measures used in this study does not demonstrate adequate reliability or validity.

Rapp, J. C. (1991). The effects of cooperative learning on selected student variables (Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition on academic achievement in reading comprehension, vocabulary, and spelling on student self-esteem). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *52*(10), 3516A. (UMI No. 9207225) Confound: there was only one intervention and one comparison unit in each study condition, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Stevens, R. J., Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., & Farnish, A. M. (1987). Cooperative integrated reading and composition: Two field experiments. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *22*(4), 433–454. **(Study: Fall 1985)** Complete data were not reported for the WWC to compute effect sizes for the third graders, the sample of interest to this review.

Stevens, R. J., Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., & Farnish, A. M. (1987). Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition: Two field experiments. *Reading Research Quarterly, 22*(4), 433–454. **(Study: Spring 1985)** Complete data were not reported for the WWC to compute effect sizes for the third graders, the sample of interest to this review.

Stevens, R. J., Slavin, R. E., & Farnish, A. M. (1991). The effects of cooperative learning and direct instruction in reading comprehension strategies on main idea identification. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *83*(1), 8–16. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this

study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Stevens, R. J., & Slavin, R. E. (1995). Effects of a cooperative learning approach in reading and writing on academically handicapped and nonhandicapped students. *The Elementary School Journal*, *95*(3), 241–262. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Stevens, R. J., & Slavin, R. E. (1995). The Cooperative Elementary School: Effects on Students' Achievement, Attitudes, and Social Relations. *American Educational Research Journal*, *32*(2), 321–351. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

***Core Knowledge Curriculum***

Mac Iver, M. A., Kemper, E., & Stringfield, S. (2000). *The Baltimore Curriculum Project: Fourth year report.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Mac Iver, M. A., Stringfield, S., & McHugh, B. (2000). *Core Knowledge Curriculum: Five year analysis of implementation and effects in five Maryland schools*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Sterbinsky, A., Ross, S. M., & Redfield, D. (2002). *The effects of implementing comprehensive school reform models in 12 elementary schools: Year 3 study results*. Charleston, SC: Appalachia Educational Laboratory. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

***Additional source:***

Sterbinsky, A., Ross, S., & Redfield, D. (2003, April). *Comprehensive school reform: A multi-site replicated experiment*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. The sample is not appropriate to this review: The parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Taylor, B. M., Pearson, P. D., Clark, K. F., & Walpole, S. (1999). *Beating the odds in teaching all children to read* (Report No. 2-006). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Cornerstone Literacy Initiative***

Lockwood, D., Donis-Keller, C., Hanlon, E., Saunders, T., Wang, L., Weinstein, M., et al. (2004). *Second year evaluation report: Cornerstone Literacy Initiative*. New York: Institute for Education and Social Policy. Retrieved from Institute for Education and Social Policy, Steinhardt School of Education, New York University Web site: http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/iesp/publications/pubs/cornerstone/ENTIRE%20REPORT.PDF **(Study: Cleveland)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Lockwood, D., Donis-Keller, C., Hanlon, E., Saunders, T., Wang, L., Weinstein, M., et al. (2004). *Second year evaluation report: Cornerstone Literacy Initiative*. Retrieved from Institute for Education and Social Policy, Steinhardt School of Education, New York University Web site: http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/iesp/publications/pubs/cornerstone/ENTIRE%20REPORT.PDF **(Study: Jackson)** Does not use a strong causal design:

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*

this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Lockwood, D., Donis-Keller, C., Hanlon, E., Saunders, T., Wang, L., Weinstein, M., et al. (2004). *Second year evaluation report: Cornerstone Literacy Initiative*. Retrieved from Institute for Education and Social Policy, Steinhardt School of Education, New York University Web site: http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/iesp/publications/pubs/cornerstone/ENTIRE%20REPORT.PDF **(Study: Talladega)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Lockwood, D., Donis-Keller, C., Hanlon, E., Saunders, T., Wang, L., Weinstein, M., et al. (2004). *Second year evaluation report: Cornerstone Literacy Initiative*. Retrieved from Institute for Education and Social Policy, Steinhardt School of Education, New York University Web site: http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/iesp/publications/pubs/cornerstone/ENTIRE%20REPORT.PDF **(Study: Trenton)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Lockwood, D., Donis-Keller, C., Hanlon, E., Saunders, T., Wang, L., Weinstein, M., et al. (2004). *Second year evaluation report: Cornerstone Literacy Initiative*. Retrieved from Steinhardt School of Education, Institute for Education and Social Policy Web site: http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/iesp/publications/pubs/cornerstone/ENTIRE%20REPORT.PDF **(Study: Bridgeport)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Lockwood, D., Donis-Keller, C., Hanlon, E., Saunders, T., Wang, L., Weinstein, M., et al. (2004). *Second year evaluation report: Cornerstone Literacy Initiative*. Retrieved from Institute for Education and Social Policy, Steinhardt School of Education, New York University Web site: http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/iesp/publications/pubs/cornerstone/ENTIRE%20REPORT.PDF **(Study: Greenwood)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Lockwood, D., Donis-Keller, C., Hanlon, E., Saunders, T., Wang, L., Weinstein, M., et al. (2004). *Second year evaluation report: Cornerstone Literacy Initiative*. Retrieved from Institute for Education and Social Policy, Steinhardt School of Education, New York University Web site: http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/iesp/publications/pubs/cornerstone/ENTIRE%20REPORT.PDF **(Study: Dalton)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Lockwood, D., Donis-Keller, C., Hanlon, E., Saunders, T., Wang, L., Weinstein, M., et al. (2004). *Second year evaluation report: Cornerstone Literacy Initiative*. Retrieved from Institute for Education and Social Policy, Steinhardt School of Education, New York University Web site: http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/iesp/publications/pubs/cornerstone/ENTIRE%20REPORT.PDF **(Study: New Haven)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Lockwood, D., Donis-Keller, C., Hanlon, E., Saunders, T., Wang, L., Weinstein, M., et al. (2004). *Second year evaluation report: Cornerstone Literacy Initiative*. Retrieved from Institute for Education and Social Policy, Steinhardt School of Education, New York University Web site: http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/iesp/publications/pubs/cornerstone/ENTIRE%20REPORT.PDF **(Study: Springfield)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

***Crossties***

Froniabarger, E. W. (1983). A comparison of the Crossties, Alpha-Time, Sullivan, and Bookmark reading readiness programs in kindergarten. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *44*(08), 2349A. (UMI No. 8325590) Does not use a strong causal

design: there was only one intervention and/or one comparison unit, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other.

***DaisyQuest***

Lonigan, C. J., Driscoll, K., Phillips, B. M., Cantor, B. G., Anthony, J. L., & Goldstein, H. (2003). A computer-assisted instruction phonological sensitivity program for preschool children at-risk for reading problems. *Journal of Early Intervention*, *25*(4), 248–262. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades kindergarten through 3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

***Destination Reading***

Long-Cotty, B. D., & Levenson, T. (2004). *The impact of Destination Reading on kindergarten and first grade reading skills*. San Francisco, CA: Riverdeep Limited. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design that uses achievement pretests but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

***Different Ways of Knowing***

Sterbinsky, A., Ross, S. M., & Redfield, D. (2002). *The effects of implementing comprehensive school reform models in 12 elementary schools: Year 3 study results*. Charleston, SC: Appalachia Educational Laboratory. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

***Additional source:***

Sterbinsky, A., Ross, S., & Redfield, D. (2003, April). *Comprehensive school reform: A multi-site replicated experiment*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. The sample is not appropriate to this review: The parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

***Direct Instruction/Direct Instruction***

Adams, G. L., & Engelmann, S. (1996). Additional documentation. In *Research on Direct Instruction: 25 years and beyond DISTAR.* (pp. 99–145). Eugene, OR: Association for Direct Instruction. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Darch, C., Gersten, R., & Taylor, R. (1987). Evaluation of the Williamsburg County Direct Instruction Program: Factors leading to success in rural elementary programs. *Research in Rural Education*, *4*(3), 111–118. Study is outside the time frame of the review: the parameters for this WWC review specified interventions that were implemented after 1983 but this study involves students that began the intervention prior to 1983.

Gersten, R., Darch, C., & Gleason, M. (1988). Effectiveness of a Direct Instruction academic kindergarten for low-income students. *The Elementary School Journal*, *89*(2), 227–240. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

McCollum-Rogers, S. A. (2004). Comparing Direct Instruction and Success For All with a basal reading program in relation to student achievement. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *65*(10), 3642A. (UMI No. 3149920) Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

McGahey, J. T. (2002). Differences between a Direct Instruction reading approach and a balanced reading approach among elementary school students. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *63*(06A), 2147. (UMI No. 3057184) Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does

not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

***Direct Instruction and CIRC***

Stevens, R. J., Slavin, R. E., & Farnish, A. M. (1991). The effects of cooperative learning and direct instruction in reading comprehension strategies on main idea identification. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *83*(1), 8–16. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

***Direct Instruction/Corrective Reading***

Arthur, C. (1988). Progress in a high school LD class. *ADI News*, *27*(4), 17–18. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Byron, D. (1988). Corrective Reading in a comprehensive school: The Hartcliffe Project. *Educational and Child Psychology 5*(4), 35–41. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Campbell, M. L. (1984). Corrective Reading program evaluated with secondary students in San Diego. *ADI News*, *3*, 3. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Department of Accountability and Organizational Evaluation. (2002). Evaluation of the 2001–02 Corrective Reading program. Retrieved from San Juan Unified School District Web site: http://www.sanjuan.edu/accountability/program-evaluations/corrective-reading-2002.pdf The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Drakeford, W. (2002). The impact of an intensive program to increase the literacy skills of incarcerated youth. *Journal of Correctional Education*, *53*(4), 139–144. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Gunn, B., Smolkowski, K., & Biglan, A., Black, C., & Blair, J. (2005). Fostering the development of reading skill through supplemental instruction: Results for Hispanic and Non-Hispanic students. *Journal of Special Education*, *39*(2), 66–85. Does not use a causal design: this study, which uses a randomized controlled trial design, combined two interventions and therefore the effects of Corrective Reading could not be isolated.

Gunn, B., Smolkowski, K., Biglan, A. & Black, C. (2005). Supplemental instruction in decoding skills for Hispanic and Non-Hispanic students in early elementary school: A follow-up. *Journal of Special Education, 36*(2), 69–80. Does not use a causal design: this study, which uses a randomized controlled trial design, combined two interventions and therefore the effects of Corrective Reading could not be isolated.

***Additional source:***

Gunn, B., Biglan, A., Smolkowski, K., & Ary, D. (2000). The efficacy of supplemental instruction in decoding skills for Hispanic and non-Hispanic students in early elementary school. *Journal of Special Education, 34*(2), 90–103.

Harris, R. E., Marchand-Martella, N. E., Martella, R. C. (2000). Effects of a peer-delivered Corrective Reading program. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, *10*, 21–36. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Hempenstall, K. J. (1997). *The effects on the phonological processing skills of disabled readers participating in Direct Instruction reading programs*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia. The sample is not appropriate to this review:

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Herr, C. M. (1989). Using Corrective Reading with adults. *ADI News*, *8*(2), 18–21. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Juel, C. (1988). Learning to read and write: A longitudinal study of 54 children from first through fourth grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *80*(4), 437–447. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Keel, M. C., Federick, L. D., Hughes, T. A., & Owens, S. H. (1999). Using paraprofessionals to deliver Direct Instruction reading programs. *Effective School Practices, 18*(2), 16–22. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Malmgren, K. W., & Leone, P. E. (2000). Effects of a short-term auxiliary reading program on the reading skills of incarcerated youth. *Education & Treatment of Children*, *23*, 239–247. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Marchand-Martella, N. E., & Martella, R. C. (2002). An overview and research summary of peer-delivered *Corrective Reading* instruction. *Behavior Analysis Today, 3,* 213–220. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Marchand-Martella, N. E., Martella, R. C., Bettis, D. F., & Riley Blakely, M. (2004). Project Pals: A description of a high school-based tutorial program using *Corrective Reading* and peer-delivered instruction. *Reading and Writing Quarterly, 20*, 179–201. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Marchand-Martella, N. E., Martella, R. C., Orlob, M., & Ebey, T. (2000). Conducting action research in a rural high school setting using peers as Corrective Reading instructors for students with disabilities. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, *19*(2), 20–29. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Polloway, E. A., Epstein, M. H., Polloway, C. H., Patton, J. R., & Ball, D. W. (1986). Corrective Reading program: An analysis of effectiveness with learning disabled and mentally retarded students. *Remedial and Special Education*, *7*(4), 41–47. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Scarlato, M. C, & Asahara, E. (2004). Effects of Corrective Reading in a residential treatment facility for adjudicated youth. *Journal of Direct Instruction*, *4*, 211–217. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Short, C., Marchand-Martella, N. E., Martella, R. C., & Ebey, T. L. (1999). The benefits of being high school Corrective Reading peer instructors. *Effective School Practices*, *18*(2), 23–29. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Slaton, D. (2006). Effects of Corrective Reading on the reading abilities and classroom behaviors of middle school students with reading deficits and challenging behavior. *Behavioral Disorders 31*(3), 265–283. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Somerville, D. E., & Leach, D. J. (1988, February). Direct or indirect instruction: An evaluation of three types of intervention programs for assisting students with specific reading difficulties. *Educational Research*, *30*(1), 46–53. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Sommers, J. (1995). Seven-year overview of Direct Instruction programs used in basic skills classes at Big Piney Middle School. *Effective School Practices*, *14*(4), 29–32. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Steventon, C. E., & Frederick, L. D. (2003). The effects of repeated readings on student performance in the Corrective Reading program. *Journal of Direct Instruction*, *3*(1), 17–27. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Vitale, M., Medland, M., Romance, N., & Weaver, H. P. (1993). Accelerating reading and thinking skills of low-achieving elementary students: Implications for curricular change. *Effective School Practices*, *12*(1), 26–31. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

***Direct Instruction/DISTAR***

Benner, G. J., Trout, A., Nordness, P. D., Nelson, J. R., Epstein, M. H., Knobel, M., et al. (2002). The effects of the Language for Learning program on the receptive language skills of kindergarten children. *Journal of Direct Instruction*, *2*(2), 67–74. Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Carnine, L., Carnine, D., & Gersten, R. (1984). Analysis of oral reading errors made by economically disadvantaged students taught with a synthetic-phonics approach. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *19*(3), 343–356. Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

DeVries, R., Reese-Learned, H., & Morgan, P. (1991). Sociomoral development in Direct Instruction, eclectic, and constructivist kindergartens: A study of children's emotional interpersonal understanding. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *6*, 473–517. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Dowdell, T. (1996). *The effectiveness of Direct Instruction on the reading achievement of sixth graders*. Chicago, IL: Chicago Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED396268) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Sexton, C. W. (1989). Effectiveness of the DISTAR Reading I program in developing first graders' language skills. *Journal of Educational Research*, *82*(5), 289–293. Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Traweek, D., & Berninger, V. W. (1997). Comparisons for beginning literacy programs: Alternative paths to the same learning outcome. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, *20*(2), 160–168. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*

to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

***Direct Instruction/DISTAR and Success for All***

Ross, S. M., Nunnery, J. A., Goldfeder, E., McDonald, A., Rachor, R., Hornbeck, M., et al (2004). Using school reform models to improve reading achievement: A longitudinal study of Direct Instruction and Success for All in an urban district. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, *9*(4), 357–388. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

***Additional source:***

Ross, S. M., Fleischman, S. W., & Hornbeck, M. (2003). *Progress and options regarding the implementation of Direct Instruction and Success for All in Toledo public schools*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

***Direct Instruction/Horizons***

Tobin, K. G. (2004). The effects of beginning reading instruction in the Horizons Reading Program on the reading skills of third and fourth graders. *Journal of Direct Instruction*, *4*(2), 129–137. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

***Additional source:***

Tobin, K. G. (2003). The effects of the Horizons Reading Program and prior phonological awareness training on the reading skills of first graders. *Journal of Direct Instruction*, *3*(1), 1–16. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

***Direct Instruction/Reading Mastery***

Ashworth, D. R. (1999). Effects of Direct Instruction and basal reading instruction programs on the reading achievement of second graders. *Reading Improvement*, *35*(4), 150–156. Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Council of Chief State School Officers. (2003). City Springs Elementary School, Baltimore, MD. In *Results with reading mastery.* (pp. 14–15). New York: McGraw-Hill. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Council of Chief State School Officers. (2003). Eshelman Avenue Elementary, Lomita, CA. In *Results wtih reading mastery.* (pp. 16–17). New York: McGraw-Hill. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Council of Chief State School Officers. (2003). Fort Worth Independent School District, Fort Worth, TX. In *Results with Reading Mastery.* (pp. 4–5). New York: McGraw-Hill. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Council of Chief State School Officers. (2003). Lebanon School District, Lebanon, PA. In *Results with Reading*

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


*Mastery.* (pp. 8–9). New York: McGraw-Hill. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Council of Chief State School Officers. (2003). Park Forest-Chicago Heights School District 163, Chicago, IL. In *Results with Reading Mastery.* (pp. 10–11). New York: McGraw-Hill. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Council of Chief State School Officers. (2003). Portland Elementary School, Portland, AR. In *Results with reading mastery.* (pp. 2–3). New York: McGraw-Hill. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Council of Chief State School Officers. (2003). Roland Park Elementary/Middle School, Baltimore, MD. In *Results with Reading Mastery.* (pp. 12–13). New York: McGraw-Hill. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Council of Chief State School Officers. (2003). Wilson Primary School, Phoenix, AZ. In *Results with Reading Mastery.* (pp. 6–7). New York: McGraw-Hill. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Brent, G., Diobilda, N., & Gavin, F. (1986). Camden Direct Instruction project 1984–1985. *Urban Education, 21*(2), 138–148. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Gunn, B., Smolkowski, K., Biglan, A., & Black, C. (2002). Supplemental instruction in decoding skills for Hispanic and non-Hispanic students in early elementary school: A follow-up. *Journal of Special Education*, *36*(2), 69–79. Does not use a causal design: this study, which uses a randomized controlled trial design, combined two interventions and therefore the effects of Corrective Reading could not be isolated.

Joseph, B. L. (2000). Teacher expectations of low-SES preschool and elementary children: Implications of a research-validated instructional intervention for curriculum policy and school reform. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *65*(01), 35A. (UMI No. 3120273) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

League, M. B. (2001). The effects of the intensity of phonological awareness instruction on the acquisition of literacy skills. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *62*(10), 3299A. (UMI No. 3027542) Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Ryder, R. J., Sekulski, J. L., & Silberg, A. (2003). *Results of Direct Instruction reading program evaluation longitudinal results: First through third grade 2000–2003*. Retrieved from University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee Web site: http://www.uwm.edu/News/PR/04.01/DI_Final_Report_2003.pdf Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Thomson, B. (1991). Pilot study of the effectiveness of a Direct Instruction model (reading mastery fast cycle) as a supplement to a literature based delivery model (Houghton-Mifflin

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


Integrated Reading Program) in two regular first grade classrooms. *Florida Educational Research Council Research Bulletin*, *23*(2), 3–23. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Umbach, B., Darch, C., & Halpin, G. (1989). Teaching reading to low performing first graders in rural schools: A comparison of two instructional approaches. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, *16*(3), 112–121. Disruption: this study, which uses a quasi-experimental design, exhibited disruption problems that made it difficult to attribute study outcomes to the intervention, as delivered.

***Direct Instruction/Reading Mastery, Direct Instruction, and direct instruction***

Mac Iver, M. A., & Kemper, E. (2002). The impact of Direct Instruction on elementary students' reading achievement in an urban school district. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, *7*(2), 197–220. Disruption: this study, which uses a quasi-experimental design, exhibited disruption problems that made it difficult to attribute study outcomes to the intervention, as delivered.

***Direct Instruction/Reading Mastery and Direct Instruction/Teach Your Child to Read in 100 Easy Lessons***

Jones, C. D. (2002). Effects of direct instruction programs on the phonemic awareness abilities of kindergarten students. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *63*(03), 902A. (UMI No. 3044898) Confound: the intervention condition was largely assisted by an aide, while the control condition was not. Therefore, the study could not separate the effects of the intervention form the effect of aides.

***Direct Instruction/Reading Mastery (RITE)***

Carlson, C. D., & Francis, D. J. (2002). Increasing the reading achievement of at-risk children through direct instruction: Evaluation of the Rodeo Institute for Teacher Excellence (RITE). *Journal of Direct Instruction*, *3*(1), 29–50. Does not use a strong causal design: for the portion of the sample of interest for this WWC review, there was a confound, with the Direct Instruction intervention being modified or combined with other interventions, making it difficult to attribute study outcomes to the intervention.

***Direct Instruction/Spelling Mastery***

Lum, T., & Morton, L. L. (1984). Direct Instruction in spelling increases gain in spelling and reading skills. *Special Education in Canada*, *58*(2), 41–45. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify student outcome measures but this study does not focus on students.

***Direct Instruction/SRA***

Sterbinsky, A., Ross, S. M., & Redfield, D. (2002). *The effects of implementing comprehensive school reform models in 12 elementary schools: Year 3 study results*. Charleston, SC: Appalachia Educational Laboratory. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

***Additional source:***

Sterbinsky, A., Ross, S., & Redfield, D. (2003, April). *Comprehensive school reform: A multi-site replicated experiment*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. The sample is not appropriate to this review: The parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

***Direct Instruction/Teach Your Child to Read in 100 Easy Lessons***

Koehler, K. M. (1996). The effects of phonological awareness and letter naming fluency on reading acquisition for first-graders

experiencing difficulty learning to read. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *57*(07), 2944A. (UMI No. 9638095) Does not use a strong causal design: in this study, the comparison group schools also used the intervention, which does not provide a direct test of the intervention.

***Discovery Health Connection***

Boster, F. J. (2004). *A report on the effect of the Discovery Health Connection Application on student reading comprehension: 2005 Virginia evaluation.* East Lansing, MI: Cometrika, Inc. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

***Early Intervention in Reading®***

Chard, D. J. (1997). *Final evaluation report AY 1996–97: Early Reading Intervention Project, Springfield Public Schools, Springfield, Massachusetts.* Retrieved from Houghton Mifflin Company, Education Place Web site: http://www.eduplace.com/intervention/readintervention/pdfs/springfield.pdf Confound: this study included EIR but combined it with another intervention so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Taylor, B. M., Critchley, C., Paulsen, K., MacDonald, K., & Miron, H. (2002). *Learning to teach an early reading intervention program through Internet-supported professional development.* Retrieved from Early Intervention in Reading Program Web site: http://www.earlyinterventioninreading.com/pdfs/taylor_research2.pdf Confound: the intervention condition was largely assisted by an aide, while the control condition was not. Therefore, the study could not separate the effects of the intervention from the effect of aides.

Taylor, B. M., Hanson, B. E., Justice-Swanson, K., & Watts, S. (1997). Helping struggling readers: Linking small-group intervention with cross-age tutoring. *The Reading Teacher, 51*(3), 196–208. Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

***Additional source:***

Taylor, B. M., Watts, S. M., & Hanson, B. E. (1997). Teachers working together to help struggling readers: Linking second grade reading *intervention with fourth grade tutoring in urban elementary school.* (Available from Barbara Taylor, Ed.D., University of Minnesota, 1517 Goodrich Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55105)

Wing, M. A. (1994). The effects of a supplemental literacy program on students in a developmental first-grade classroom using cross-age tutors. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 56*(01), 151A. (UMI No. 9514687) Does not use a strong causal design: for the sample of interest to this WWC review, there was only one intervention, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

***Earobics®***

Cognitive Concepts, Inc. (2000). *Earobics Early Literacy Instruction: Chicago Public Schools pilot research report*. Retrieved from http://www.cogcon.com/research/proven/cpsoutcomes.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Cognitive Concepts, Inc. (2002). *Outcomes report: Anne Arundel County Public Schools, Maryland*. Retrieved from http://www.cogcon.com/research/proven/Aa-OC.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Cognitive Concepts, Inc. (2002). *Outcomes report: Brevard County Public Schools, Florida*. Retrieved from http://www.cogcon.com/research/proven/Brevard.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Cognitive Concepts, Inc. (2002). *Outcomes report: Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Ohio*. Retrieved from http://www.cogcon.com/research/proven/CCH-OC.pdf Does

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*

not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Cognitive Concepts, Inc. (2002). *Outcomes report: Culver City Unified School District, California*. Retrieved from http://www.cogcon.com/research/proven/culveroutcomes.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Cognitive Concepts, Inc. (2001). *Outcomes report: Daviess County Public Schools, Kentucky*. Retrieved from http://www.cogcon.com/research/proven/DaviessCounty.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Cognitive Concepts, Inc. (2002). *Outcomes report: District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, DC*. Retrieved from http://www.cogcon.com/research/proven/DCPS-OC.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Cognitive Concepts, Inc. (2001). *Outcomes report: Newport News Public Schools, Virginia*. Retrieved from http://www.cogcon.com/research/proven/newportoutcomes.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Cognitive Concepts, Inc. (2002). *Outcomes report: Northwestern University, Illinois*. Retrieved from http://www.cogcon.com/research/proven/NorthwesternU.pdf The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Cognitive Concepts, Inc. (2001). *Outcomes report: PALS assessment, Virginia*. Retrieved from http://www.cogcon.com/research/proven/newportPALSoutcomes.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Cognitive Concepts, Inc. (2002). *Outcomes report: Polk County School District, Florida*. Retrieved from http://www.cogcon.com/research/proven/polkoutcomes.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Cognitive Concepts, Inc. (2001). *Outcomes report: Spring Branch Independent School District, Texa*s. Retrieved from http://www.cogcon.com/research/proven/ShadowOutcomes.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Hayes, E. A., Warrier, C. M., Nicol, T. G., Zecker, S. G., & Kraus, N. (2002). Neural plasticity following auditory training in children with learning problems. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, *114*, 673–684. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify student outcome measures but this study does not focus on students.

Pettis, A. M. (2000). *A study on phonological awareness: The comparison of two computer-based programs used as intervention for students with disabilities*. Unpublished master's thesis, Grand Valley State University, Allendale, MI. The study, which uses a randomized controlled trial design, reported an extreme overall attrition rate.

Pobanz, M. S. (2000, January). *The effectiveness of an early literacy/auditory processing training program, called Earobics, with young children achieving poorly in reading*. Paper presented at the meeting of the California Association of Social Psychologists, Los Angeles, CA. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Pokorni, J. L., Worthington, C. K., & Jamison, P. J. (2004). Phonological awareness intervention: Comparison of Fast ForWord, Earobics, and LiPS. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *97*(3), 147–157. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

***Edison Schools***

Miron, G., & Applegate, B. (2000). *An evaluation of student achievement in Edison Schools opened in 1995 and 1996.* Kalamazoo, MI: The Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is

a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

***Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction (ECRI)***

Education Commission of the States. (1999). Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction (ECRI). Denver, CO: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED447425) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Reid, E. R. (n. d.). *Evaluation of ECRI's effectiveness*. Salt Lake City, UT: Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Reif, E. R. (1996). *Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction (ECRI) validation study.* Salt Lake City, UT: Exemplary Center for Reading. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED414560) Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

***Failure Free Reading***

Algozzine, B., & Lockavitch, J. F. (1998). Effects of the Failure Free Reading program on students at-risk for reading failure. *Special Services in the Schools*, *13*(1/2), 95–103. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Algozzine, B., Lockavitch, J. F., & Audette, R. (1997). Implementing Failure-Free Reading with students seriously at-risk for failure. *Australian Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *2*(3), 14–17. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Bergquist, C. C., Richardson, G. H., Bigbie, C. L., Castine, W. H., Hancock, W. B., Largent, W. B., et al. (2001). *Final report of the Failure Free Reading Bridges programs funded under Florida's 2000 Specific Appropriation 5A: Executive summary*. Tallahassee, FL: Evaluation Systems Design, Inc. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Blount, L. J. (2003). *Clay County School District comprehensive school reform grant project summary and evaluation report July 1, 1998–June 30, 2001*. Green Cove Springs, FL: Clay County School District. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Educational Enhancement Services. (2000). Greensboro Elementary School comprehensive school reform evaluation report. Retrieved August 26, 2006, from http://www.failurefree.com/downloads/Greensboro_CSRD_Report.PDF Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Additional sources:***

Failure Free Reading. (n.d.). *Research summary intensive intervention for upper elementary students.* Retrieved from http://www.failurefree.com/downloads/FFR_Upper_Elem_Intervention.pdf **(Study: Florida Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) Sites)** The sample is not appropriate to this review: The parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Failure Free Reading. (2003). *Failure Free Reading's continuum of effectiveness: Research summary.* (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). **(Study: Greensboro Elementary, Gadsden County, FL)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

England, G., Collins, S., & Algozzine, B. (n.d.). Effects of Failure Free Reading on culturally and linguistically diverse students with learning disabilities. *Multiple Voices*, *5*(1), 28–37. Does

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading (n.d.). *Chicago Public Schools SES tutoring evaluation*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (n.d.). *Dramatic intensive intervention results in Chicago.* Retrieved from http://www.failurefree.com/downloads/Dulles_Elem_Chicago.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (n.d.). *Failure Free Reading research findings: OhioReads 2000–01 school year results*. Retrieved August 26, 2006, from http://www.failurefree.com/downloads/FFR_OHReads_Set_1.PDF **(Study: Hamden Elementary)** The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Failure Free Reading. (n.d.). *Failure Free Reading research findings: OhioReads 2000–01 school year results*. Retrieved August 26, 2006, from http://www.failurefree.com/downloads/FFR_OHReads_Set_1.PDF **(Study: Secrest Elementary)** The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Failure Free Reading. (n.d.). *Failure Free Reading research findings: OhioReads 2000–01 school year results*. Retrieved August 26, 2006, from http://www.failurefree.com/downloads/FFR_OHReads_Set_1.PDF **(Study: Shumaker Elementary)** The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Failure Free Reading (n.d.). *Independent research study Failure Free Reading research case study*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (n.d.). *Program effectiveness has been shown through an experimental design that includes experimental and control groups created through random assignment or carefully matched comparison groups.* Retrieved from http://www.failurefree.com/downloads/FFR_vs_Control.pdf **(Study: Cowee Elementary, Macon County, NC)** The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Failure Free Reading. (n.d.). *Program effectiveness has been shown through an experimental design that includes experimental and control groups created through random assignment or carefully matched comparison groups.* Retrieved from http://www.failurefree.com/downloads/FFR_vs_Control.pdf **(Study: Southwest Elementary)** Complete data are not reported: the WWC could not evaluate the design because complete data were not reported.

Failure Free Reading. (n.d.). *Research findings concerning the impact of the Failure Free Reading program on at-risk and special education lowest literacy students.* (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). **(Study: Accelerated growth curve)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (n.d.). R*esearch findings concerning the impact of the Failure Free Reading Program on at-risk and special education lowest literacy students.* (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). **(Study: Learning curve of at-risk and special education students)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (n.d.). *Research findings concerning the impact of the Failure Free Reading program on at-risk and special education lowest literacy students.* (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


28025). **(Study: Sustaining growth)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (n.d.). *Research findings concerning the impact of the Failure Free Reading program on at-risk and special education lowest literacy students*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). **(Study: Transfer to standardized measuring instruments)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (n.d.). *Research summary intensive intervention for upper elementary students.* Retrieved from http://www.failurefree.com/downloads/FFR_Upper_Elem_Intervention.pdf **(Study: Klein ISD)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Additional source:***

Failure Free Reading. (2005). *Failure Free Reading's continuum of effectiveness: Research summary.* (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). **(Study: Kline ISD)** Complete data are not reported: the WWC could not evaluate the design because complete data were not reported.

Failure Free Reading. (n.d.). *Research summary intensive intervention for upper elementary students.* Retrieved from http://www.failurefree.com/downloads/FFR_Upper_Elem_Intervention.pdf **(Study: Russellville, AL – Fall 2002)** The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Failure Free Reading. (n.d.). *Research summary intensive intervention for upper elementary students.* Retrieved from http://www.failurefree.com/downloads/FFR_Upper_Elem_Intervention.pdf **(Study: Washington, DC – Spring 2002)** The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

***Additional source:***

Failure Free Reading (2002). *Case study: Washington, D.C. research results: River Terrace Elementary & Miner Elementary*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025) Complete data are not reported: the WWC could not evaluate the design because complete data were not reported.

Failure Free Reading. (1999). *Failure Free Reading's Impact on North Carolina's end of grade assessment.* (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025) **(Study: Cabarrus County – Coltrane-Webb Elementary, NC)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (1999). *Failure Free Reading's Impact on North Carolina's end of grade assessment.* (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025) **(Study: Catawba County)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (1999). *Failure Free Reading's Impact on North Carolina's end of grade assessment.* (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025) **(Study: Johnson County – Benson Elementary, NC)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Additional source:***

Failure Free Reading. (1999). *Benson Elementary's 3rd and 4th graders experience 2 straight years of dramatic reading growth.* (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (1999). *Failure Free Reading's Impact on North Carolina's end of grade assessment.* (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025) **(Study: Lincoln County)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (1999). *Failure Free Reading's Impact on North Carolina's end of grade assessment.* (Available

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025) **(Study: Rutherford County – Rutherfordton Elementary, NC)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (1999). Four week summer school with Failure Free Reading produces greater growth than entire year. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Failure Free Reading. (1999). *Twelve days with Failure Free Reading produced dramatic results* (North Carolina Research Brief 99.102). Retrieved from http://www.failurefree.com/downloads/FFR_Catawba.PDF The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Failure Free Reading. (2003). *Case study: Fairland East Elementary's fourth grade reading blitz*. Concord, NC: Author. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

***Additional source:***

Failure Free Reading (n.d.) *Case study: Fairland East Elementary's after-school solution*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). The sample is not appropriate to this review: The parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Failure Free Reading. (2003). *Failure Free Reading's continuum of effectiveness: Research summary*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). **(Study: Fairland East Elementary, Proctorville, OH)** The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Failure Free Reading. (2003). *Case study: Washington, DC summer reading blitz for special education*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (2003). *Coronado High School Students, El Paso, TX: Stanford Achievement Test growth results*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (2003). *Failure Free Reading research findings: OhioReads 2000–01 school year results*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). **(Study: Chester Elementary)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (2003). *Failure Free Reading research findings: OhioReads 2000–01 school year results*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). **(Study: Fullerton Elementary)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (2003). *Failure Free Reading research findings: OhioReads 2000–01 school year results*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). **(Study: Lowest literacy students during OhioReads)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Additional source:***

Failure Free Reading (2003). *OhioReads research evaluation (2000–2001 School Year) impact on lowest literacy students.* (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (2003). *Failure Free Reading research findings: OhioReads 2000–01 school year results*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). **(Study: Lincoln Elementary)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (2003). *Failure Free Reading research findings: OhioReads 2000–01 school year results*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). **(Study: Lyme Elementary)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (2003). *Failure Free Reading research findings: OhioReads 2000–01 school year results*. Retrieved August 26, 2006, from http://www.failurefree.com/downloads/FFR_OHReads_Set_1.PDF **(Study: Midway Elementary)** The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Failure Free Reading. (2003). *Failure Free Reading research findings: OhioReads 2000–01 school year results*. Retrieved August 26, 2006, from http://www.failurefree.com/downloads/FFR_OHReads_Set_1.PDF **(Study: Miles Standish Elementary)** The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Failure Free Reading. (2003). *Failure Free Reading research findings: OhioReads 2000–01 school year results*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). **(Study: Mount Washington Elementary)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (2003). *Failure Free Reading research findings: OhioReads 2000–01 school year results*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). **(Study: North Elementary, Urbana City Schools)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (2003). *Failure Free Reading research findings: OhioReads 2000–01 school year results*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). **(Study: Perry Elementary)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (2003). *Failure Free Reading research findings: OhioReads 2000–01 school year results*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). **(Study: SC Dennis Elementary)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (2003). *Washington DC—Reed elementary 2002/03 results.* Retrieved from http://www.failurefree.com/downloads/FFR_Reed_Elem_2003.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (2003). *Failure Free Reading research findings: OhioReads 2000–01 school year results*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). **(Study: Williamson Elementary)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (2003). *Failure Free Reading's continuum of effectiveness: Research summary*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). **(Study: Dickerson Elementary)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (2003). *Failure Free Reading's continuum of effectiveness: Research summary*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). **(Study: West Clay Elementary, Clay County, MS)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


Failure Free Reading. (2003). *Failure Free Reading research findings: Intervention for Beginning Reading*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). **(Study: Greenwood, MS: Longitudinal study of at-risk 1st graders)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (2003). *Failure Free Reading research findings: Intervention for Beginning Reading*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025). **(Study: Rowan County, NC: Reading readiness study of at-risk 1st graders)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (2004). *Anne Arundel County, MD*. Retrieved from http://www.failurefree.com/downloads/Anne_Arundel_Summary.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Failure Free Reading. (2004). *Supplemental educational service provider (SSP): Bacon School, Millville, NJ.* Retreived from http://www.failurefree.com/downloads/Bacon_Results_Summary.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Lockavitch, J. F., & Algozzine, B. (1998). Effects of intensive intervention on students at-risk for reading failure. *The Florida Reading Quarterly*, *35*(2), 27–31. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Lockavitch, J. F., Morgan, L., & Algozzine, B. (1999). Accelerating the growth curve: Improving opportunities for children at risk for reading failure. *Proven Practice*, *1*(2), 60–67. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

McElveen, L. K. (2000, June). *Case study: Helen Edwards, Elementary, New Orleans, Louisiana*. (Available from the Failure Free Reading, 140 W. Cabarrus Ave., Concord, NC 28025) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Additional source:***

Failure Free Reading (n.d.). *Case study: Helen Edwards Elementary New Orleans, Louisiana*. (Available from the Failure Free Reading, 140 W. Cabarrus Ave., Concord, NC 28025) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

McElveen, L. K. (2000). *Helen S. Edwards elementary school: Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program (CSRD): Evaluation report for year one of the Failure Free Reading Program*. (Available from the Failure Free Reading, 140 W. Cabarrus Ave., Concord, NC 28025) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. (2003). *Brightmoor America reads challenge: Detroit, Michigan*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Rankhorn, B., England, G., Collins, S. M., Lockavitch, J. F., & Algozzine, B. (1998). Effects of the Failure Free Reading program on students with severe reading disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *31*(3), 307–312. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Schroeder, C., & Henry, S. (2003). *The Copperas Cove I.S.D. Failure Free Reading research project*. (Available from Failure Free Reading, 140 Cabarrus Ave., W., Concord, NC 28025) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Slate, J. (n.d.). *Failure Free Reading: A program evaluation*. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University, Department of Educational Leadership. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


Slate, J., Algozzine, B., & Lockavitch, J. F. (1998). Effects of intensive remedial reading instruction. *Journal of At-Risk Issues*, *5*(1), 30–35. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Fast ForWord®***

Battin, R. R., Young, M., & Burns, M. (2000). Use of Fast ForWord® in remediation of central auditory processing disorders. *Audiology Today*, *12*(2), 13–15. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: this study does not focus on one of the domains specified for this WWC review.

Booth, J. R., Perfetti, C. A., MacWhinney, B., & Hunt, S. B. (2000). The association of rapid temporal perception with orthographic and phonological processing in children and adults with reading impairment. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, *4*(2), 101–132. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Breier, J. I., Gray, L., Fletcher, J. M., Diehl, R. L., Klaas, P., Foorman, B. R., et al. (2001). Perception of voice and tone onset time continua in children with dyslexia with and without attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *80*(3), 245–270. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Friel-Patti, S., DesBarres, K., & Thibodeau, L. (2001). Case studies of children using Fast ForWord®. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *10*(3), 203–215. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Gillam, R. B., Crofford, J. A., Gale, M. A., & Hoffman, L. M. (2001). Language change following computer-assisted language instruction with Fast ForWord® or Laureate Learning Systems Software. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *10*(3), 231–247. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Habib, M., Espesser, R., Rey, V., Giraud, K., Brunas, P., & Gres, C. (1999). Training dyslexics with acoustically modified speech: Evidence of improved phonological awareness. *Brain & Cognition*, *40*, 143–146. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not focus on students learning to read in English, one of the parameters for this WWC review.

Habib, M., Rey, V., Daffaure, V., Camps, R., Espesser, R., Joly-Pottuz, B., et al. (2002). Phonological training in children with dyslexia using temporally modified speech: A three-step pilot investigation. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, *37*(3), 289–308. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not focus on students learning to read in English, one of the parameters for this WWC review.

Hall, L. S. (2002). *Dallas Independent School District, final report: Scientific Learning/Fast ForWord® program: 2001–2002* (Report No. REIS02-168-2). Retrieved from the Scientific Learning Corporation Web site: http://www.scilearn.com/alldocs/rsrch/30051DallasEduRpt.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Hook, P. E., Macaruso, P., & Jones, S. (2001). Efficacy of Fast ForWord® training on facilitating acquisition of reading skills by children with reading difficulties: A longitudinal study. *Annals of Dyslexia*, *51*, 75–96. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Marion, G. G. (2004). An examination of the relationship between students' use of the Fast ForWord® reading program and their performance on standardized assessments in elementary schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *65*(01), 106A. (UMI No. 3120324) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Marler, J. A., Champlin, C. A., & Gillam, R. B. (2001). Backward and simultaneous masking measured in children with language-learning impairments who received intervention with Fast ForWord® or Laureate Learning Systems Software. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *10*(3), 258–268. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: this study does not focus on one of the domains specified for this WWC review.

Merzenich, M. M., Jenkins, W. M., Johnston, P., Schreiner, C., Miller, S. L., Tallal, P. (1996). Temporal processing deficits of language-learning impaired children ameliorated by training. *Science*, *271*, 77–80. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: this study does not focus on one of the domains specified for this WWC review.

Merzenich, M. M., Miller, S. L., Jenkins, W. M., Saunders, G., Protopapas, A., Peterson, B. E.,& Tallal, P. (1997). Amelioration of the acoustic reception and speech reception deficits underlying language-based learning impairments. In C. von Euler, I. Lundberg, & R. Llinas (Eds.), *Basic mechanisms in cognition and language.* (pp. 143–172). New York: Elsevier. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: this study does not focus on one of the domains specified for this WWC review.

Merzenich, M. M., Saunders, G., Jenkins, W. M., Miller, S. L., Peterson, B. E., Tallal, P. (1999). Pervasive developmental disorders: Listening training and language abilities. In S. H. Broman, & J. M. Fletcher (Eds.), *The changing nervous system: Neurobehavioral consequences of early brain disorders.* (pp. 365–385). New York: Oxford University Press. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: this study does not focus on one of the domains specified for this WWC review.

Merzenich, M. M., Tallal, P., Peterson, B. E., Miller, S. L., & Jenkins, W. M. (1999). Some neurological principles relevant to the origins of—and the cortical plasticity-based remediation of—developmental language impairments. In J. Grafman & Y. Christen (Eds.), *Neuroplasticity: Building a bridge from the laboratory to the clinic.* (pp. 169–187). Amsterdam: Elsevier. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: this study does not focus on one of the domains specified for this WWC review.

Miller, S. L., Merzenich, M. M., Tallal, P., DeVivo, K., LaRossa, K., Linn, N., et al. (1999). *Fast ForWord® training in children with low reading performance.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Jaarcongres Auditieve Vaardigheden en Spraak-taal (Dutch National Speech-Language Association), Woerden, Netherlands. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Nagarajan, S. S., Wang, X., Merzenich, M. M., Schreiner, C., Johnston, P., Jenkins, W. M., et al. (1998). Speech modifications algorithms used for training language learning-impaired children. *IEEE Transactions on Rehabilitation Engineering*, *6*(3), 257–268. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: this study does not focus on one of the domains specified for this WWC review.

Pokorni, J. L., Worthington, C. K., & Jamison, P. J. (2004). Phonological awareness intervention: Comparison of Fast ForWord®, Earobics, and LiPS. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *97*(3), 147–157. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Rouse, C. E., & Krueger, A. B. (2004). Putting computerized instruction to the test: A randomized evaluation of a "scientifically based" reading program. *Economics of Education Review*, *23*(4), 323–338. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Schopmeyer, B., Mellon, N., Dobaj, H., Grant, G., & Niparko, J. K. (2000). Use of Fast ForWord® to enhance language development in children with cochlear implants. *Annals of Otology,*

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


*Rhinology & Laryngology*, *109*(12), 95–98. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: this study does not focus on one of the domains specified for this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corportation. (n.d.). Summary of data collected and analyzed by the Dallas Independent School District (Research and Outcomes Department Report #129). Texas: Author. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: this study does not focus on one of the domains specified for this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (1998). *National field trial results*. Oakland, CA: Author. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2002). *Scientifically based reading research and the Fast ForWord products: Research implications for effective language and reading intervention* (Education Department Report #127). Oakland, CA: Author. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2003). *Cherry Hill Public School District, New Jersey*. Oakland, CA: Author. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2003). *Cobb County School District, Georgia*. Oakland, CA: Author. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2003). *Fast ForWord® language to reading: A research study*. Oakland, CA: Author. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2003). Fast ForWord Middle and High School: A research study (Report No. 117). Oakland, CA: Research and Outcomes Department.The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2003). Improved language and early reading skills of English-language learners in the Paradise Valley Unified School District who used Fast ForWord® Language. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *7*(7), 1–5. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2003). Improved language skills by students in the Escambia County School District who used Fast ForWord® Products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *7*(8), 1–6. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2003). Improved listening comprehension by middle school students in the Waupun School District who used Fast ForWord® Middle & High School. *MAPS for Learning: Educator Reports*, *7*(2), 1–4. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2003). Improved reading achievement by middle school students at George Thomas Middle School who used Fast ForWord® Products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(22), 1–3. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2003). Improved reading skills by high school students in the Pocatello/Chubbuck School District #25 who used Fast ForWord® Middle & High School. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *7*(5), 1–4. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2003). Improved reading skills by students in the exceptional student education program in the Osceola County School District who used Fast ForWord® Language. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *7*(1), 1–4. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2003). Improved reading vocabulary and comprehension skills by students in the School District of Philadelphia who used Fast ForWord® Language. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *7*(6), 1–4. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2003). *School District 154, Illinois*. Oakland, CA: Author. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved academic achievement by students in the Manchester City School District, Tennessee, who used Fast ForWord® Products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(7), 1–5. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved academic skills of low-performing students in the Pacifica School District who used Fast ForWord® Products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(1), 1–7. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved cognitive and early reading by students in the Berlin School District who used Fast ForWord® Products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(31), 1–5. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved cognitive and early reading skills by students in the Stamford City School District who used Fast ForWord® Products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(30), 1–4. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved cognitive and language skills by students in the Niagara Falls City School District who used Fast ForWord® Products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(35), 1–6. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved early reading skills by students in the Marshall County School District who used Fast ForWord® Basics. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(12), 1–3. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved language and early reading skills by students at the Rockaway Township School District who used Fast ForWord® Products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(15), 1–5. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved language and early reading skills by students in the Cherry Hill Public School District in New Jersey who used Fast ForWord® Language.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


*Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(4), 1–4. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved language and early reading skills by students in the Harrisburg School who used Fast ForWord® Language. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(10), 1–5. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved language and early reading skills by students who used Fast ForWord® Language to Reading. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(1), 1–4. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved language and early reading skills by students who used Fast ForWord® Middle & High School. *Maps for Learning: Product Reports*, *8*(2), 1–4. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved language and early reading skills by students who used Fast ForWord® to Reading 3. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(3), 1–3. Does not use a strong causal design: this study, which uses a quasi-experimental design, does not use equating measures to ensure that the comparison group is equivalent to the treatment group.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved language and reading achievement by students in the Grainger County School District who used the Fast ForWord® Language product. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(2), 1–4. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved language and reading skills by students at Title I schools who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(16), 1–8. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved language and reading skills by students in the Albuquerque Public School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(33), 1–5. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved language and reading skills by students in the Boone County School Disctrict who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning, Educator Reports*, *8*(17), 1–7. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved language and reading skills by students in the Los Banos Unified School District who used Fast ForWord® Products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(18), 1–6. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved language and reading skills by students in the Puyallup School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(11), 1–6. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved language and reading skills by students in the School District of Philadelphia who were receiving services for special education and who

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(20), 1–4. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved language skills by children with low reading performance who used Fast ForWord® Language. *Maps for Learning: Product Report*, *3*(1), 1–13. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved language skills by students at Mora School District who used Fast ForWord® Language. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(19), 1–4. Does not use a strong causal design: there was only one intervention and/or one comparison unit, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved language skills by students in Shelby County School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(26), 1–6. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved language skills by students in the Brainerd School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(29), 1–5. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved language skills by students in the Pottsville School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning, Educator Reports*, *8*(24), 1–4. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved Ohio reading proficiency test scores by students in the Springfield City School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(8), 1–5. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved reading achievement by students in the Bay District Schools in Florida who used Fast ForWord® Products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(27), 1–4. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved reading abilities by students in the Bethlehem Area School District in Pennsylvania who used the Fast ForWord® Language product. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(3), 1–4. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved reading achievement by students in the Pawhuska and Harlandale School Districts who used Fast ForWord® to Reading 3. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *7*(13), 1–3. Does not use a strong causal design: this study, which uses a quasi-experimental design, does not use equating measures to ensure that the comparison group is equivalent to the treatment group.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved reading achievement by students in the School District of Philadelphia who used Fast ForWord® Products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(21), 1–6. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved reading comprehension by students in the Trumbull Public Schools who

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


used Fast ForWord® Products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(34), 1–5. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved reading skills by students in the Virginia Department of Correctional Education who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(28), 1–5. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Improved reading skills by students who used Fast ForWord® to Reading 3. *Maps for Learning: Product Reports*, *8*(3), 1–3. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Increased reading achievement by students in Pocatello/Chubbuck school district 25 who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(32), 1–3. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2004). Reading skills improved by students at Centerville Elementary School who used Fast ForWord® to Reading 3. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *8*(2), 1–5. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved academic achievement by students in the Christina School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(7), 1–10. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved academic achievement by students in the Joshua Independent School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(19), 1–5. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved academic skills in the Harlem School District 12 by students with Native American ancestry who used Fast ForWord® Products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(12), 1–4. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved academic skills by students at Harlem School District 12 who used Fast ForWord® Products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(11), 1–4. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved oral language skills by students in the Weymouth Public Schools who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(18), 1–5. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved reading achievement by students in the Miami-Dade County Public Schools who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(10), 1–5. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved reading achievement by students in Oregon City School District who

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(20), 1–5. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved reading achievement by students in the Washington Local School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(9), 1–6. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved reading skills by students in a Texas school district who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(24), 1–6. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved reading skills by students in the Anne Arundel County Public Schools who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(4), 1–5. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved reading skills by students in the Clover Park School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(6), 1–7. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved reading skills by students in the Columbia School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(36), 1–8. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved reading skills by students in the El Campo Independent School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(29), 1–5. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved reading skills by students in the El Campo Independent School District who used Fast ForWord® products with a 30–minute protocol. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(35), 1–4. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved reading skills by students in the Erlanger-Elsmere Independent School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(22), 1–4. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved reading skills by students in the Hingham Public School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(26), 1–4. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved reading skills by students in the La Joya Independent School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(32), 1–7. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved reading skills by students in the Milford City School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(1), 1–4. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved reading skills by students in the Monessen City School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(23), 1–6. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved reading skills by students in the Portsmouth School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *10*(8), 1–4. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved reading skills by students in the Poteau School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(16), 1–5. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved reading skills by students in the School District of Philadelphia who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(31), 1–6. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved reading skills by students in the United Independent School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(27), 1–5. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved reading skills by students in the Wichita Falls Independent School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(13), 1–4. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved reading skills by students in Todd County School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *MAPS for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(14), 1–8. The sample is not appropriate to this review: The parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved reading skill by students in Weakley County School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(21), 1–6. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2005). Improved reading skills by students in Williamsport Area School District who used Fast ForWord® Language. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *9*(15), 1–4. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2006). Improved academic achievement by students in the Hamilton County School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *10*(1), 1–4. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2006). Improved language and reading skills by students in NSW Australia who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *10*(3), 1–5. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2006). Improved reading skills and behavior in primary school students who used Fast ForWord® Language at a Singapore Public School. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *10*(5), 1–6. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Scientific Learning Corporation. (2006). Improved reading skills by students in Boone County School District who used Fast ForWord® products. *Maps for Learning: Educator Reports*, *10*(15), 1–7. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Slattey, C. A. (2003). The impact of a computer-based training system on strengthening phonemic awareness and increasing reading ability level. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *64*(09), 3234A. (UMI No. 3103754) The sample is not

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Tallal, P., Miller, S. L., Bedi, G., Byma, G., Wang, X., Nagarajan, S. S., Schreiner, C., Jenkins , W. M., & Merzenich, M. M. (1996). Language comprehension in language-learning impaired children improved with acoustically modified speech. *Science*, *271*, 81–84. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: this study does not focus on one of the domains specified for this WWC review.

Tallal, P., Saunders, G., Miller, S., Jenkins, W. M., Protopapas, A., & Merzenich, M. M. (1997). Rapid training-driven improvement in language ability in autistic and other PDD children. *Society for Neuroscience—Abstracts*, *23*, 490. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Temple, E., Deutsch, G. K., Poldrack, R. A., Miller, S. L., Tallal, P., Merzenich, M. M., & Gabrieli, J. D. E. (2003). Neural deficits in children with dyslexia ameliorated by behavioral remediation: Evidence from functional MRI. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *100* (5), 2860–2865. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: this study does not focus on one of the domains specified for this WWC review.

Temple, E., Poldrack, R. A., Protopapas, A., Salz, T., Tallal, P., Merzenich, M. M., Gabrieli, J. D. E. (2000). Disruption of the neural response to rapid acoustic stimuli in dyslexia: Evidence from functional MRI. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *97*(25), 13907–13912. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: this study does not focus on one of the domains specified for this WWC review.

Thibodeau, L., Friel-Patti, S., & Britt, L. (2001). Psychoacoustic performance in children completing Fast ForWord® training. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *10*(3), 248–257. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: this study does not focus on one of the domains specified for this WWC review.

Trei, L. (2003, February). Remediation training improves reading ability of dyslexic children. *Stanford Report.* Retrieved from http://news-service.stanford.edu/news/2003/february26/dyslexia-226.html The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Troia, G. A. (2004). Migrant students with limited English proficiency: Can Fast ForWord® Language™ make a difference in their language skills and academic achievement? *Remedial and Special Education*, *25*(6), 353-368. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

Troia, G. A., & Whitney, S. D. (2002). A close look at the efficacy of Fast ForWord® Language for children with academic weaknesses. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *28*(4), 465–494. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not disaggregate data for students in other grades from students in grades K–3, the focus of this WWC review.

***Fast Track Action Reading Program***

City of Montgomery, Alabama. (n.d.). *Test interpretation.* Author. (Available from Action Reading, Lost Technology, LLP, 7908 Mill Creek Circle, West Chester, OH 45069 – 5805) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***First Steps***

St. John, E. P., Manset, G., Chung, C., Simmons, A. B., & Musoba, G. D. (2000). *Research-based reading interventions: The impact of Indiana's Early Literacy Grant Program.* Bloomington: Indiana University, Indiana Education Policy Center, Smith Center for Research in Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED447466) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


***Four Block Framework***

Popplewell, S. R., & Doty, D. E. (2001). Classroom instruction and reading comprehension: A comparison of one basal reader approach and the four-blocks framework. *Reading Psychology*, *22*(2), 83–95. There was only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Wang, L. W., & Ross, S. M. (2003). *Comparisons between elementary school programs on reading performance: Albuquerque Public Schools*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy. Does not use a strong causal design: this study, which used a quasi-experimental design, does not use equating measures to ensure that the comparison group is equivalent to the treatment group.

***Frontline Phonics***

Frontline Educational Products. (n.d.). *Frontline Coaching: Case study*. Orem, UT: Author. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

***Funnix***

Parlange, L. A. (2004). *The effects of the Funnix Beginning Reading Program on the reading skills of preschoolers.* Unpublished paper, Eastern Washington University. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

***Goldman-Lynch Sounds-in-Symbols Development Kit***

Richards, M. L. (1995). *Goldman-Lynch in the classroom: Does phonemic awareness improve early reading ability in a whole-language setting*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

***Guided Discovery LOGO***

Robinson, M., Gilley, W. F., & Uhlig, G. E. (1988). The effects of Guided Discovery Logo on SAT performance of first grade students. *Education*, *109*(2), 226–231. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

***Headsprout Early Reading***

Headsprout. (n.d.). *Students using Headsprout Early Reading™ achieve substantial reading gains: Randomized control and multi-year studies show Headsprout Early Reading produces significant reading outcomes for kindergarten and first grade*. Retrieved from http://static.headsprout.com/pdf/headsprout%20nyc%20substantial%20reading%20gains%20-%20preliminary%20results.pdf Complete data are not reported: the WWC could not evaluate the design because complete data were not reported. Attempts to contact the authors for more information were unsuccessful.

Layng, T. V. J., Twyman, J. S., & Stikeleather, G. (2003). Headsprout Early Reading: Reliably teaching children to read. *Behavioral Technology Today*, *3*, 7–20. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Layng, T. V. J., Twyman, J. S., & Stikeleather, G. (2004). Engineering discovery learning: The contingency adduction of some precursors of textual responding in a beginning reading program. *Analysis of Verbal Behavior*, *20*, 99–109. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


Layng, T. V. J., Twyman, J. S., & Stikeleather, G. (2004). Selected for success: How Headsprout Reading Basics teaches beginning reading. In D. J. Moran & R. Malott (Eds.), *Empirically supported educational methods.* St. Louis, MO: Elsevier Science/Academic Press. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***HOTS***

Pogrow, S. (1995). *A revalidation of the effectiveness of the HOTS program*. Retrieved from Higher Order Thinking Skills Web site: http://www.hots.org/docs/NDN.pdf The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

***Huntington Phonics***

Tupper, A. T. (2000). A comparison of two systematic decoding programs for developing reading skills in beginning readers. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *61*(11), 4326A. (UMI No. 9995925) Does not use a strong causal design: there was only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

***IntelliTools Reading***

Erickson, K. A., & Stanger, C. (n. d.). *Balanced literacy instruction and an integrated beginning reading program*. Retrieved from IntelliTools Web site: http://store.cambiumlearning.com/Resources/Research/pdf/itc_Research_BalancedLit_01.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

***Invitations to Literacy***

EDSTAR, Inc. (n.d.). *Technical report: Houghton Mifflin Invitations to Literacy California reading performance evaluation.* Raleigh, NC: Author. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

EDSTAR, Inc. (2002). *Analysis of the effects of using Houghton Mifflin Reading Programs on reading test scores in Chicago Public Schools*. Raleigh, NC: Author. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K-3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

EDSTAR, Inc. (2002). *Houghton Mifflin Invitations to Literacy California reading performance evaluation*. Raleigh, NC: Author. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group is comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

***Jigsaw Classroom***

Moskowitz, J. M., Malvin, J. H., Schaeffer, G. A., & Schaps, E. (1983). Evaluation of a cooperative learning technique. *American Educational Research Journal*, *20*(4), 687–696. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Moskowitz, J. M., Malvin, J. H., Schaeffer, G. A., & Schaps, E. (1985). Evaluation of Jigsaw, a cooperative learning technique. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *10*(2), 104–112. The sample is not appropriate to this review: The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

***Jostens Integrated Language Arts Basic Learning System***

Standish, D. G. (1995). The effects on reading comprehension of Jostens' Integrated Language Arts for second-grade

students along with Jostens' Basic Learning System for second-grade Chapter 1 students. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *57*(03), 1079A. (UMI No. 9623238) Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

***Kindergarten Works***

O'Hearn-Curran, M. C. (1999). What we need to know about linking assessment and phonemic awareness training in the classroom we can learn in kindergarten. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *60*(11), 3904A. (UMI No. 9950194) Confound: this study included Kindergarten Works but combined it with other interventions so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

***Ladders to Literacy***

Notari-Syverson, A., O'Connor, R. E., & Vadasy, P. F. (1996). *Supporting the development of early literacy in preschool children with disabilities*. Seattle: Washington Research Institute. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Notari-Syverson, A., O'Connor, R. E. & Vadasy, P. F. (1996). *Facilitating language and literacy development in preschool children: To each according to their needs*. New York, NY: Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Meeting. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 395692). The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

O'Hearn-Curran, M. C. (1999). What we need to know about linking assessment and phonemic awareness training in the classroom we can learn in kindergarten. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *60*(11), 3904A. (UMI No. 9950194) Confound: this study included *Ladders to Literacy* but combined it with other interventions so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

***Letter People***

Crosswhite, L., & Sieradzki, C. C. (2003). Efficacy study of the Letter People Programs 2000–2002. (Available from Abrams & Company Publishers, Inc., P.O. Box 10025, Waterbury, CT 06725) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Letter People. (2005). Letter People study-Hamden, CT. (Available from Abrams & Company Publishers, Inc., P.O. Box 10025, Waterbury, CT 06725). Complete data are not reported: the WWC could not evaluate the design because complete data were not reported. Attempts to contact the authors for more information were unsuccessful.

Letter People. (2005). Letter People study–Kent, WA. (Available from Abrams & Company Publishers, Inc., P.O. Box 10025, Waterbury, CT 06725). Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Letter People. (2005). Letter People study–Rutherford, TN. (Available from Abrams & Company Publishers, Inc., P.O. Box 10025, Waterbury, CT 06725). Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Letter People. (2005). Letter People study–University of Northern Iowa. (Available from Abrams & Company Publishers, Inc., P.O. Box 10025, Waterbury, CT 06725). Complete data are not reported: the WWC cannot evaluate the design because complete data are not reported. Attempts to contact the authors for more information were unsuccessful.

***Leap into Phonics***

Pettis, A. M. (2000). *A study on phonological awareness: The comparison of two computer-based programs used as intervention for students with disabilities.* Unpublished master's thesis, Grand Valley State University, Allendale, MI. High overall attrition: this study reported severe overall attrition.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*

***Lexia Learning Systems***


Lankutis, T. (2001). Co:Writer. *Technology & Learning*, *21*(10), 24. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified student outcome measures but this study does not focus on students.

MacLaughlin, A. I. (2003). *Will a computer based phonics practice program result in higher reading and writing skills for kindergarten children?* Unpublished master's thesis, Salem State College, MA. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Ruth, R. (1997). *Remedial reading instruction using the Accelerated Learning Program.* Retrieved from http://www.lexialearning.co.nz/library/source/research/robert_ruth_1997.pdf The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Stevens, D. A. (2000, March). *Leveraging technology to improve test scores: A case study of low-income Hispanic students*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Conference on Learning with Technology, Cambridge, MA. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.


***Literacy Collaborative***


Literacy Collaborative Research and Evaluation Center. (2003). Increasing student achievement in Ohio. Columbus: Ohio State University, Literacy Collaborative Research and Evaluation Center. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Literacy Collaborative Research and Evaluation Center. (2003). *Student achievement in Literacy Collaborative schools: Reanalysis of 2002 research report data*. Columbus, OH: Author. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Manset, G., St John, E. P., & Simmons, A. B. (2000). *Progress in early literacy: Summary evaluation of Indiana's early literacy intervention grant program, 1997–98 through 1999–00 school year*. Bloomington: Indiana Education Policy Center. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Pinnell, G. S. (1998). *ELLI research report*. Columbus: Ohio State University, The Early Literacy Learning Initiative. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Scharer, P. L., Williams, E. J., & Pinnell, G. S. (2001). *Literacy Collaborative 2001 research report*. Columbus: Ohio State University, Literacy Collaborative. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

St. John, E. P., Manset, G., Chung, C., Simmons, A. B., & Musoba, G. D. (2000). *Research-based reading interventions: The impact of Indiana's Early Literacy Grant Program.* Bloomington: Indiana University, Indiana Education Policy Center, Smith Center for Research in Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED447466) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

St John, E. P., Manset, G., Chung, C. G., Simmons, A. B., Musoba, G. D., Manoil, K., et al. (2000). *Research-based reading reforms: The impact of state-funded interventions on educational outcomes in urban elementary schools* (Report No. 00-08). Bloomington: Indiana Education Policy Center. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Williams, E. J., Scharer, P. L., & Pinnell, G. S. (2000). *Literacy Collaborative 2000 research report*. Columbus: Ohio State University, Literacy Collaborate. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Williams, E. J. (2002). The power of data utilization in bringing about systemic school change: Presidential address. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, *15*(1), 4–10. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


Williams, E. J. (2004). *Literacy Collaborative 1999 research report*. Columbus: Ohio State University, Literacy Collaborative. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Literacy First***

Grady, L. (2000). *Reading achievement effects of Literacy First process as measured by Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) Reading 1998, 1999, 2000*. Mill Creek, Washington: Literacy First Comprehensive Reading Reform Process Professional Development Institute, Inc.. The sample is not appropriate to this review: The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Literacy First Process. (2004). *Middle school – high school: Excellence in reading and student achievement*. Mill Creek, Washington: Professional Development Institute, Inc. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. (2003). *Oklahoma commission for teacher preparation: Literacy First phase IV school program report on progress*. Austin: TX: Author. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Little Books***

McCormick, C. E., & Mason, J. M. (1989). Fostering reading for Head Start children with Little Books. In J. Allen & J. M. Mason (Eds.), *Risk makers, risk takers, risk breakers: Reducing the risks for young literacy learners* (pp. 154–177). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

***Additional source:***

McCormick, C. E., & Mason, J. M. (1986). Use of Little Books at home: A minimal intervention strategy that fosters early reading (Tech. Rep. No. 338). Champaign: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Center for the Study of Reading. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED314742)

***My Reading Coach™***

Bliss, J., Larrabee, J., & Schnitzler, P. (2002). *The performance of a new computer-based reading tutor*. Retrieved from Mindplay Web site: http://images.pcmac.org/Uploads/ELSSystems/ELSSystems/Divisions/DocumentsCategories/Documents/Comp-BasedReadingTeacher.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Mindplay. (n.d.). *My Reading Coach™ case studies and pilot results.* (Available from Mindplay Educational Software, 440 S. Williams Blvd., Suite #206, Tucson, AZ 85711) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Mindplay. (n.d.). *My Reading Coach™ Ocotillo Elementary School pilot results.* (Available from Mindplay Educational Software, 440 S. Williams Blvd., Suite #206, Tucson, AZ 85711) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Mindplay. (n.d.). *Pilot results for My Reading Coach™ Computer Assisted Instruction program.* (Available from Mindplay Educational Software, 440 S. Williams Blvd., Suite #206, Tucson, AZ 85711) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Mindplay. (n.d.). *Scientifically-based reading research: Mindplay's My Reading Coach™.* (Available from Mindplay Educational Software, 440 S. Williams Blvd., Suite #206, Tucson, AZ 85711) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***New Century Integrated Instructional System***

Manzo, K. K. (2000, March). Dallas reading initiative produces limited results. *Education Week*, *19*(25), 11. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified student outcome measures but this study does not focus on students.

New Century Education Corporation. (n.d.). *Documented results from client schools*. Piscataway, NJ: Author. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

New Century Education Corporation. (2003). *New Century Integrated Instructional Program*. Piscataway, NJ: Author. The sample is not appropriate to this review: The parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

New Century Education Corporation. (2003). *Study of efficacy of New Century Education Corporation's integrated instructional system as a reading intervention among elementary school students.* Draft report for New Century Education Corporation. Does not use a strong causal: there was only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

***Additonal source:***

New Century Education Corporation. (2002). *Study of efficacy of New Century Education Corporation: Integrated instructional system as a reading intervention among elementary school students*. Piscataway, NJ: Author. Does not use a strong causal design: this study, which uses a quasi-experimental design, does not use equating measures to ensure that the comparison group is equivalent to the treatment group.

Weinstock, R. (2004). A Title I tale: High reading/math gains at low cost in Kansas City, Kansas. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 632–634. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Additional source:***

Weinstock, R. (1984). A Title 1 tale: High reading/math gains at low cost to Kansas City, Kansas. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 632. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Onward to Excellence***

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. (1989). *Success for all students: How "Onward to Excellence" uses R&D to improve schools*. Portland, OR: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED314865) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Open Court***

McGraw-Hill Education. (2002). *Results with Open Court Reading*. New York: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED464189) **(Study: Canopy Oaks Elementary, Tallahassee, FL)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

McGraw-Hill Education. (2002). *Results with Open Court Reading*. New York: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED464189) **(Study: Curtis Creek School District, Sonora, CA)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

McGraw-Hill Education. (2002). *Results with Open Court Reading*. New York: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED464189) **(Study: Fort Worth Independent School District, Fort Worth, TX)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

McGraw-Hill Education. (2002). *Results with Open Court Reading*. New York: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED464189) **(Study: Hartsfield Elementary School, Tallahassee, FL)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

McGraw-Hill Education. (2002). *Results with Open Court Reading*. New York: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED464189) **(Study: Kelso Elementary School,**

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


**Inglewood, CA)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

McGraw-Hill Education. (2002). *Results with Open Court Reading*. New York: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED464189) **(Study: Lemoore Union Elementary School District, Lemoore, CA)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

McGraw-Hill Education. (2002). *Results with Open Court Reading*. New York: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED464189) **(Study: Public School 161, Crown Heights, Brooklyn, NY)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

McGraw-Hill Education. (2002). *Results with Open Court Reading*. New York: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED464189) **(Study: Sacramento City Unified School District, Sacramento, CA)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Wehby, J. H., Falk, K. B., Barton-Arwood, S., Lane, K. L., & Cooley, C. (2003). The impact of comprehensive reading instruction on the academic and social behavior of students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, *11*(4), 225. Confound: this study included Open Court but combined it with another intervention so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

***Pause Prompt & Praise***

Goyen, J. D., & McClelland, D. J. (1994). Pause, Prompt and Praise: The need for more research. *Journal of Research in Reading, 17*(2), 108–119. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Medcalf, J. (1989). Comparison of peer tutored remedial reading using the Pause, Prompt and Praise procedure with an individualised tape-assisted reading programme. *Educational Psychologist, 9*(3), 253–262. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

***Peabody Language Development Kits***

Yoshinaga-Itano, C., & Downey, D. M. (1992). When a story is not a story: A process analysis of the written language of hearing impaired children. *Volta Review*, *94*(2), 131–158. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: the outcomes in this study does not address one of the domains of interest in this review.

***Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS)***

Bergeron, J. (1998). A comparison of classwide cross-age and same-age peer tutoring for second-grade students at risk for reading failure. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *59*(09), 3390A. (UMI No. 9905010). Confound: there was only one classroom in each study condition, so the effects of the intervention could not be separated from the effects of the teacher.

Fuchs, D., Fuchs, L. S., Mathes, P. G., & Simmons, D. (1997). Peer-assisted learning strategies: Making classrooms more responsive to diversity. *American Educational Research Journal*, *34*(1), 174–206. The sample is not appropriate for this review; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range (K through 3rd grade) from those outside the range.

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., & Kazdan, S. (1999). Effects of peer-assisted learning strategies on high school students with serious reading problems. *Remedial and Special Education*, *20*(5), 309–318. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Hudson, K. G. (2004). The effects of Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies on the reading achievement of elementary students with and without decoding weaknesses. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *65*(10), 3754A. (UMI No. 3149163) The

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Pearson, J. J. M. (2004). The effect of peer-assisted literacy strategies on the social standing of first-grade readers. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65*(2–A), 412A. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified student outcome measures but this study does not focus on students.

Sáenz, L. M., Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (2005). Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies for English language learners with learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 71,* 231–247. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades kindergarten through third grade; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Wehby, J. H., Falk, K. B., Barton-Arwood, S., Lane, K. L., & Cooley, C. (2003). The impact of comprehensive reading instruction on the academic and social behavior of students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, *11*(4), 225. Confound: this study included PALS but combined it with another intervention so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

***Phono-Graphix***

McGuinness, C., McGuinness, D., & McGuinness, G. (1996). Phono-Graphix: A new method for remediating reading difficulties. *Annals of Dyslexia*, *46*, 73–96. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

McGuinness, C., & McGuiness, G. (1996). *Research: A short report on Phono-Graphix clinical and classroom application on British school children*. Retrieved from Read America. Retrieved from Web site: http://www.readamerica.net/memberResearchView.asp?ResearchID=8 Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Project CHILD***

Bird, J. B. H. (1999). An academic comparison between Project CHILD and the traditional classroom. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *60*(03), 0633A. (UMI No. 9922208) Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

***Project FAST (Families Are Students and Teachers)***

Hampton, F. M., Mumford, D. A., & Bond, L. (1998). Parent involvement in inner-city schools: The Project FAST extended family approach to success. *Urban Education*, *33*(3), 410–427. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

***Project LISTEN's Reading Tutor***

Aist, G. (2001). Towards automatic glossarization: Automatically constructing and administering vocabulary assistance factoids and multiple-choice assessment. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, *12*, 212–231. The sample is not appropriate for this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified student outcome measures but this study does not focus on students.

Aist, G., Kort, B., Reilly, R., Mostow, J., & Picard, R. (2002, June). *Experimentally augmenting an intelligent tutoring system with human-supplied capabilities: Adding human-provided emotional scaffolding to an automated reading tutor that listens*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Workshop on Empirical Methods for Tutorial Dialogue Systems, San Sebastian, Spain. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: the outcomes in this study does not address one of the domains of interest in this review.

Aist, G. S., & Mostow, J. (2000, June). *Using automated within-subject invisible experiments to test the effectiveness of*

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


*automated vocabulary assistance*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Workshop on Modeling Human Teaching Tactics and Strategies, Montreal, Canada. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Banerjee, S., Beck, J., & Mostow, J. (2003, September). *Evaluating the effect of predicting oral reading miscues*. Paper presented at the meeting of the European Conference on Speech Communication and Technology (Eurospeech 2003), Geneva, Switzerland. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Beck, J. E., Jia, P., & Mostow, J. (2003, June). *Assessing student proficiency in a reading tutor that listens*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Conference on User Modeling, Johnstown, PA. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Beck, J. E., Mostow, J., Cuneo, A., & Bey, J. (2003, July). *Can automated questioning help children's reading comprehension?* Paper presented at the meeting of the International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education, Sydney, Australia. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Hauptmann, A. G., Chase, L. L., & Mostow, J. (1993, September). *Speech recognition applied to reading assistance for children: A baseline language model*. Paper presented at the meeting of the European Conference on Speech Communication and Technology, Berlin, Germany. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify student outcome measures but this study does not focus on students.

Jia, P., Beck, J. E., & Mostow, J. (2002, June). *Can a reading tutor that listens use inter-word latency to assess a student's reading ability?* Paper presented at the meeting of the Workshop on Creating Valid Diagnostic Assessments, San Sebastian, Spain. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Mostow, J., & Aist, G. (1997, July). *The sounds of silence: Towards automated evaluation of student learning in a reading tutor that listens*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Association for Artificial Intelligence, Providence, RI. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Mostow, J., Aist, G., Burkhead, P., Corbett, A., Cuneo, A., Eitelman, S., et al. (2003). Evaluation of an automated reading tutor that listens: Comparison to human tutoring and classroom instruction. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *29*(1), 61–117. Complete data are not reported: the WWC could not evaluate the design because complete data were not reported. Attempts to contact the authors for more information were unsuccessful.

***Additional sources:***

Aist, G., Mostow, J., Tobin, B., Burkhead, P., Corbett, A., Cuneo, A., et al. (2001). Computer-assisted oral reading helps third graders learn vocabulary better than a classroom control—about as well as one-on-one human-assisted oral reading. *Proceedings of the Tenth Artificial Intelligence in Education (AI-ED) Conference*, San Antonio, TX.

Mostow, J., Aist, G., Burkhead, P., Corbett, A., Cuneo, S. E., Huang, C., et al. (1992). Evaluation of an automated reading tutor that listens: Comparison to human tutoring and classroom instruction. Draft manuscript to appear in *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 29*(1).

Mostow, J., Aist, G., Burkhead, P., Corbett, A., Cuneo, A., Rossbach, S., et al. (2002). Independent versus computer-assisted reading: Equal-time comparison of sustained silent reading to an automated reading tutor that listens. Pittsburgh,

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


PA: Project LISTEN. Complete data are not reported: the WWC could not evaluate the design because complete data were not reported. Attempts to contact the authors for more information were unsuccessful.

***Additional source:***

Mostow, J., Aist, G., Bey, J., Burkhead, P., Cuneo, A., Junker, B. et al. (2002, June). *Independent practice versus computer-guided oral reading: Equal-time comparison of sustained silent reading to an automated reading tutor that listens.* Powerpoint presented at the meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Reading, Chicago, IL.

Mostow, J., Aist, G., Huang, C., Junker, B., Kennedy, R., Lan, H., et al. (2001). Four-month evaluation of a learner-controlled reading tutor that listens. In V. M. Holland, & F. N. Fisher (Eds.), *Speech Technology for Language Learning.* Lisse, Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger Publishers. Complete data are not reported: the WWC could not evaluate the design because complete data were not reported. Attempts to contact the authors for more information were unsuccessful.

Mostow, J., Beck, J. E., & Valeri, J. (2003, June). *Can automated emotional scaffolding affect student persistence? A baseline experiment*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Conference on User Modeling, Johnstown, PA. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify student outcome measures but this study does not focus on students.

Mostow, J., Beck, J., Winter, S. V., Wang, S., & Tobin, B. (2002, September). *Predicting oral reading miscues*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Conference on Spoken Language Processing, Denver, CO. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Mostow, J., Huang, C., & Tobin, B. (2001). Pause the video: Quick but quantitative expert evaluation of tutorial choices in a reading tutor that listens. In J. D. Moore., C. L. Redfield., & W. L. Johnson (Eds.), *Artifical intelligence in education: AI-ED in the wired and wireless future.* (343–353). Amsterdam, Netherlands: IOS Press. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Mostow, J., Roth, S., Hauptmann, A. G., Kane, M. (1994). A prototype reading coach that listens. *Proceedings of the American Association for Artificial Intelligence*, 785–792. Available from http://citeseer.ist.psu.edu/cache/papers/cs/10944/http:zSzzSzwww.ri.cmu.eduzSzpub_fileszSzpub1-zSzmostow_jack_1994_1zSzmostow_jack_1994_1.pdf/ Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Tam, Y., Beck, J., Mostow, J., & Banerjee, S. (2003, September). *Training a confidence measure for a reading tutor that listens*. Paper presented at the meeting of the European Conference on Speech Communication and Technology, Geneva, Switzerland. The sample is not appropriate for this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified student outcome measures but this study does not focus on students.

***Project Listen's Writing Tutor***

Mostow, J., Beck, J., Bey, J., Cuneo, A., Sison, J., Tobin, B., et al. (2004). Using automated questions to assess reading comprehension, vocabulary, and effects of tutorial intervention. *Technology, Instruction, Cognition and Learning*, *2*, 103–140. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Project PLUS (Partnership Linking University School Personnel)***

Haager, D., & Windmueller, M. P. (2001). Early reading intervention for English language learners at-risk for learning disabilities: Student and teacher outcomes in an urban school. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, *24*(4), 235–250. Does not use strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*

***Project Read***


Acalin, T. A. (1995). A comparison of Reading Recovery to Project READ. *Masters Abstracts International*, *33*(06), 1660. (UMI No. 1361908) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Bompadre, C. E. (2002). The effectiveness of systematic reading programs on the achievement of students in grades K–2. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *63*(03), 890A. (UMI No. 3045848) Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatement group prior to the start of the intervention.

Englert, C. S., Garmon, A., Mariage, T., Rozendal, M., Tarrant, K, & Urba, J. (1995). The Early Literacy Project: Connecting across the literacy curriculum. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, *18*(4), 253–275. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Enfield, M. L. (n.d.). *Louisiana research study supports Project Read's effectiveness.* Retrieved from Project Read Web site: http://71.5.108.18/~projread/uploads/Louisiana%20Study%20Only.pdf Complete data are not reported: the WWC could not evaluate the design because complete data were not reported.

Enfield, M. L., & Greene, V. (2000). *Project Read original evaluation/research summary: 1969–1989*. Retrieved from Language Circle Enterprises Web site: http://71.5.108.18/~projread/uploads/Bloomington%20Studies%20Only.pdf **(Study: 1983–1984: Comparison of Achievement vs. Learning Ability)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Enfield, M. L., & Greene, V. (2000). *Project Read original evaluation/research summary: 1969–1989*. Retrieved from Language Circle Enterprises Web site: http://71.5.108.18/~projread/uploads/Bloomington%20Studies%20Only.pdf **(Study: 1986–1988: Longitudinal Study)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Enfield, M. L., & Greene, V. (2000). *Project Read original evaluation/research summary: 1969–1989*. Retrieved from Language Circle Enterprises Web site: http://71.5.108.18/~projread/uploads/Bloomington%20Studies%20Only.pdf **(Study: 1988–1989 Study: Learning Curve Comparisons)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Enfield, M. L., & Greene, V. (2000). *Project Read original evaluation/research summary: 1969–1989*. Retrieved from Language Circle Enterprises Web site: http://71.5.108.18/~projread/uploads/Bloomington%20Studies%20Only.pdf **(Study: Bloomington Public Schools)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Project Read (1999). *Longitudinal Project Read Study 1995–1999: Irwin-Schickler Elementary School Lapeer, Michigan.* (Available from Project Read, Language Circle Enterprises, Inc., 1620 West 98th Street, Suite #130, Bloomington, MN 55431) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Project Read. (2000). *Project Read program replication site data 1990–2000.* (Available from Project Read, Language Circle Enterprises, Inc., 1620 West 98th Street, Suite #130, Bloomington, MN 55431). Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Project Read. (2001). *Longitudinal Project Read Study 1994–2001: Goose Creek School District Baytown, TX.* (Available from Project Read, Language Circle Enterprises, Inc., 1620 West 98th Street, Suite #130, Bloomington, MN 55431).

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***QuickReads***

Hiebert, E. H. (2003). *The role of text in developing fluency: A comparison of two interventions*. Retrieved from Pearson Education. Retrieved from http://www.pearsoned.com/RESRPTS_FOR_POSTING/LANGUAGE_ARTS/LA1.%20rsp_QR_RoleofTextinFluency.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

***Rainbow Reading Program***

Nalder, S. (2002). *The effectiveness of Rainbow Reading: An audio-assisted reading program*. Retrieved from Pacific Learning Web site: http://www.pacificlearning.com/Pages/articles/NHRReffectiveness1.doc The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Pluck, M. (1995). *Rainbow Reading Program: Using taped stories: The Nelson Project.* Reading Forum, Term 1. Auckland: New Zealand Reading Association. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

***Read Naturally***

Denton, C. A., Fletcher, J. M., Anthony, J. L., & Francis, D. J. (2006). An evaluation of intensive intervention for students with persistent reading difficulties. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 39(5), 447–466. Confound: this study included Read Naturally but combined it with another intervention so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Heistad, D. (n.d.). A Minneapolis study of the effects of Read Naturally on fluency and reading comprehension: A supplemental service intervention. Minnesota: Minneapolis Public Schools. Does not use a strong causal design: For the portion of the sample of interest to this WWC review, there was only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Read Naturally. (2005). Read Naturally: Rationale & research. Retrieved from http://www.readnaturally.com/pdf/rationale&research.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: the study does not use a comparison group.

Read Naturally. (n.d.). Case 1: Original study, Minneapolis, Minn. Retrieved April 25, 2007, from http://www.readnaturally.com/why/case1.htm Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group was equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Read Naturally. (n.d.). Case 2: Special education students, Huron County, Mich. Retrieved April 25, 2007, from http://www.readnaturally.com/why/case2.htm Complete data are not reported: the WWC could not compute effect sizes because complete study details were not reported.

Read Naturally. (n.d.). Case 4: Two-school study, Minneapolis, Minn. Retrieved April 25, 2007, from http://www.readnaturally.com/why/case4.htm Complete data are not reported: the WWC could not compute effect sizes because complete study details were not reported.

Read Naturally. (n.d.). Case 5: Four-school study, Minneapolis, Minn. Retrieved April 25, 2007, from http://www.readnaturally.com/why/case5.htm Complete data are not reported: the WWC could not compute effect sizes because complete study details were not reported.

Read Naturally. (n.d.). Case 6: Second graders, Elk River, Minn. Retrieved April 25, 2007, from http://www.readnaturally.com/why/case6.htm Complete data are not reported: the WWC could not compute effect sizes because complete study details were not reported.

Read Naturally. (n.d.). Case 7: Second graders, Leavenworth, Kan. Retrieved April 25, 2007, from http://www.readnaturally.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*

com/why/case7.htm Does not use a strong causal design: the study does not use a comparison group.

Read Naturally. (n.d.). Case 8: Improved TAAS scores, San Antonio, Tex. Retrieved April 25, 2007, from http://www.read-naturally.com/why/case8.htm Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Read Naturally. (n.d.). Case 9: Special education students, Upper Lake, Calif. Retrieved April 25, 2007, from http://www.read-naturally.com/why/case9.htm Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Read Naturally. (n.d.). Case 10: Third grade student, Mathews County, Va. Retrieved April 25, 2007, from http://www.read-naturally.com/why/case10.htm Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Read Well***

Simon, J. (2002). *Implementation results: Technical report*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West Educational Services. **(Pacific Northwest)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Simon, J. (2002). *Implementation results: Technical report*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West Educational Services. **(Oregon School 1)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Simon, J. (2002). *Implementation results: Technical report*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West Educational Services. **(Oregon School 2)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Simon, J. (2002). *Implementation results: Technical report*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West Educational Services. **(Montana)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group was equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Simon, J. (2002). *Implementation results: Technical report*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West Educational Services. **(Texas)** The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

***Reading Recovery®***

Acalin, T. A. (1995). A comparison of Reading Recovery to Project READ. *Masters Abstracts International, 33*(06), 1660. (UMI No. 1361908) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades kindergarten through 3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Ashdown, J., & Simic, O. (2003). Is early literacy intervention effective for English language learners? Evidence from Reading Recovery. In S. Forbes & C. Briggs (Eds.), *Research in Reading Recovery.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Askew, B. J., & Frasier, D. F. (1997). Sustained effects of Reading Recovery intervention on the cognitive behaviors of second grade children and the perceptions of their teachers. In S. L. Swartz & A. F. Klein (Eds.), *Research in Reading Recovery* (pp. 18–38). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Bermel, S. (1987). *Language development component, CLEAR-Reading Recovery program 1985–86. Final evaluation report.* Columbus, OH: Columbus Public Schools, Ohio Department of Evaluation Services. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED281157) Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design that uses achievement pretests but it does not establish that the comparison group is comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


Brown, K. L. (1999). The impact of Reading Recovery intervention on the reading achievement of selected second grade students. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 62*(08), 2636A. (UMI No. 3023650) Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design that uses achievement pretests but it does not establish that the comparison group is comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Brown, W., Denton, E., Kelly, P., & Neal, J. (1999). Reading Recovery effectiveness: A five-year success story in San Luis Costal Unified School District. *ERS Spectrum, 17*(1), 3–12. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Bufalino, J. M. (1993). The sustained effects of Reading Recovery intervention on the reading comprehension of second graders. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 54*(11), 145A. (UMI No. 9407866) Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Center, Y., Freeman, L., & Robertson, G. (2001). The relative effect of a code-oriented and a meaning-oriented early literacy program on regular and low progress Australian students in year 1 classrooms which implement Reading Recovery. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education, 48*(2), 207–232. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Center, Y., Wheldall, K., Freeman, L., Outhred, L., & McNaught, M. (1995). An evaluation of Reading Recovery. *Reading Research Quarterly, 30*(2), 240–263. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design that uses achievement pretests but it does not establish that the comparison group is comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Chapman, J., Tunmer, W. E., & Prochnow, J. E. (2001). Does success in the Reading Recovery program depend on developing proficiency in phonological-processing skills? A longitudinal study in a whole language instructional context. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 5*(2), 141–176. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design that uses achievement pretests but it does not establish that the comparison group is comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Christman, M. S. (2003). An examination of the effects and costs of the Reading Recovery Program in an urban school district. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64*(08), 2824A. (UMI No. 3102259) Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Collins, E. W. (2000). The immediate and sustained effects of the Reading Recovery program on grade one and grade four at-risk students: A longitudinal study. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61*(05), 1784A. (UMI No. 9971239) Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Collins, V. K. (1994). Automaticity in information processing. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 55*(9), 2708A. (UMI No. 9502838) Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Curtin, J. (1993). *The effectiveness of the Reading Recovery Program on reading achievement.* Chicago: Chicago Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED363863) Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


DeFord, D. E. (1997). Early writing: Teachers and children in Reading Recovery. In S. L. Swartz & A. F. Klein (Eds.), *Research in Reading Recovery* (pp. 148–172). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Department of Evaluation Services. (1995). *Compensatory Education (CE) product evaluation: Elementary and secondary programs 1994–95.* Saginaw, MI: Saginaw Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED391853) Does not use a strong causal design: in this study, which uses a quasi-experimental design, data were presented only for students who successfully completed the intervention, which does not provide a direct test of the intervention as a whole.

***Additional source:***

Department of Evaluation Services. (1992). Compensatory education product evaluation: Elementary and secondary programs 1991–1992. Saginaw, MI: Saginaw Public Schools, Michigan Department of Evaluation Services. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED350370)

Dunkeld, C. (1990). *Gaining experience with Reading Recovery: A pilot project between Portland Public Schools and Portland State University.* Portland, OR: Portland State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED321246) Does not use a strong causal design: this study, which uses a quasi-experimental design, had a confounding factor. The Reading Recovery intervention was used without proper Reading Recovery materials, and the instructors had not been fully trained. This makes it difficult to attribute study outcomes to Reading Recovery.

Escamilla, K. (1997). Descrubriendo la lectura: An early intervention literacy program in Spanish. In S. L. Swartz & A. F. Klein (Eds.), *Research in Reading Recovery* (pp. 109–121). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not focus on students learning to read in English, one of the parameters for this WWC review.

Escamilla, K., Loera, M., Ruiz, O., & Rodriguez, Y. (2003). An examination of sustaining effects in Descubriendo la Lectura programs. In S. Forbes & C. Briggs (Eds.), *Research in Reading Recovery.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not focus on students learning to read in English, one of the parameters for this WWC review.

Evans, T. L. P. (1996). 'I can read deze books!': A qualitative comparison of the Reading Recovery program and a small group reading intervention. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 57*(02), 565A. (UMI No. 9619200) Does not use a strong causal design: this is a qualitative study.

Fullerton, S. K., & DeFord, D. E. (2001, December). *Conversations before writing during Reading Recovery lessons: Negotiations or tug of war?* Paper presented at the meeting of the National Reading Conference, Chicago. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Gilmer, V. B. (2003). Sustained success of former Reading Recovery students. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64*(02), 444A. (UMI No. 3081577) Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Gomez-Bellenge, F. X., Rodgers, E., & Fullerton, S. K. (2003). *Reading Recovery and Descubriendo la Lectura national report 2001–2002.* Columbus, OH: Ohio State University. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not focus on students learning to read in English, one of the parameters for this WWC review.

Gomez-Bellenge, F. X., & Rodgers, E. M. (2004). *Reading Recovery and Descubriendo la Lectura national report 2002–2003.* Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, College of Education, School of Teaching and Learning. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Hovest, C. M. (2000). An examination of the achievement of phonological skills for three groups participating in an early

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


intervention program. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61*(08), 3107A. (UMI No. 9982583) Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Johnson, J. A. (1996). *Reading Recovery: Early intervention.* Hays, KS: Fort Hays State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED398564) Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design that uses achievement pretests but it does not establish that the comparison group is comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

LaFave, C. E. (1995). Impact of Reading Recovery on phonemic awareness. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 56*(07), 2621A. (UMI No. 9540370) Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design that uses achievement pretests but it does not establish that the comparison group is comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Leitner, D. (1990). *Portland Reading Recovery program 1989–90 evaluation report. Year 1.* Portland, OR: Portland Public Schools, Oregon Research and Evaluation Department. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED326839) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Litt, D. G. (2003). An exploration of the double-deficit hypothesis in the Reading Recovery population. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64*(06), 2028A. (UMI No. 3094512) Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Lyons, C. (1989). Reading Recovery: A preventative for mislabeling young 'at-risk' learners. *Urban Education, 24*(2), 125–139. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Marina, B., & Gilman, D. A. (2003). *Is Reading Recovery worth the cost?* Vigo County, IN: Vigo County School Corporation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED473957) Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Marvin, C. A., & Gaffney, J. S. (2003). The effects of Reading Recovery on children's home literacy experiences. In S. Forbes & C. Briggs (Eds.), *Research in Reading Recovery.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

McManus, D. A. (1999). A modified Reading Recovery program can be successful in a second grade Title I reading program. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 60*(10), 3597A. (UMI No. 9947733) Complete data are not reported: the WWC could not evaluate the design because complete data were not reported. Attempts to contact the authors for more information were unsuccessful.

Miller, S. D. (2003). Partners-in-Reading: Using classroom assistants to provide tutorial assistance to struggling first-grade readers. J*ournal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 8*(3), 333–349. High overall attrition: The study reported an extreme overall attrition rate.

Moore, M., & Wade, B. (1998). Reading Recovery: Its effectiveness in the long term. *Support for Learning, 13*(3), 123–128. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Murphy, J. A. (2003). An application of growth curve analysis: The evaluation of a reading intervention program. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64*(12), 4358A. (UMI No. 3114448) Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design that uses achievement pretests but it does not

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*

establish that the comparison group is comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Neal, J. C., & Kelly, P. R. (2003). The success of Reading Recovery for English language learners and Descubriendo la Lectura for bilingual students in California. In S. Forbes & C. Briggs (Eds.), *Research in Reading Recovery.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not focus on students learning to read in English, one of the parameters for this WWC review.

O'Connor, E. A., & Simic, O. (2002). The effect of Reading Recovery on special education referrals and placements. *Psychology in the Schools, 39*(6), 635–646. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified student outcome measures, but this study does not focus on students.

Pinnell, G. S. (1997). An inquiry-based model for educating teachers of literacy. In S. L. Swartz & A. F. Klein (Eds.), *Research in Reading Recovery* (pp. 6–17). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified student outcome measures, but this study does not focus on students.

Plewis, I. (2000). Evaluating educational interventions using multilevel growth curves: The case of Reading Recovery. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 6*(1), 83–101. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design that uses achievement pretests but it does not establish that the comparison group is comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Pollock, J. S. (1993). *Final evaluation report: Reading Recovery™ program 1991–92.* Columbus, OH: Columbus Public Schools, Ohio Department of Program Evaluation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED358440) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Pollock, J. S. (with Morgan, K. L., Williams, E. J., & Amorose, R. A.). (1991). *Reading Recovery program 1990–91. Final Evaluation report.* Elementary and Secondary Education Act—Chapter 1. Columbus, OH: Columbus Public Schools, Ohio Department of Program Evaluation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED343108) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Pollock, J. S., Williams, E. J., Morgan, K. L., & Amorose, R. A. (1990). *Language development component compensatory language experiences and reading, CLEAR-Reading Recovery program, 1989–90. Final Evaluation Report.* Columbus, OH: Columbus Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED327821) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Potter, T. (2004). *Reading Recovery evaluation.* Madison, WI: Planning, Research and Evaluation, Madison Metropolitan School District. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design that uses achievement pretests but it does not establish that the comparison group is comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Quay, L. C., Steele, D. C., Johnson, C. I., & Hortman, W. (2001). Children's achievement and personal and social development in a first-year Reading Recovery program with teachers in training. *Literacy Teaching and Learning, 5,* 7–25. Disruption: this study, which uses a quasi-experimental design, exhibited disruption problems that made it difficult to attribute study outcomes to the intervention, as delivered.

Ramaswami, S. (1994). *The differential impact of Reading Recovery on achievement of first graders in the Newark School District, 1991–1993.* Newark, NJ: Newark Board of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Testing. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Rhodes, J. A. (1998). A comparison of the effects of individualized writing instruction with and without phonemic segmentation on the standard spelling performance of at-risk first graders. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 59*(07), 2426A. (UMI No. 9839187) Does not use a strong causal design: this study, which uses a quasi-experimental design, tested only a

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


portion of the Reading Recovery curriculum, making it difficult to attribute study outcomes to Reading Recovery.

Rodgers, E., Gomez-Bellenge, F. X., & Fullerton, S. K. (2003). *Reading Recovery in Ohio: 2001–2002 state report* (National Data Evaluation Center Tech. Rep. No. 2003-03). Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, College of Education, School of Teaching and Learning. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Rodgers, E. M., Fullerton, S. K., & DeFord, D. E. (2001). What does it take to reform instructional practices? In J. V. Hoffman, D. L. Schallert, C. M. Fairbanks, J. Worthy, & B. Maloch (Eds.), *Fiftieth yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 519–532). Chicago: National Reading Conference. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified student outcome measures, but this study does not focus on students.

Rodgers, E. M., Gomez-Bellenge, F. X., & Schulz, M. M. (2005). *Reading Recovery in Ohio: 2003–2004 state report* (National Data Evaluation Center Tech. Rep. No. 2005-01). Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, College of Education, School of Teaching and Learning. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Roehrig, A. D., Pressley, M., & Sloup, M. (2001). Reading strategy instruction in regular primary-level classrooms by teachers trained in Reading Recovery. R*eading & Writing Quarterly, 17*(4), 323–348. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified student outcome measures, but this study does not focus on students.

Ross, S. M., Nunnery, J. A., & Smith, L. J. (1996). *Evaluation of Title I reading programs: Amphitheater public schools—Year 1: 1995–1996.* Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy. Does not use a strong causal design: for the portion of the sample of interest for this WWC review, there was one of two issues. Either there was a confound, with the Reading Recovery intervention being modified or combined with other interventions, making it difficult to attribute study outcomes to the intervention. Or the study does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Salinas, A., Williams, I., & Kohler, L. (1993). Reading Recovery program evaluation: Report 1992-93. McAllen, TX: McAllen Independent School District, Office of Research and Evaluation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED366938) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Schmitt, M. C. (2001). The development of children's strategic processing in Reading Recovery. *Reading Psychology, 22,* 129–151. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: the outcomes in this study does not address one of the domains of interest in this review.

Schmitt, M. C. (2003). Metacognitive strategy knowledge: Comparison of former Reading Recovery children and their current classmates. *Literacy Teaching and Learning, 7*(1–2), 57–76. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: the outcomes in this study does not address one of the domains of interest in this review.

Schmitt, M. C., & Gregory, A. E. (2001, June). *The impact of early intervention: Where are the children now?* Paper presented at the meeting of the National Reading Conference, San Antonio, TX. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Schotanus, H. (1991). R*eading Recovery pilot project (Laws 1989: 301): Report of results and effectiveness.* Concord, NH: New Hampshire State Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED363859) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


Schotanus, H., Chase, C., & Fontaine, A. (1992). *Reading Recovery program, implementation year two, school year 1991–1992. Report of results and effectiveness.* Concord, NH: New Hampshire State Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED363860) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Schotanus, H., Chase, C., Fontaine, A., & Tilton, S. (1993). *Reading Recovery program implementation year three, school year 1992–1993. Report of results and effectiveness.* Concord, NH: New Hampshire Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED364869) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Schotanus, H., Fontaine, A., Tilton, S., Westergren, G., & Anderson, A. (1996). *Reading Recovery program implementation year six, school year 1995–96. Report of results and effectiveness.* Concord, NH: New Hampshire Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED405573) Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design that uses achievement pretests but it does not establish that the comparison group is comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Shoulders, M. D. (2004). The long-term effectiveness of the Reading Recovery Program. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65*(03), 836A. (UMI No. 3127549) Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Simpson, S. H. (1997). A principal's perspective of the implementation of Reading Recovery in six metropolitan Nashville elementary schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 58*(08), 2948A. (UMI No. 9806596) Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Smith, N. (1994). Reading Recovery data and observations from one Illinois site (Part II). *Illinois Reading Council Journal, 22*(3), 29–46. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design that uses achievement pretests but it does not establish that the comparison group is comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

***Additional source:***

Smith, N. (1994). Reading Recovery data and observations from one Illinois site (Part I). *Illinois Reading Council Journal, 22*(2), 7–27.

Smith, P. E. (1994). Reading Recovery and children with English as a second language. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 29*(2), 141–155. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Stahl, K. A. D., Stahl, S. A., & McKenna, M. C. (2004). The development of phonological awareness and orthographic processing in Reading Recovery. In S. Forbes & C. Briggs (Eds.), *Research in Reading Recovery.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design that uses achievement pretests but it does not establish that the comparison group is comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Swartz, S. L. (1999, December). California Early Literacy Learning and Reading Recovery: Two innovative programs for teaching children to read and write. Paper presented at the Claremont Reading Conference, CA. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Thomas, P. M. (with Morgan, K. L., Amorose, R. A., & Williams, E. J.). (1989). *Language development component, compensatory language experiences and reading: CLEAR—Reading Recovery program 1987–88. Final evaluation report.* Columbus, OH: Columbus Public Schools, Ohio Department of Evaluation Services. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED313668) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


Townsend, M. A. R., Townsend, J. E., & Seo, K. J. (2001, December). *Children's motivation to read following Reading Recovery.* Paper presented at the meeting of the National Reading Conference, Chicago. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Wang, Y. L., & Johnstone, W. (1997, March). *Evaluation of Reading Recovery program.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Weeks, D. (1992). A study of the implementation of Reading Recovery in Scarborough: 1990–1991. *Masters Abstracts International, 3*(03), 1005. (UMI No. MM74064) High overall attrition: The study reported an extreme overall attrition rate.

Wilkes Pendergrass, P. V. (2004). The short-term effects of Reading Recovery on children's reading development: Process and product. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65*(03), 823A. (UMI No. 3127551) Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Wright, A. (1992). Evaluation of the first British Reading Recovery programme. *British Educational Research Journal*, 18(4), 351–368. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Yukish, J. F., & Fraas, J. W. (1997). Success of old order Amish children in a strategy-oriented program for children at-risk of failure in reading. In S. L. Swartz & A. F. Klein (Eds.), *Research in Reading Recovery* (pp. 39–51). Portsmouth, NH: Heineman. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Zielinski, L. A. (1997). The long term effectiveness of Reading Recovery in a small, rural school district. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59(01), 0077A. (UMI No. 9822883) Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

***Reading Success from the Start***

Tindall, J. M. (2001). An evaluation study of the reading success from the start framework on first grade academically at-risk students at a small, K–2 elementary school in southern New Castle County, Deleware. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *62*(02), 467A. (UMI No. 3004827) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Reading Theater***

Strecker, S. K. (1999). The effects of instruction and practice through readers theater on young readers' oral reading fluency. *Dissertation Abstracts nternational*, *60*(09), 3278A. (UMI No. 9947399) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Reading Together™***

Learning Together Company. (2002). *The Learning Together Company submission of proposal to What Works Clearinghouse*. (Available from the The Learning Together Company, 5509-B West Friendly Avenue, Suite 201, Greensboro, NC 27410) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Richards Read Systematic Language Program***

Kusik, J., & Richards, C. (n.d.). *Square one... again?* Waco, TX: Creative Education Institute. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


North Coast Education Services. (2002). *Mystery solved ... a missing piece to literacy: Richards Read Systematic Language implications for improved literacy in the United States*. Chagrin Falls, OH: Author. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Richards, C., & Truelson, N. (1996). *Richards Read Systematic Language Program in the Bedford City Schools*. Chagrin Falls, OH: North Coast Education Services. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Richards, C., & Truelson, N. (1996). *Richards Read Systematic Language Program in the Bedford City Schools: 1995–96 school year.* Chagrin Falls, OH: North Coast Education Services. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Right Start to Reading***

Taylor, B. M., Pearson, P. D., Clark, K. F., & Walpole, S. (1999). *Beating the odds in teaching all children to read* (Report No. 2-006). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Schoolwide Early Language and Learning (SWELL)***

Center, Y., & Freeman, L. (1997). A trial evaluation of SWELL (Schoolwide Early Language and Literacy): A whole class early literacy program for at-risk and disadvantaged children. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, *44*(1), 21–39. Complete data are not reported: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not present achievement pretest data to establish that the comparison group was equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Center, Y., Freeman, L., & Robertson, G. (1998). An evaluation of the Schoolwide Early Language and Literacy program (SWELL) in six disadvantaged schools. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, *45*, 143–172. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Center, Y., Freeman, L., & Robertson, G. (2001). A longitudinal evaluation of the Schoolwide Early Language and Literacy Program (SWELL). In R. E. Slavin & N. A. Madden (Eds.), *Success for All: Research and reform in elementary education.* (111–147). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

***Additional source:***

Center, Y., Freeman, L., & Robertson, G. (2001). The relative effect of a code-oriented and a meaning-oriented early literacy program on regular and low progress Australian students in year 1 classrooms which implement Reading Recovery. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, *48*(2), 207–232. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

***Sing, Spell, Reading and Write (SSRW)***

Bryan, L. D. (1996). A comparison of the Sing, Spell, Read, and Write Program and the traditional approach to reading instruction. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *57*(04), 1541A. (UMI No. 9628619) Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: Aberdeen and Taylorsville Schools)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: Bleckley County Schools)** Does not use a strong causal design. A historical cohort was used as the comparison group. WWC conventions allow for historical control cohorts in studies that have a broad unit of analysis (school or higher). This study analyzes at the student level and therefore does not fulfill the WWC requirement.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: Century Elementary School)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: Chesapeake Self-Contained Learning Disabilities Study)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: Christian Heritage Elementary School)** Does not use a strong causal design. A historical cohort was used as the comparison group. WWC conventions allow for historical control cohorts in studies that have a broad unit of analysis (school or higher). This study analyzes at the student level and therefore does not fulfill the WWC requirement.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: D.D. Crawford Primary School)** Does not use a strong causal design. A historical cohort was used as the comparison group. WWC conventions allow for historical control cohorts in studies that have a broad unit of analysis (school or higher). This study analyzes at the student level and therefore does not fulfill the WWC requirement.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: Earle Elementary School)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: Ernest R. Graham Elementary School)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design that uses achievement pretests but it does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: Eugene Fields Elementary School)** Does not use a strong causal design: there was only one intervention unit, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: Fayette County Schools)** Does not use a strong causal design. A historical cohort was used as the comparison group. WWC conventions allow for historical control cohorts in studies that have a broad unit of analysis (school or higher). This study analyzes at the student level and therefore does not fulfill the WWC requirement.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: Freeport Elementary School)** Does not use a strong causal design. A historical cohort was used as

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


the comparison group. WWC conventions allow for historical control cohorts in studies that have a broad unit of analysis (school or higher). This study analyzes at the student level and therefore does not fulfill the WWC requirement.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: Fenton Avenue Elementary School, LAUSD)** Does not use a strong causal design. A historical cohort was used as the comparison group. WWC conventions allow for historical control cohorts in studies that have a broad unit of analysis (school or higher). This study analyzes at the student level and therefore does not fulfill the WWC requirement.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: Jonesboro School)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: Kerens Elementary School)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: Lone Oak Elementary School)** Does not use a strong causal design: A historical cohort was used as the comparison group. WWC conventions allow for historical control cohorts in studies that have a broad unit of analysis (school or higher). This study analyzes at the student level and therefore does not fulfill the WWC requirement.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: Mahwah Elementary School)** Does not use a strong causal design: there was only one intervention or one comparison unit, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: Memphis)** Complete data are not reported: the WWC could not evaluate the design or data because complete study details were not reported.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: National Reading Panel)** Complete data are not reported: the WWC could not evaluate the design or data because complete study details were not reported.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: P.S. 138, Queens)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: San Francisco)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: Schull School)** Does not use a strong causal design: there was only one intervention or one comparison unit, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: Tice Elementary School)** Does not use a strong causal design. A historical cohort was used as the comparison group. WWC conventions allow for historical control cohorts in studies that have a broad unit of analysis (school or higher). This study analyzes at the student level and therefore does not fulfill the WWC requirement.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: Traphagen School)** Does not use a strong causal design: there was only one intervention or one comparison unit, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: Tusculum College Study, East Tennessee)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: Washington Primary School, Berkeley)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design that uses achievement pretests but it does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: West Clay County Elementary School)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design that uses achievement pretests but it does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: Wynne Primary School)** Does not use a strong causal design. A historical cohort was used as the comparison group. WWC conventions allow for historical control cohorts in studies that have a broad unit of analysis (school or higher). This study analyzes at the student level and therefore does not fulfill the WWC requirement.

Pearson Learning. (2002). *Sing, Spell, Read, & Write research compendium.* Retrieved from http://pearsonlearning.com/communities/assets/research_center/00_SSRW_Compendium.pdf **(Study: Valley View Elementary School)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.


***Sonday System***


Catawba County Schools. (2002). *Catawba County Schools Sonday System evaluation*. Newton, NC: Author. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Winsor Learning. (n. d.). *Kapalama Elementary School, Honolulu, Hawaii*. Retrieved from http://www.sondaysystem.com/results/test_scores.shtml#haw The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Winsor Learning. (n.d.). *New York test scores*. Retrieved from http://www.sondaysystem.com/results/test_scores.shtml#ny The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not use a comparison group.


***Sound Foundations***


Fielding-Barnsley, R., & Byrne, B. (1991). Evaluation of a program to teach phonemic awareness to young children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *83*(4), 451–455. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during

the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Fielding-Barnsley, R., & Byrne, B. (1993). Evaluation of a program to teach phonemic awareness to young children: A 1-year follow-up. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *85*(1), 103–111. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

***Sound Reading***

Kulas, D., & Andrews, M. (n.d.). *Study using Sound Reading Elementary Activity Program Means-to-an-End Reader Sound Reading Elementary CD.* Aurora, NY: Southern Cayuga School District. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Howlett, B. (n.d.). *Study using Sound Reading Elementary Activity Program.* Ithaca, NY: Sound Reading Solutions. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Wheeler, T., Volpicelli, V., & Peck, B. (n.d.). Sound Reading Elementary Activity Program: Third grade students. Newfield, NY: Newfield Elementary School. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Sound Partners***

Marchand-Martella, N. E., Martella, R., Nelson, J. R., Shelley, S. A., & Hatfield, D. (2002). Implementation of the Sound Partners Reading Program. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, *11*(2), 117–130. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Vadasy, P. F., & Sanders, E. A. (2004). *Sound Partners: Research summary*. Seattle, WA: Washington Research Institute. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Vadasy, P. F., Sanders, E. A., Peyton, J. A., & Jenkins, J. R. (2002). Timing and intensity of tutoring: A closer look at the conditions for effective early literacy tutoring. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *17*(4), 227–241. Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

***Sounds and Symbols Early Reading Program***

Allen, N. (1982). *A descriptive study of a high incidence of honor roll students in an itinerant speech-language pathologist's case load.* Unpublished manuscript. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Stories and More***

Stine, H. A. (1993). The effects of CD-ROM interactive software in reading skills instruction with second-grade Chapter 1 students. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *54*(9), 3388A. (UMI No. 9400115) Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

***Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD)***

Slavin, R. E. (1980). Effects of student teams and peer tutoring on academic achievement and time on-task. *Journal of Experimental Education*, *48*, 252–257. Study is outside the timeframe of the review: the parameters for this WWC review specified interventions that were implemented after 1983 but this study involves students that began the intervention prior to 1983.

Slavin, R. E., & Karweit, N. (1981). Cognitive and affective outcomes of an intensive student team learning experience. *Journal of Experimental Education*, *50*(1), 29–35. Study is outside the timeframe of the review: the parameters for this WWC review specified interventions that were implemented after 1983 but this study involves students that began the intervention prior to 1983.

## Appendix A5 References (continued)

***Success for All***


Ahearn, E. M. (1994). *Involvement of students with disabilities in the New American Schools development corporation projects*. Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Directors of Special Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED371513) The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify student outcome measures but this study does not focus on students.

Atkinson, C. L. H. (1998). An analysis of the impact of 'Success for All' on reading, attendance, and academic self-efficacy with at-risk elementary school students. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *59*(10), 3699A. (UMI No. 9905180) Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Barnes, C., Camburn, E., Kim, J. S., & Rowan, B. (2005, April). *School leadership and instructional improvement in CSR schools*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify student outcome measures but this study does not focus on students.

Berends, M., Chun, J., Schuyler, G., Stockly, S., & Briggs, R. J. (2002). *Challenges of conflicting school reforms: New American Schools in a high-poverty district*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED464984) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Berends, M., Kirby, S. N., Naftel, S., & McKelvey, C. (2000). *Implementation and performance in New American Schools: Three years into scale-up*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED451204) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Bifulco, R. (2001). Do whole-school reform models boost student performance: Evidence from New York City. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *62*(06), 1991A. (UMI No. 3019134) The study, which uses a quasi-experimental design, reported an extreme overall attrition rate.

Casey, J., Smith, L. J., & Ross, S. M. (1994). *Final report: 1993–94 Success for All Program in Memphis, Tennessee: Formative evaluation of new SFA Schools*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy. Does not use a strong causal design: For the portion of the sample of interest to this WWC review, there was only one intervention and/or one comparison unit, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Chambers, B., Cheung, A. C. K., Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., & Gifford, R. (2006). Achievement effects of embedded multimedia in a Success for All reading program. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *98*(1), 232–237. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Additional source:***

Chambers, B., Cheung, A., Gifford, R., Madden, N., & Slavin, R. E. (2004). *Achievement effects of embedded multimedia in a Success For All reading program*. Baltimore, MD: Success for All Foundation.

Chambers, B., Abrami, P. C., & Morrison, S. (2001). Can Success for All succeed in Canada? In R. E. Slavin, & N. A. Madden (Eds.), *Success for All: Research and reform in elementary education.* (pp. 93–109). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Clarke, P. A. (2001). *Analysis of the Success for All and School Development programs and their effects on reading comprehension*. Union, NJ: Kean University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED456426) The sample is not appropriate

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*

to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Datnow, A., Borman, G. D., Stringfield, S., Overman, L. T., & Castellano, M. (2003). Comprehensive school reform in culturally and linguistically diverse contexts: Implementation and outcomes from a four-year study. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *25*(2), 143–170. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Dicembre, E. (2002). How they turned the ship around. *Journal of Staff Development*, *23*(2), 32–35. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Greenlaw, M. J. (2004). A case study examining the relationships among teachers' perceptions of the Success for All reading program, teachers' sense of efficacy, students' attitudes toward reading and students' reading achievement. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *65*(07), 2541A. (UMI No. 3139431) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Grehan, A. W. (2001). The effects of the Success for All Program on improving reading readiness skills for at-risk students in kindergarten. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *62*(10), 3292A. (UMI No. 3029892) Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Hankerson, K. M. (2004). A cross-case study of the practices of the Success for All (SFA) facilitator. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *65*(03), 836A. (UMI No. 3126318) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Harris, A., Hopkins, D., & Wordsworth, J. (2001). The implementation and impact of Success for All in English schools. In R. E. Slavin, & N. A. Madden (Eds.), *Success for All: Research and reform in elementary education.* (pp. 81–92). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (2001). Success for All: A community model for advancing Arabs and Jews in Israel. In R. E. Slavin, & N. A. Madden (Eds.), *Success for All: Research and reform in elementary education.* (pp. 149–177). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not focus on students learning to read in English, one of the parameters for this WWC review.

Hess, P. M. (2004). A study of teachers' selection and implementation of meta-cognitive reading strategies for fourth/fifth grade reading comprehension from a Success for All reading program perspective: Moving beyond the fundamentals. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *65*(07), 2542A. (UMI No. 3140930) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Hurley, E. A., Chamberlain, A., Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. A. (2001). Effects of Success for All on TAAS reading scores—A Texas statewide evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *82*(10), 750–756. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

James, D. W., Jurich, S., & Estes, S. (2001). *Raising minority academic achievement: A compendium of education programs and practices*. Retrieved from American Youth Policy Forum Web site: http://www.aypf.org/publications/rmaa/pdfs/Book.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

James, L. R. D. (2003). The effect of the Success for All reading approach on fourth- and fifth-grade students' standardized reading assessment scores. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *63*(11), 3896A. (UMI No. 3072259) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*

review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Jones, E. M., Gottfredson, G. D., & Gottfredson, D. C. (1997). Success for some: An evaluation of a Success for All Program. *Evaluation Review*, *21*(6), 643–670. Does not use a strong causal design: For the portion of the sample of interest to this WWC review, there was only one intervention and/or one comparison unit, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

***Additional sources:***

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L. J., & Wasik, B. A. (1996). Success for All: A summary of research. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, *1*(1), 41–76. **(Study: Charleston, SC)**

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L., Wasik, B. A., Ross, S. M., & Smith, L. J. (1994, April). *Success for All: Longitudinal effects of systemic school-by-school reform in seven districts*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. **(Study: Charleston, SC)**

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L., Wasik, B. A., Ross, S. M., & Smith, L. J. (1994). 'Whenever and wherever we choose': The replication of 'Success for All'. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *75*(8), 639–647. **(Study: Charleston, SC)**

Kapushion, B. M. (2003). A qualitative study of "Success for All—Roots and Wings" on four Jefferson County schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *64*(01), 58A. (UMI No. 3078189) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Koh, M. S., & Robertson, J. S. (2003). School reform models and special education. *Education and Urban Society*, *35*(4), 421–442. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Lewis, J. L., & Bartz, M. (1999). *New American Schools designs: An analysis of program results in district schools – Cincinnati Public Schools*. Cincinnati, OH: Cincinnati Public Schools, Research and Evaluation Office. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Lucius, L. B. (2000). A comparison of three kindergarten curricula on language and literacy performance. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *62*(01), 65A. (UMI No. 3003007) The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify student outcome measures but this study does not focus on students.

Manset, G., St. John, E. P., Simmons, A., Michael, R., Bardzell, J., Hodges, D., et al. (1999). *Indiana's early literacy intervention grant program impact study for 1997–98*. Retrieved from Indiana University, Indiana Education Policy Center Web site: http://www.doe.state.in.us/publications/pdf_early/impact98-whole.pdf The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified student outcome measures, but this study does not focus on students.

Massue, F. M. (1999). *Effects of engaging in Success for All on children's causal attributions*. Montreal, Quebec, Canada: Concordia University, Department of Education. Does not use a strong causal design: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

McCollum-Rogers, S. A. (2004). Comparing Direct Instruction and Success for All with a basal reading program in relation to student achievement. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *65*(10), 3642A. (UMI No. 3149920) Does not use a strong causal design: this study, which uses a quasi-experimental design, does not use equating measures to ensure that the comparison group is equivalent to the treatment group.

Munoz, M. A., Dossett, D., & Judy-Gallans, K. (2003). *Educating students placed at risk: Evaluating the impact of Success for All in urban settings*. Retrieved from Jefferson County Public Schools, Accountability, Research, and Planning Department Web site: www.jefferson.k12.ky.us/Departments/AcctResPlan/PDF/SFApaper.pdf Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


pretests to establish that the comparison group was equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Nunnery, J. A., Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., Hunter, P., et al. (1997, March). *Effects of full and partial implementations of Success for All on student reading achievement in English and Spanish*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group was equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

***Additional sources:***

Nunnery, J. A. (1995). An assessment of Success for All program component effects on the reading achievement of at-risk first grade students. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *57*(01), 155A. (UMI No. 9615378)

Nunnery, J. A., Slavin, R. E., Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., Hunter, P., & Stubbs, J. (1996, April). *An assessment of Success for All program component configuration effects on the reading achievement of at-risk first grade students*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Pogrow, S. (2002). Success for All is a failure. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *83*(6), 463–468. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Additional source:***

Pogrow, S. (2003). [Pogrow final debate]. Unpublished raw data.

Ross, S. M., & Casey, J. (1998). *Success for All evaluation: 1997–1998 Tigard-Tualatin School District*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group was equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Ross, S. M., Nunnery, J. A., Goldfeder, E., McDonald, A., Rachor, R., Hornbeck, M., et al (2004). Using school reform models to improve reading achievement: A longitudinal study of direct instruction and Success for All in an urban district. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, *9*(4), 357–388. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group was equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

***Additional source:***

Ross, S. M., Fleischman, S. W., & Hornbeck, M. (2003). *Progress and options regarding the implementation of Direct Instruction and Success for All in Toledo public schools*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Ross, S. M., Nunnery, J. A., & Smith, L. J. (1996). *Evaluation of Title I reading programs: Amphitheater public schools – Year 1: 1995–1996*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy. Does not use a strong causal design: for the portion of the sample of interest for this WWC review, there was a confound, with the intervention being modified or combined with other interventions, making it difficult to attribute study outcomes to the intervention.

***Additional source:***

Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. A. (1999). Effects of bilingual and English as a second language adaptations of Success for All on the reading achievement of students acquiring English. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, *4*(4), 393–416. **(Study: Arizona)**

Ross, S. M., & Smith, L. J. (1994). Effects of the Success for All model on kindergarten through second-grade reading achievement, teachers' adjustment, and classroom-school climate at an inner-city school. *The Elementary School Journal*, *95*(2), 121–138. Does not use a strong causal design: For the portion of the sample of interest to this WWC review, there was only one intervention and/or one comparison unit, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


***Additional sources:***

Ross, S. M., & Smith, L. J. (1992). *Final report: 1991–92 Success for All program in Memphis, Tennessee*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., Casey, J., Johnson, B., & Bond, C. (1994, April). *Using Success for All to restructure elementary schools: A tale of four cities*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. **(Study: Memphis, TN)**

Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., Crawford, A., Eck, L., Lohr, L., & Faulks, A. (1991). *Final report: Success for All 1990–91 Memphis program*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L. J., & Wasik, B. A. (1996). Success for All: A summary of research. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, *1*(1), 41–76. **(Study: Memphis, TN)**

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L., Wasik, B. A., Ross, S. M., & Smith, L. J. (1994, April). *Success for All: Longitudinal effects of systemic school-by-school reform in seven districts*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. **(Study: Memphis, TN)**

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L., Wasik, B. A., Ross, S. M., & Smith, L. J. (1994). 'Whenever and wherever we choose': The replication of 'Success for All'. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *75*(8), 639–647. **(Study: Memphis, TN)**

Smith, L. J., Ross, S. M., & Casey, J. (1994). *Final report: 1993–1994 Success for All Program in Memphis, Tennessee*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Smith, L. J., Ross, S. M., & Casey, J. (1996). Multi-site comparison of the effects of Success for All on reading achievement. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *28*(3), 329–353. **(Study: Memphis, TN)**

Smith, L. J., Ross, S. M., Johnson, B., & Casey, J. (1993). *Final report: 1992–1993 Memphis, Tennessee SFA results*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Ross, S. M., Sanders, W. L., & Wright, S. P. (2000). *Fourth-year achievement results on the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System for restructuring schools in Memphis*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Ross, S. M., Sanders, W. L., Wright, S. P., Stringfield, S., Wang, L. W., & Alberg, M. (2001). *Two- and three-year achievement results from the Memphis Restructuring Initiative*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., & Casey, J. (1992). *Final report: 1991–92 Success for All program in Caldwell, Idaho*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy. Does not use a strong causal design: For the portion of the sample of interest to this WWC review, there was only one intervention and/or one comparison unit, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

***Additional sources:***

Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., Casey, J., & Slavin, R. E. (1995). Increasing the academic success of disadvantaged children: An examination of alternative early intervention programs. *American Educational Research Journal*, *32*(4), 773–800.

Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., Casey, J., Johnson, B., & Bond, C. (1994, April). *Using Success for All to restructure elementary schools: A tale of four cities*. Paper presented

at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. **(Study: Caldwell, ID)**

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L. J., & Wasik, B. A. (1996). Success for All: A summary of research. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, *1*(1), 41–76. **(Study: Caldwell, ID)**

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L., Wasik, B. A., Ross, S. M., & Smith, L. J. (1994, April). *Success for All: Longitudinal effects of systemic school-by-school reform in seven districts*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. **(Study: Caldwell, ID)**

Smith, L. J., Ross, S. M., & Casey, J. (1996). Multi-site comparison of the effects of Success for All on reading achievement. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *28*(3), 329–353. **(Study: Caldwell, ID)**

Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., & Casey, J. (1997a). *Final report: 1996–97 Success for All Program in Clark County, Georgia*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy. Does not use a strong causal design: For the portion of the sample of interest to this WWC review, there was only one intervention and/or one comparison unit, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., & Casey, J. (1997b). Preventing early school failure: Impacts of Success for All on standardized test outcomes, minority group performance, and school effectiveness. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 2*(1), 29–53. Does not use a strong causal design: this study, which used a quasi-experimental design, experienced attrition which led to possible bias in reporting.

***Additional source:***

Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., & Casey, J. (1999). Bridging the gap: The effects of the Success For All Program on elementary school reading achievement as a function of student ethnicity and ability level. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 10*(2), 129–150.

Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., & Nunnery, J. A. (1998, April). *The relationship of program implementation quality and student achievement*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA. Does not use a strong causal design: For the portion of the sample of interest to this WWC review, there was only one intervention and/or one comparison unit, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

***Additional source:***

Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., Lewis, T., & Nunnery, J. A. (1996). *1995–96 evaluation of Roots and Wings in Memphis City Schools*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Ross, S. M., Tabachnick, S., & Sterbinsky, A. (2002). *Using comprehensive school reform models to raise student achievement: Factors associated with success in Memphis*. Retrieved from New American Schools Web site: http://www.naschools.org/uploadedfiles/Ross%20Using%20Comprehensive%20School%20Reform%20Models.pdf The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify student outcome measures but this study does not focus on students.

Ross, S. M., Wang, L. W., Sanders, W. L., Wright, S. P., & Stringfield, S. (1999). *Two- and three-year achievement results on the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System for restructuring schools in Memphis*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Ross, S. M., Wang, W., Sanders, W. L., & Wright, S. P. (1999). *Teacher mobility and effectiveness in restructuring and non-restructuring schools in an inner-city district*. Retrieved from SAS Institute Web site: http://www.sas.com/govedu/edu/teacher_mobility.pdf The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


student outcome measures but this study does not focus on students.

Sanders, W. L., Wright, S. P., Ross, S. M., & Wang, L. W. (2000). *Value-added achievement results for three cohorts of Roots and Wings schools in Memphis: 1995–1999 outcomes*. Retrieved from Success for All Foundation Web site: http://successforall.com/_images/pdfs/Ross_Roots_Wings_99.pdf The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Schneider, F. H. (1999). Impact of the 'Success for All' program in the teaching of reading for third grade students in selected elementary schools in the Pasadena Independent School District. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *60*(06), 1965A. (UMI No. 9934489) Does not use a strong causal design: this study, which uses a quasi-experimental design, does not use equating measures to ensure that the comparison group is equivalent to the treatment group.

Seligo Boehle, D. (2003). How schema appropriate alternate assessments affect the oral reading accuracy and oral reading fluency of selected first-grade students using the school-wide reform model Success for All. *Masters Abstracts International, 42*(02), 383. (UMI No. 1416013) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Simpson, S. H. (1997). A principal's perspective of the implementation of Reading Recovery in six metropolitan Nashville elementary schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *58*(08), 2948A. (UMI No. 9806596) Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. A. (1991). *Success for All at Buckingham Elementary: Second year evaluation*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students. Does not use a strong causal design: for the portion of the sample of interest to this WWC review, there was only one intervention and/or one comparison unit, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

***Additional source:***

Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B. A. (1991). *Success for All: Multi-year effects of a schoolwide elementary restructuring program*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students. **(Study: Worchester County (Berlin), MD)**

Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. A. (1994, April). *Lee Conmigo: Effects of Success for All in bilingual first grades*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not focus on students learning to read in English, one of the parameters for this WWC review.

Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. A. (1998). *Success for All/Éxito Para Todos—Effects on the reading achievement of students acquiring English* (Report No. 19). Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk, Johns Hopkins University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED423327) The sample is not appropriate to this review: this study does not focus on students learning to read in English, one of the parameters for this WWC review.

Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. A. (1999). Effects of bilingual and English as a second language adaptations of Success for All on the reading achievement of students acquiring English. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, *4*(4), 393–416. **(Study: Philadelphia, PA)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study, which uses a quasi-experimental design experienced attrition which led to possible bias in reporting.

***Additional sources:***

Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B. A. (1991). *Success for All: Multi-year effects of a schoolwide elementary restructuring program*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


Schooling for Disadvantaged Students. **(Study: Philadelphia, PA)**

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L. J., & Wasik, B. A. (1994). *Implementing Success for All in the Philadelphia Public Schools: Final report to the Pew Foundation*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L. J., & Wasik, B. A. (1993). *Success for All: Evaluations of national replications* (Report No. 43). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L. J., & Wasik, B. A. (1996). Success for All: A summary of research. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, *1*(1), 41–76. **(Study: Philadelphia, PA)**

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L., Wasik, B. A., Ross, S. M., & Smith, L. J. (1994, April). *Success for All: Longitudinal effects of systemic school-by-school reform in seven districts*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. **(Study: Philadelphia, PA)**

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L., Wasik, B. A., Ross, S. M., & Smith, L. J. (1994). 'Whenever and wherever we choose': The replication of 'Success for All'. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *75*(8), 639–647. **(Study: Philadelphia, PA)**

Slavin, R. E., Leighton, M., & Yampolsky, R. (1990). Success For All: Effects on the achievement of limited English proficient children (Report No. 5). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED331585) Does not use a strong causal design: for the portion of the sample of interest to this WWC review, there was only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

***Additional source:***

Slavin, R. E., & Yampolsky, R. (1991). *Effects of Success for All on students with limited English proficiency: A three-year evaluation*. Retrieved from Success for All Foundation Web site: http://www.successforall.net/_images/pdfs/englanlearn.htm

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Cheung, A., & Liang, C. (2002). *Success for All in California: Gains on SAT-9 Reading and the Academic Performance Index*. Baltimore, MD: Success for All Foundation. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Karweit, N., Livermon, B. J., & Dolan, L. (1990). Success for All: First-year outcomes of a comprehensive plan for reforming urban education. *American Educational Research Journal*, *27*(2), 255–278. Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Smith, L. J., Ross, S. M., & Casey, J. (1996). Multi-site comparison of the effects of Success for All on reading achievement. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *28*(3), 329–353. **(Study: Montgomery, AL)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study, which uses a quasi-experimental design, does not use equating measures to ensure that the comparison group is equivalent to the treatment group.

***Additional sources:***

Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., Casey, J., Johnson, B., & Bond, C. (1994, April). *Using Success for All to restructure elementary schools: A tale of four cities*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. **(Study: Montgomery, AL)**

Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L., Wasik, B. A., Ross, S. M., & Smith, L. J. (1994, April). *Success for All: Longitudinal effects of systemic school-by-school reform in seven districts*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. **(Study: Montgomery, AL)**

St. John, E. P., Manset, G., Chung, C., & Worthington, K. (2001). *Assessing the rationales for educational reforms: A test of the professional development, comprehensive reform, and direct instruction hypotheses*. Bloomington: Indiana University, Indiana Education Policy Center, Smith Center for Research in Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED458641) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified student outcome measures but this study does not focus on students.

St. John, E. P., Manset, G., Chung, C., Simmons, A. B., & Musoba, G. D. (2000). *Research-based reading interventions: The impact of Indiana's Early Literacy Grant Program.* Bloomington: Indiana University, Indiana Education Policy Center, Smith Center for Research in Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED447466) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Sterbinsky, A., Ross, S. M., & Redfield, D. (2002). *The effects of implementing comprehensive school reform models in 12 elementary schools: Year 3 study results*. Charleston, SC: Appalachia Educational Laboratory. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

***Additional source:***

Sterbinsky, A., Ross, S. M., & Redfield, D. (2003, April). *Comprehensive school reform: A multi-site replicated experiment*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Stringfield, S., Millsap, M. A., Herman, R., Yoder, N., Brigham, N., Nesselrodt, P., et al. (1997). *Urban and suburban/rural special strategies for educating disadvantaged children: Findings and policy implications of a longitudinal study*. Retrieved from Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools Web site: http://www.csos.jhu.edu/Otherlinks/SpecialStrategies/index.htm Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Tivnan, T., & Hemphill, L. (2005). Comparing four literacy reform models in high-poverty schools: Patterns of first-grade achievement. *The Elementary School Journal*, *105*(5), 419–441. Does not use a strong causal design: this study, which uses a quasi-experimental design, does not use equating measures to ensure that the comparison group is equivalent to the treatment group.

Urdegar, S. M. (2000). *Evaluation of the Success for All Program 1998–99*. Miami, FL: Miami-Dade County Public Schools, Office of Evaluation and Research. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

***Additional source:***

Urdegar, S. M. (1998). *Evaluation of the Success for All program 1997–98*. Miami, FL: Miami-Dade Public Schools, Office of Educational Evaluation.

Veals, C. J. (2002). The impact of the Success for All reading program on the reading performance of third grade students in two southwest Mississippi schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *63*(04), 1291A. (UMI No. 3049586) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Wang, L. W., & Ross, S. M. (1999). *Results for Success for All Program: Alhambra School District*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy. Confound: the effects of the intervention could not be separated from other factors; the impact of the agent of the intervention was confounded with the impact of the intervention.

Wang, L. W., & Ross, S. M. (2003). *Comparisons between elementary school programs on reading performance: Albuquerque Public Schools*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy. Does not use a strong causal design: this study, which uses a quasi-experimental

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


design, does not use equating measures to ensure that the comparison group is equivalent to the treatment group.

Wells, L. R. (2000). An investigation of the Success for All reading program at two Mississippi elementary schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *61*(04), 1342A. (UMI No. 9970370) The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

***SuccessMaker® Reading***

Brush, T. A. (1998). *An evaluation of the effectiveness of the Computer Curriculum Corporation's (CCC) Foundations and Exploreware software on students in grades one through five.* Unpublished manuscript. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Fitzgerald, D., Hughes, P., & Fitzgerald, R. N. (1996). *An evaluation of computer assisted learning in Victorian Schools.* Melbourne: Victorian Directorate of School Education. The sample is not appropriate for review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Isernhagen, J. C. (1999). Technology: A major catalyst for increasing learning. *T.H.E. Journal*, *27*(1), 30, 32, 34, 36, 38. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Levitt, J. L. (2000). *An interim evaluation of operation safety net, a five-year project, 1996–1997 – 2000–01, Three year report 1996–98 – 1998–99.* Miami, FL: Miami-Dade County Public Schools, Office of Evaluation and Research. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Metis Associates. (1996). *Community School District Six: Integrated technology reading support project.* Unpublished manuscript. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

NCS Learn. (2000). *North Carolina end-of-grade/SuccessMaker relationship study for Cumberland County Schools spring 2000.* Mesa, AZ: Author. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Suppes, P., Zanotti, M., Smith, N., & Tingey, B. (1987). *Effectiveness of the CAI program for chapter I students in Fort Worth Parochial Schools: Global evaluation.* Palo Alto: CA, Computer Curriculum Corporation. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Suppes, P., Zanotti, M., & Smith, N. (1988). *Effectiveness of the CAI program for chapter I students in Fort Worth Parochial Schools: Global evaluation for 1986–87.* Palo Alto, CA: Computer Curriculum Corporation. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Suppes, P., Zanotti, M., & Smith, N. (1988). *Effectiveness of the CCC CAI program for chapter I students in Fort Worth Parochial Schools: Global evaluation for 1987–88.* Palo Alto, CA: Computer Curriculum Corporation. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Suppes, P., Zanotti, M., & Smith, N. (1989). *Effectiveness of the CCC CAI program for Chapter I students in Fort Worth Parochial Schools: Global evaluation for 1988–89.* Palo Alto, CA: Computer Curriculum Corporation. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Suppes, P., Zanotti, M., & Smith, N. (1991). *Effectiveness of the CCC CAI program for chapter I students in Fort Worth Parochial Schools: Global evaluation for 1990–91.* Palo Alto, CA: Computer Curriculum Corporation. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Thrall, A., & Tingey, B. (Eds.). (2003, February). *SuccessMaker® Primary reading: SuccessMaker submission for W-W-C*. (Available from the Pearson Education Technologies, 6710 East Camelback Road, Scottsdale, Arizona 85251) **(Study:**

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


**Aiken County Schools: On target analysis for 2001–2002 PACT and SuccessMaker)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Thrall, A., & Tingey, B. (Eds.). (2003, February). *SuccessMaker® Primary reading: SuccessMaker submission for W-W-C*. (Available from the Pearson Education Technologies, 6710 East Camelback Road, Scottsdale, Arizona 85251) **(Study: Hueneme School District. Efficacy analysis for 2000–2002 Stanford 9 and SuccessMaker)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Thrall, A., & Tingey, B. (Eds.). (2003, February). *SuccessMaker® Primary reading: SuccessMaker submission for W-W-C*. (Available from the Pearson Education Technologies, 6710 East Camelback Road, Scottsdale, Arizona 85251) **(Study: Hueneme School District. OnTarget analysis for 2001–2002 Stanford 9 and SuccessMaker)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Thrall, A., & Tingey, B. (Eds.). (2003, February). *SuccessMaker® Primary reading: SuccessMaker submission for W-W-C*. (Available from the Pearson Education Technologies, 6710 East Camelback Road, Scottsdale, Arizona 85251) **(Study: MAP/SuccessMaker relationship study for North Kansas City Public Schools)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Thrall, A., & Tingey, B. (Eds.). (2003, February). *SuccessMaker® Primary reading: SuccessMaker submission for W-W-C*. (Available from the Pearson Education Technologies, 6710 East Camelback Road, Scottsdale, Arizona 85251) **(Study: Meadowlane Elementary School Miami-Dade County Schools Hialeah, Florida: Case study and program summary 2001–2002)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Thrall, A., & Tingey, B. (Eds.). (2003, February). *SuccessMaker® Primary reading: SuccessMaker submission for W-W-C*. (Available from the Pearson Education Technologies, 6710 East Camelback Road, Scottsdale, Arizona 85251) **(Study: Minneapolis Public Schools: Efficacy analysis for 2001–2002 MCA and SuccessMaker)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Thrall, A., & Tingey, B. (Eds.). (2003, February). *SuccessMaker® Primary reading: SuccessMaker submission for W-W-C*. (Available from the Pearson Education Technologies, 6710 East Camelback Road, Scottsdale, Arizona 85251) **(Study: Minneapolis Public Schools: OnTarget analysis for 2001–2002 MCA and SuccessMaker)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Thrall, A., & Tingey, B. (Eds.). (2003, February). *SuccessMaker® Primary reading: SuccessMaker submission for W-W-C*. (Available from the Pearson Education Technologies, 6710 East Camelback Road, Scottsdale, Arizona 85251) **(Study: Orange County Public Schools: FCAT OnTarget analysis for 2001–2002)** The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Thrall, A., & Tingey, B. (Eds.). (2003, February). *SuccessMaker® Primary reading: SuccessMaker submission for W-W-C*. (Available from the Pearson Education Technologies, 6710 East Camelback Road, Scottsdale, Arizona 85251) **(Study: Orange County Public Schools: OnTarget analysis for 2002–2003 FCAT and SuccessMaker)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Thrall, A., & Tingey, B. (Eds.). (2003, February). *SuccessMaker® Primary reading: SuccessMaker submission for W-W-C*. (Available from the Pearson Education Technologies, 6710 East Camelback Road, Scottsdale, Arizona 85251) **(Study: Orange County Public Schools, Orlando, Florida: End of year report SuccessMaker high stakes forecast pilot)** The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Thrall, A., & Tingey, B. (Eds.). (2003, February). *SuccessMaker® Primary reading: SuccessMaker submission for W-W-C*.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


(Available from the Pearson Education Technologies, 6710 East Camelback Road, Scottsdale, Arizona 85251) **(Study: Orange County Public Schools, Orlando, Florida: End of year report SuccessMaker ontarget analysis efficacy)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Thrall, A., & Tingey, B. (Eds.). (2003, February). *SuccessMaker® Primary reading: SuccessMaker submission for W-W-C*. (Available from the Pearson Education Technologies, 6710 East Camelback Road, Scottsdale, Arizona 85251) **(Study: Seminole County Public Schools. OnTarget analysis for 2001–2002 FCAT and SuccesMaker)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Thrall, A., & Tingey, B. (Eds.). (2003, February). *SuccessMaker® Primary reading: SuccessMaker submission for W-W-C*. (Available from the Pearson Education Technologies, 6710 East Camelback Road, Scottsdale, Arizona 85251) **(Study: Seminole County Public Schools. OnTarget analysis for 2002–2003 FCAT and SuccessMaker)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Thrall, A., & Tingey, B. (Eds.). (2003, February). *SuccessMaker® Primary reading: SuccessMaker submission for W-W-C*. (Available from the Pearson Education Technologies, 6710 East Camelback Road, Scottsdale, Arizona 85251) **(Study: Seminole County Public Schools Orlando, Florida: End of year report SuccessMaker OnTarget analysis efficacy)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Thrall, A., & Tingey, B. (Eds.). (2003, February). *SuccessMaker® Primary reading: SuccessMaker submission for W-W-C*. (Available from the Pearson Education Technologies, 6710 East Camelback Road, Scottsdale, Arizona 85251) **(Study: SuccessMaker ontarget analysis highlights from study of ITBS and SuccessMaker in North Kansas City School District)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Thrall, A., & Tingey, B. (Eds.). (2003, February). *SuccessMaker® Primary reading: SuccessMaker submission for W-W-C*. (Available from the Pearson Education Technologies, 6710 East Camelback Road, Scottsdale, Arizona 85251) **(Study: Technology literacy challenge fund sub-grant program)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Thrall, A., & Tingey, B. (Eds.). (2003, February). *SuccessMaker® Primary reading: SuccessMaker submission for W-W-C*. (Available from the Pearson Education Technologies, 6710 East Camelback Road, Scottsdale, Arizona 85251) **(Study: Wake County Schools: North Carolina EOG tests and SuccessMaker relationship study for 1999–2000)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Tingey, B., & Simon, C. (2001). *SuccessMaker: Evidence of effectiveness selected evaluation studies*. Retrieved from Pearson Education Web site: http://www.pearsoned.com/RESRPTS_FOR_POSTING/DIGITALCONTENT_RESEARCH/DC4.%20SuccessMaker_Enterprise-Evidence_of_Effectiveness.pdf **(Study: Relationship study for SuccessMaker levels and SAT-9 in Hueneme Elementary District school year 2000–2001)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

***Sullivan Program***

Froniabarger, E. W. (1983). A comparison of the Crossties, Alpha-Time, Sullivan, and Bookmark reading readiness programs in kindergarten. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *44*(08), 2349A. (UMI No. 8325590) Does not use a strong causal design: there was only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors

***Tribes Learning Communities***

Kiger, D. (2000). *The Tribes Process: Phase III evaluation*. Beloit, WI: Research and Accountability Department, School District

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


of Beloit. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

School District of Beloit. (1998). Tribes evaluation—phase two (precursor study). *Research Focus*, *3*(9), 1–6. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

***Voyager Universal Literacy System***

Roberts, G. (2003). *Longitudinal study of the effect of universal literacy: A hierarchical linear modeling analysis of curriculum-based measurement data.* Austin, TX: Evaluation Research Services. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Roberts, G. (2002, June). Evaluation report on the impact of the Voyager Universal Literacy System in Birmingham City Schools. Retrieved April 19, 2007, from http://www.voyager-learning.com/docs/difference/report_studies/Birmingham.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Roberts, G., & Allen, A. S. (2003). *Impact of the Voyager Universal Literacy System as measured by PALS in Virginia*. Retrieved from Voyager Expanded Learning Web site: http://www.voyagerlearning.com/ResearchStudyDocuments/ULS_measuredby_PALS_Richmond_VA.pdf This study is a quasi-experimental design that uses achievement pretests but it does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Starnes, D., Taylor, D., & Betourne, M. (2004). *Voyager Universal Literacy System Second Year Evaluation Report: Fulton County Schools.* Atlanta, GA: EMSTAR Research, Inc. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group was equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

***Waterford Early Reading Program™***

Alfaro, R. (1999). The technology-reading connection. *Educational Workshop*, *56*(6), 48 – 51. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Canedo, M., Smolen, L., & Pollard, J. (2000). *A study of the effectiveness of the Waterford Early Reading Program: Final evaluation results 1997–98*. Buffalo, NY: Buffalo Public Schools. Complete data are not reported: The WWC could not compute effect sizes because complete study details were not reported.

Cassady, J. C., & Smith, L. L. (2003). The impact of a reading-focused integrated learning system on phonological awareness in kindergarten. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *35*(4), 947–964. Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Cassady, J. C., & Smith, L. L. (2005). The impact of a structured integrated learning system on first grade students' reading gains. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, *21*(4), 361–376. Does not use a strong causal design. A historical cohort was used as the comparison group. WWC conventions allow for historical control cohorts in studies that have a broad unit of analysis (school or higher). This study analyzes at the student level and therefore does not fulfill the WWC requirement.

Heuston, D. (1996). Power tools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *77* (10), 706. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Obeso-Bradley, C., & Miller, B. (1999, December). *Early literacy and technology: The Waterford Early Reading Program (WERP) Level 2, Southside School District, Hollister, California.* Paper presented at the annual education conference of the California School Boards Association, San Francisco, CA. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Paterson, W. A., Henry, J. J., O'Quin, K., Ceprano, M. A., & Blue, E. V. (2003). Investigating the effectiveness of an integrated learning system on early emergent readers. *Reading Research*

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


*Quarterly*, *38*(2), 172–206. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not provide enough information to establish that the comparison group and the intervention group were composed of comparable students.

Shapley, K. S. (1997). *Special report of the 1996–1997 Waterford Early Reading Program*. Dallas, TX: Dallas Public Schools. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

***Additional source:***

Waterford Institute, Inc. (1998). *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101). **(Study: Dallas ISD, Dallas, TX)**

Tracey, D. H. (n.d.). *The Waterford Early Reading Program: Research orientation, studies, and findings: Executive summary*. Pittsburgh PublicSchools, Office of the Deputy Superintendent of Instruction, Assessment, and Accountability. Retrieved March 1, 2007, from http://www.pps.k12.pa.us/academicoffice/literacyplus/waterford/stuff/executive%20summary%20-%20diane%20traecy.doc Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Waterford Institute, Inc. (1998). *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101). **(Study: Collins Garden and Nelson Elementary Schools, San Antonio, TX)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Waterford Institute, Inc. (1998). *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101). **(Study: Daily use of computer materials in Utah and New York)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Waterford Institute, Inc. (1998). *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101). **(Study: Glenridge Elementary School)** Complete data are not reported: the WWC could not compute effect sizes because complete study details were not reported.

Waterford Institute, Inc. (1998). *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101). **(Study: Hillcrest Elementary School preliminary study)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Waterford Institute, Inc. (1998). *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101). **(Study: New London Public Schools, New London, CT)** Complete data are not reported: the WWC could not compute effect sizes because complete study details were not reported.

Waterford Institute, Inc. (1999). *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101). **(Study: Hacienda la Puente Unified School District Program Year 1997–8, Los Angeles County, CA)** Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design that uses achievement pretests but it does not establish that the comparison group is comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Waterford Institute, Inc. (1999). *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101). **(Study: Pittsburgh, PA Public School District)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


Waterford Institute, Inc. (1999). *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101). **(Study: Selected Utah public schools for the 1997–98 school year)** Does not use a strong causal design. A historical cohort was used as the comparison group. WWC conventions allow for historical control cohorts in studies that have a broad unit of analysis (school or higher). This study analyzes at the student level and therefore does not fulfill the WWC requirement.

Waterford Institute, Inc. (2000). *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101). **(Study: Utah and New York Schools)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Waterford Institute, Inc. (2000). *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101). **(Study: Duncanville Independent School District, Duncanville, TX)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Waterford Institute, Inc. (2000). *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101). **(Study: Hillcrest Title I school in Alpine School District, Orem, Utah)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Waterford Institute, Inc. (2000). *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101). **(Study: Norwalk Public Schools 1998–99 school year, Norwalk, CT)** Complete data are not reported: the WWC could not compute effect sizes because complete study details were not reported.

Waterford Institute, Inc. (2000). *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101). **(Study: Scott Lane Elementary School, Santa Clara Unified School District)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Waterford Institute, Inc. (2002). Correlation. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101.) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Waterford Institute, Inc. (2002). *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101). **(Study: Bryan Elementary, Hillsborough County, Florida, 1997–98 school year)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Waterford Institute, Inc. (2002). *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101). **(Study: Commons Lane Elementary School: 2000–2001)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Waterford Institute, Inc. (2002). *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101). **(Study: Correlation between test gains and time spend using the Waterford Early Reading Program)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Waterford Institute, Inc. (2002). *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101). **(Study: Decatur School District 61)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group is equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Waterford Institute, Inc. (2002). *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101). **(Study: El Centrito interim grant report for the period of July 1, 1999 to December 31, 1999; report no. 109)** The

sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Waterford Institute, Inc. (2002). *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101). **(Study: Hempstead Independent School District, Hempstead, TX)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Waterford Institute, Inc. (2002). *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101). **(Study: Los Angeles Unified School District, Los Angeles, CA)** Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Waterford Institute, Inc. (2002). *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101). **(Study: Los Angeles Unified School District: Academic alliance and support, Los Angeles, CA)** Confound: this study included Waterford but combined it with another intervention so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Waterford Institute, Inc. (2002). *Research Compendium: The Waterford Early Reading Program*. (Available from Waterford Institute, Inc., 55 West 900 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84101). **(Study: Madisonville Consolidated Independent School District)** Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design that uses achievement pretests but it does not establish that the comparison group is comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Walberg, H. J. (2001). *Final evaluation of the reading initiative. Report to the J.A. & Kathryn Albertson Foundation Board of Directors.* Available from the Waterford Institute Web site: http://www.waterford.org/corporate_pages/IdahoStudy.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Washington, S. T. (2003). Teachers' perceptions of the implementation of the Waterford Early Reading Program, a computer-based instruction program: A case study of the evidence from teachers' interviews and students' achievement data in selective Pennsylvania urban elementary schools. *Dissertation Abstracts International,* 64, 07A. Complete data are not reported: the WWC could not compute effect sizes because complete study details were not reported.

Young, J. W., & Tracey, D. H. (2004). *An evaluation of the Waterford Early Reading Program Newark, New Jersey 1997–98 school year*. Rutgers, NJ: Authors. Complete data are not reported; The WWC could not evaluate the design because complete data were not reported. Attempts to contact the authors for more information were unsuccessful.

***Wiggleworks***

Boling, C., Martin, S. H., & Martin, M. A. (2002). The effects of computer-assisted instruction on first grade students' vocabulary development. *Reading Improvement*, *39*(2), 79–88. Does not use a strong causal design: the outcome measures used in this study do not demonstrate adequate reliability or validity.

***Wilson Reading System®***

Banks, S. R., Guyer, B. P., & Guyer, K. E. (1993). Spelling improvement by college students who are dyslexic. *Annals of Dyslexia*, *43*, 186–193. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Gustavson, K., & Watson, N. (1995). *Wilson Reading and Reading to Read.* Augusta, ME: Division of Adult & Community Education. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


Guyer, B. P., Banks, S. R., & Guyer, K. E. (1993). Spelling improvement for college students who are dyslexic. *Annals of Dyslexia*, *43*, 254–259. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Moats, L. C. (1998). Reading, spelling, and writing disabilities in the middle grades. In B. Wong (Ed.), *Learning about learning disabilities, 2nd edition* (pp. 1–19). Orlando, FL: Academic Press. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specify that students should be in grades K–3 during the time of the intervention; this study does not focus on the targeted grades.

Wilson, B. A. (1998). Matching student needs to instruction: Teaching reading and spelling using the Wilson Reading System. In S. A. Vogel, & S. Reder (Eds.), *Learning disabilities, literacy, and adult education* (pp. 213–234). Baltimore, MD: Brookes Publishing. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades kindergarten through 3; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Wilson, B. A., & O'Connor, J. R. (1995). Effectiveness of the Wilson Reading System used in public school training. In C. W. McIntyre & J. S. Pickering (Eds.), *Clinical studies of multisensory structured language education.* (pp. 247 – 254). Salem, OR: International Multisensory Structured Language Education Council. The sample is not appropriate to this review: the parameters for this WWC review specified that students should be in grades kindergarten through third grade; this study does not disaggregate students in the eligible range from those outside the range.

Wilson Language Training (2002). [Evidence of Effectiveness: Wake Forest University, 2002: Data analysis]. Unpublished raw data. Retrieved from http://www.wilsonlanguage.com/PDF/Evidence_Data_Analysis.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Wilson Language Training Corporation. (2002). Wilson Literacy Solutions: Evidence of effectiveness Wilson Spelling results 2000. Retrieved from http://www.wilsonlanguage.com/PDF/Lynn_Results.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.


***Writing to Read***


Beasley, N. S. (1989). The effects of the IBM Writing to Read program on the achievement of selected first-grade students. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 51*(3), 739A. (UMI No. 9122247) Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Blackburn, S., & Davis, M. S. (1987). *Writing to Read evaluation*. Volusia County, FL: School District of Volusia County. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Boyer, W. A. R. (1990). The effects of the Writing to Read program on first grade writing outcomes. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 51*(10), 3324A. (UMI No. 9106559) Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Brierley, M. (1987). *Writing to Read and full day kindergarten evaluation*. Columbus, OH: Public Schools Department of Evaluation Services. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED289626) Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Case, E. J. & Christopher, M. (1989). *Pilot study of the learning to read system*. Albuquerque, NM: Albuquerque Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED320333) Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Casey, J. M. (1992). *Writing to Read in the classroom: A literature-based writing literacy environment*. Simi Star Project Report. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED367952) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Childers, R. D. (1989*). Implementation of the Writing to Read instructional system in 13 rural elementary schools in southern West Virginia. 1988–89 Annual Report*. Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Lab. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED320744) Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Childers, R. D. (1990). *Implementation of Writing to Read program in 13 rural elementary schools in Southern West Virginia: A two-year evaluation. Final Report*. Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Lab. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED334032) Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Childers, R. D., & Leopold, G. D. (1993). *A follow up study of the SRC/IBM Writing to Read project in Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia: Final report.* Washington, DC: Appalachian Regional Commission. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED363474) Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Collis, B., Ollila, L., & Ollila, K. (1990). 'Writing to Read': An Evaluation of a Canadian installation of a computer-supported initial language environment. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 6*(4), 411–27. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Deboe, M., & et al. (1984). *Writing to Read in the Portland public schools—1983–1984 evaluation report*. Portland Public Schools, OR: Research and Evaluation Dept. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED255552) The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: the outcomes in this study does not address one of the domains of interest in this review.

Decker, B. C. (1991, May). *Early literacy instruction with computers and whole language: An evaluation of the Writing to Read computer progam with disadvantaged minority children*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Thirty-Sixth International Reading Association, Las Vegas, NV. Complete data are not reported: the WWC could not evaluate the design or data because complete study details were not reported.

District of Columbia Public Schools, Division of Quality Assurance. (1986). *Writing to Read Program. Final evaluation report. E.C.I.A. Chapter 2, 1985–1986*. Washington, DC: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED279018) Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Educational Testing Service. (1984). *The ETS evaluation of Writing to Read*. Retrieved from Bright Blue Software Web site: http://brightbluesoftware.com/downloads/The%20ETS%20Evaluation%20of%20WTR.pdf Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Hoffman, C. (1990). The magic of Writing to Read. *Appalachia, 23* (1), 11–16. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: the outcomes in this study does not address one of the domains of interest in this review.

Kirkland, E. R. (1984). *Writing to Read: A Computer-based, language experience, writing and reading system, as used with handicapped children*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Regional Reading Conference of the International Reading Association, Reno, NV. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: the outcomes in this

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


study does not address one of the domains of interest in this review.

Kurban, M. A. (2000). The long-term effectiveness of the Writing to Read program. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 61*(2), 548A. (UMI No. 9962340) Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Leahy, P. (1991). A multi-year formative evaluation of IBM's "Writing to Read" program. *Reading Improvement, 28*(4), 257–264. Does not use a strong causal design: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not use reading achievement pretests to establish that the comparison group was equivalent to the intervention group at baseline.

Levinson, J. L., & Lalor, I. (1989). *Computer-assisted writing/ reading instruction of young children: a 2-year evaluation of 'Writing to Read'*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. Does not use a strong causal design: there is only one intervention and one comparison unit, so the analysis cannot separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Metropolitan Public Schools. (1987). *Writing to Read Program: Tusculum Elementary School, 1985–86, 1986–87: Evaluation report*. Nashville, TN: Author. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Murphy, R. T., & Appel, L. R. (1984). *Evaluation of the Writing to Read instructional system. 1982–1984 (Second Year Report)*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. Complete data are not reported: the WWC could not evaluate the design or data because complete study details were not reported.

Rogier, L. L., Owens, J. L., & Patty, D. L. (1999). Writing to Read: A valuable program for first grade? *Reading Improvement, 36* (1), 24 – 34. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Sarangarm, I. L. (1992). The relationship between writing and reading achievement: The effectiveness of the Writing to Read program. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 53*(4), 1042A. (UMI No. 9224080) Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Sierra, R., & Naron, N. K. (1988). *Evaluating the Writing to Read Program: Seeking the ghost in the machine*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Singh, B. (1991). *IBM's Wring to Read program: The right stuff or just high tech fluff?* Atlanta, GA: Fulton County Board of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED339015) Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

Sledge, P. S. (1987). Differences in language achievement of kindergartners with and without experiences on the IBM Computer Program 'Writing to Read'. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 48*(08), 1973A. (UMI No. 8724407) Does not use a strong causal design: there was only one intervention and/ or one comparison unit, so the analysis could not separate the effects of the intervention from other factors.

Staff, P. (1987). *Final evaluation of the Writing to Read Program 1986–1987* (Report No. REA87-002-05). Dallas, TX: Department of Research, Evaluation, and Audit, Dallas Independent School District. Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


Stevenson, Z., Cathey-Pugh, J., & Kosmidis, M. (1988). *Achievement in the writing to read program: A comparative evaulation study*. Washington, DC: District of Columbia Public Schools, Division of Quality Assurance and Management Planning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED293147) Complete data are not reported: the WWC could not evaluate the design or data because complete study details were not reported.

The University of Mississippi. (n.d.). *The Mississippi evaluation of Writing to Read executive summary*. University: Author. Does not use a strong causal design: this study does not use a comparison group.

Turco, A. (1993). *Reducing the retention rate among kindergarten, first, and second grade students*. Salem, NJ: Nova University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED371820)

Vetcher, J. H. (1990). The utilization of Writing to Read and its effect on the reading and writing skills of kindergarten and first-grade students. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 51*(8), 2693A. (UMI No. 9102002) Incomparable groups: this study is a quasi-experimental design but does not establish that the comparison group was comparable to the treatment group prior to the start of the intervention.

West, V. (1985). Teaching reading and writing in Tulsa's kindergarten program. *Spectrum, 3*(3), 31–35. The outcome measures are not relevant to this review: the outcomes in this study do not address one of the domains of interest in this review.


### Studies in process of being reviewed

***Accelerated Schools***


Ross, S. M., Alberg, M., McNelis, M., & Rakow, J. (1997). *Evaluation of elementary school school-wide programs: Clover Park School District, year 1: 1996–97*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

***Additional source:***

Ross, S. M., Alberg, M., McNelis, M., & Smith, L. J. (1998). *Evaluation of elementary school-wide programs: Clover Park School District year 2: 1997–98*. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.


***Basic Reading Through Dance***


McMahon, S. D., Rose, D. S., & Parks, M. (2003). Basic reading through dance program: The impact on first-grade students' basic reading skills. *Evaluation Review*, *27*(1), 104–125.


***Beginning Sight Reading Videodisc***


Thorkildsen, R. J., & Friedman, S. G. (1986). Interactive videodisc: Instructional design of a beginning reading program. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, *9*(2), 111–117.


***Brain Gym***


Witcher, S. H. (2001). Effects of educational kinesiology, previous performance, gender, and socioeconomic status on phonological awareness literacy screening scores of kindergarten students. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *63*(09), 3111A. (UMI No. 3065470)


***Building Essential Literacy: A whole design approach for improving literacy (K–3)***


Hill, P. W., & Jaggar, A. M. (2001). *An evaluation report on the impact of Mondo Publishing's Building Essential Literacy (BEL) design and Bookshop Reading Program: 1998–1999 and 1999–2000 school years*. Retrieved from Mondo Publishing Web site: http://www.mondopub.com/articles/Hill.Jaggar.Supovitz.pdf


***Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction (CORI)***


Guthrie, J. T., Van Meter, P., Hancock, G. R., Alao, A., Anderson, E., & McCann, A. (1998). Does concept-oriented reading instruction increase strategy use and conceptual learning from text? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *90*(2), 261–278.

Guthrie, J. T., Anderson, E., Alao, S., & Rinehart, J. (1999). Influences of concept-oriented reading instruction on strategy

use and conceptual learning from text. *Elementary School Journal*, *99*(4), 343–366.

***Core Knowledge Curriculum***

Stringfield, S., Datnow, A., Borman, G., Rachuba, L. T. (2000). *National evaluation of Core Knowledge sequence implementation: Final report* (Report No. 49). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED451282)

***Direct Instruction/Reading Mastery and Open Court***

O'Brien, D. M., & Ware, A. M. (2002, March). Implementing research-based reading programs in the Fort Worth Independent School District. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, *7*(2), 167–195.

***Direct Instruction/Reading Mastery***

Lovett, M. W., & Steinbach, K. A. (1997). The effectiveness of remedial programs for reading disabled children of different ages: Does the benefit decrease for older children? *Learning Disability Quarterly*, *20*(3), 189–210.

***Direct Instruction Skills Plan***

Pinnell, G. S., DeFord, D. E., Lyons, C., Bryk, A. S., & Seltzer, M. S. (1994). Comparing instructional models for the literacy education of high-risk first graders. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *29*(1), 8–39.

***Early Steps***

Morris, D., Tyner, B., & Perney, J. (2000). Early Steps: Replicating the effects of a first-grade reading intervention program. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *92*(4), 681–693.

Santa, C. M., & Hoien, T. (1999). An assessment of Early Steps: A program for early intervention of reading problems. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *34*(1), 54–79.

***Emergent Reader Literacy Instruction (ERLI)***

Swann, J. M. (1997, March). *An investigation into the effectiveness of the emergent reader literacy instruction model*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED404636)

***Essential Learning Systems***

Holmes, S. M. (2001). The relative effectiveness of Essential Learning Systems, a sensory integration training program on introductory reading skills and academic self concept of rural African American children with learning deficits. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *62*(04), 1363A. (UMI No. 3010946)

***Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction (ECRI)***

Cohen, K. A. (1991). A comparative study of reading instruction management for selected third-grade students in urban school districts. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *52*(08), 2872A. (UMI 9201506)

***Four Block Framework***

Scarcelli, S. M. (1995). Effects of direct reading instruction on literacy achievement in urban literature based classrooms. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *57*(03), 1078A. (UMI No. 9618024)

***Houghton Mifflin Reading: A Legacy of Literacy***

Swartz, J., & Johnston, K. (2003). *Efficacy study of Houghton Mifflin Reading: A Legacy of Literacy* (Final Rep.). Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc.

***Jolly Phonics***

Sumbler, K. (1999). Phonological awareness combined with explicit alphabetic coding instruction in kindergarten: Classroom observations and evaluation. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *60*(10), 3626A. (UMI No. NQ41321)

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


***Lexia Learning Systems***

Macaruso, P., Hook, P. E., & McCabe, R. (2003, August). *The efficacy of Lexia skills-based software for improving reading comprehension.* (Available from the Department of Psychology, Community College of Rhode Island, 1762 Louisquisset Pike, Lincoln, RI 02865)

Macaruso, P., Hook, P. E., & McCabe, R. (2006). The efficacy of computer-based supplementary phonics programs for advancing reading skills in at-risk elementary students. *Journal of Research in Reading*, *29*(2), 162–172.

***Additional source:***

Macaruso, P., Walker, A., & McCabe, R. (2006). The efficacy of computer-based supplementary phonics programs for advancing reading skills in at-risk elementary students. *Reading Psychology: An International Quarterly*, *29*(2), 162–172.

***Madeline Hunter's Instructional Theory into Practice***

Stallings, J., & Krasavage, E. M. (1986). Program implementation and student achievement in a four-year Madeline Hunter Follow-Through Project. *Elementary School Journal*, *87*(2), 117–138.

***Open Court***

O'Brien, D. M., & Ware, A. M. (2002). Implementing research-based reading programs in the Fort Worth Independent School District. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, *7*(2), 167–195.

***PA-Spelling***

Edwards, L. L. (2000). The role of spelling and handwriting in kindergarten instruction: An examination of the effects of two beginning reading instructional interventions on the reading and spelling achievement of kindergarten students at-risk of reading disabilities. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *61*(09), 3512A. (UMI No. 9987232)

***PA-Storybook***

Edwards, L. L. (2000). The role of spelling and handwriting in kindergarten instruction: An examination of the effects of two beginning reading instructional interventions on the reading and spelling achievement of kindergarten students at-risk of reading disabilities. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *61*(09), 3512A. (UMI No. 9987232)

***Pathway to Early Reading***

The Early Reading Company. (n.d.). *Pathway to Early Reading*. Des Plaines, IL: Author.

***Phono-Graphix***

Denton, C. A., Fletcher, J. M., Anthony, J. L., & Francis, D. J. (2006). An evaluation of intensive intervention for students with persistent reading difficulties. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *39*(5), 447–466.

Dias, K., & Juniper, L. (2002). Phono-Graphix: Who needs additional literacy support? An outline of research in Bristol schools. *Support for Learning*, *17*(1), 34–38.

***Process Writing Approach***

Frey, J. L. (1993). The Process Writing Approach and its effects on the reading comprehension of first-grade students in the Mississippi Delta. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *54*(4), 1231A. (UMI No. 9324416)

***Project CHILD***

Butzin, S. M. (2001). Using instructional technology in transformed learning environments: An evaluation of Project CHILD. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*, *33*(4), 367–374.

***Project EASE***

Jordan, G. E., Snow, C., & 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.

## Appendix A5 References *(continued)*


***Richards Read Systematic Language Program***

Angelopoulos, J. (n.d.). *Analysis of Richards Read curriculum*. Cleveland, OH: Case Western Reserve University, Creative Education Institute, Inc.

***Sing, Spell, Reading and Write (SSRW)***

Bond, C., Ross, S. M., Smith, L. J., & Nunnery, J. A. (1995). The effects of the Sing, Spell, Read, and Write program on reading achievement of beginning readers. *Reading Research and Instruction*, *35*, 122–141.

***Tribes Learning Communities***

Kiger, D. (2000). The Tribes process TLC: A preliminary evaluation of classroom implementation & impact on student achievement. *Education*, *120*(3), 586–592.

***Word Partners***

Vadasy, P. F. (2003, March). *Word Partners: Model demonstration projects for children with disabilities, continuation report*. (Available from the Washington Research Institute, 150 Nickerson Street, Suite 305, Seattle WA 98109)

***Writing to Write***

Chambless, J., & Chambless, M. (1994). The impact of instructional technology on reading/writing skills of 2nd grade students. *Reading Improvement, 31,* 151–155.