A LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF THE ROLE OF PHONOLOGICAL AWARENESS IN EARLY READING DEVELOPMENT IN ENGLISH SPEAKING (L1) AND ENGLISH AS A SECOND -LANGUAGE SPEAKING (ESL)STUDENTS

By

CLAIRE AUDREY HOPTION

B.A., The University of British Columbia, 1993 B.Ed., The University of British Columbia, 1994

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

In

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

(Department of Educational and Counselling Psychology and Special Education; Faculty of Education; Human Learning and Development Instruction)

We accept this thesis as conforming to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA December, 2002 © Claire Audrey Hoption, 2002 In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of ECNPS (Educational and Counselling Psychology & Special Education.

The University of British Columbia Vancouver, Canada

Date December 23 2002

Abstract

This study examined the role phonological processing (PP) skills play in identifying English as a Second language (ESL) students at risk of early reading failure compared to native English speaking (L1) students at risk of early reading failure. This study also examined whether early PP skills continue to be good predictors of reading ability for L1 and ESL learners over time. This 4 year longitudinal study began in 1996 with three grades of participants Junior Kindergarteners, Senior Kindergarteners, and Grade 1 students. There were 156 ESL students and 195 L1 students in 1996, and among the ESL participants, the two most predominant languages were Punjabi and Chinese. Students were further classified as either reading disabled (RD) or normal achieving readers (NA) based on their scores on a reading measure. All students were given tasks to assess their word reading, phonological awareness, syntactic awareness, spelling and working memory skills in English over the years, although in some years certain groups of participants were administered additional and different tasks depending on their grade level. For example, math tasks were administered only to grade 3 and 4 children in 1999. Although there were a few observable differences on some of the measures between the two language groups, this study found no significant differences in early reading development between L1 and ESL learners overall. In addition, this study found evidence of a positive and stable relationship between PP skills and reading ability in ESL and L1 students.

ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract
Table of Contents
List of Tables
Acknowledgements
Dedication
Introduction
Method
Results
Discussion
References
Appendix A
Appendix B
Appendix C
Appendix D

.

iii

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Number of RD and NA Participants for each Grade in each Year by Language Category
Table 2 List of Phonological Processing Skills Measures Administered to each Grade over the
<u>Years</u>
Table 3b Mean SK Scores on Reading and Phonological Processing Skills Measures for NA
and RD students
Table 3c Grade 1 Mean Scores on Reading and Phonological Processing Skills Measures for
<u>NA Students .</u>
Table 4 Mean Scores on Reading and Phonological Processing Skills Measures 27
Table 5 Mean Scores Merged by Grade over the Four Years 28
Table 6 <u>F- values of the Significantly Different Mean Scores found between ESL and L1</u>
<u>Students</u>
Table 7 Mean Scores and F values for Significantly Different Mean Scores between ESL and L1
Students by Grade
Table 8 F-values for Time Factor for Measures Employed in ANOVA Procedure 35
Table 9 Significant Correlations for JK group of Participants across the Four Years 37
Table 10 Significant Correlations for SK group of Participants across the Four Years 39
Table 11 Significant Correlations for Grade 1 Participants across the Four Years 40
Table 12 Number of Positive Significant Correlations by Grade over the Four Years 42

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my appreciation to all of those people who made it possible for me to complete this Master of Arts Degree. Without your support none of this would be possible.

First a special thanks to my parents and family for their unconditional support and encouragement. Your continued faith in my academic endeavours, especially during the challenging moments, means so much to me.

I have also met some great people working on this research, and for their input and help on this thesis, from the smallest tasks such as answering a question or helping me with the data to the bigger tasks of conducting this research and keeping me motivated, I extend my thanks to: everyone in lab 304B, Dr. Amedeo D' Anguilli, Dr. Monique Bournot-Trites, Dr. Dan Chiappe, Sarah Kontopolous, and Dr. Maria Traché. Thanks to all of you for your encouraging words, practical assistance and sage advice. Special thanks also to all of the students who helped with data collection and entry.

Finally, I would like to thank my committee members. I am very grateful for all you have done. A huge thank you to Dr. Linda Siegel, my advisor, for taking me on as her student in the summer of 2002. Thank you for putting your faith in me and seeing me through this degree, entrusting in me the use of your data, and your continued support and insight in helping me write this research. I could not have done this without you. To Dr. Bruno Zumbo and Stan Auerbach, thank you for your participation as my committee members. I appreciate your input on this research and your positive, kind words. I am especially grateful to all of you for sharing with me your knowledge and time.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to the memory of my father, Ernest Hoption, who showed me that determination, strength of spirit and dedication in all of life's endeavours leads to success. Thank you for always believing in me, teaching me to never give up, have faith in people and, most of all, have faith in myself. This thesis is for you dad for living life so nobly, always seeing the good in people, and being such a caring and loving father.

Introduction

In Canada, many children begin school in the public education school system at the age of 5 and many of those Canadian born or new immigrants speak languages other than English at home (ESL students). For most of these young students, it will be the first time they will be immersed in an English speaking learning environment. For some of these students complementary pull-out ESL assistance will be provided during their later elementary schooling years, but excluding this language assistance, ESL students will receive the same instruction as their native English speaking peers (L1 students). That is, all subjects in their curriculum will be taught in English including instruction in reading and writing (language arts). The general aim in this study is to gain a better understanding of the reading development of ESL learners who are receiving the same literacy instruction program as their native English speaking peers. Underlying the practice of integrating ESL students with native English speakers and providing ESL students with the same reading program that native English (L1) students receive is the assumption that ESL and L1 children's language develops similarly. This study will attempt to address this theoretical assumption by investigating the reading development of L1 and ESL students.

Assuming that the development of reading skills in L1 and ESL children is the same, one may still question whether the exposure to the English language provided in the school will be sufficient to allow ESL children to succeed in learning English? Will it be possible for ESL students to equal their L1 peers in English or will their English skills always be below those of L1 students? In answering these questions it is important to note that ESL students, Canadian or new immigrants, entering the Canadian public school system at the start of elementary education, Kindergarten or Junior Kindergarten, may come from environments where the English language was rarely spoken or heard. Many ESL students may never have been read to in English or have listened to songs and rhymes in English. Speaking in English may have been limited to some basic interactions between parent or child and another Canadian speaker in an institutional or public setting (bus, bank, grocery store). Still others may have had no exposure to English at all such as some new immigrants. This lack of exposure in the second language early in a child's life may be a disadvantage for second language (L2) learners.

Some of the predictors of reading are *letter knowledge*, *phonological awareness*, *and phonemic awareness*. *Letter name knowledge*, as the name suggests, is the ability to identify the letters of the alphabet and name them. *Phonological awareness* is the awareness of the sounds of the language and is prerequisite to the ability to use this knowledge to manipulate

these sounds as in phoneme deletion or blending tasks. These tasks are specifically defined as *phonological processing tasks* (Wagner & Torgesen, 1993) because in addition to the awareness of and access to the sound structure of a language (phonological awareness) they involve the use of this knowledge. *Phoneme or phonemic awareness* is the awareness of the smallest meaningful individual sounds that make up a word in speech. For example in the English word, "cat" there are three phonemes: *lk/*, *læ/*, and *lt/*, and the removal of any one of these phonemes will change the word. A child with phonemic awareness is able to examine the language and manipulate its sounds, for example, using knowledge of the letter-sound correspondences of an alphabetic language to read and spell words. There are many levels of phoneme awareness and they are defined by the tasks used to operationalize them. A task such as phoneme recognition, for example, represents an easier and lower level of phoneme awareness than phoneme substitution tasks (an oral measure of deleting a phoneme from a word and substituting it with another to form a different word).

The positive relationship between these phonological processing skills and successful reading development is well documented in the literature (e.g. Ball & Blachman, 1991; Bradley & Bryant, 1983; Castle, Riach & Nicholson, 1994; Griffith & Olson, 1992; Juel, Griffith & Gough, 1986; Liberman & Shanweiler, 1985; Lie, 1991; Siegel, 1993; Stahl & Murray, 1994).

For example, Juel, Griffith and Gough (1986) tested a model of early literacy acquisition by studying the relationships proposed in the model between various characteristics (ethnicity, oral vocabulary, and IQ) and school developed skills (spelling, word recognition) on literacy growth. Some components of their model of literacy acquisition included phonemic awareness, exposure to print, cipher knowledge (the orthographic cipher which included the set of spelling sound correspondence rules of the language) and lexical knowledge (knowledge about which rules do or do not apply to specific items in the lexicon). Decoding was also called word recognition in this study and defined as the ability to translate print into linguistic form. The model assumed that decoding and spelling share a common denominator: cipher knowledge and lexical knowledge. The cipher is composed of phonemic awareness, oral language, ethnicity, and IQ-three characteristics that were hypothesized to have an effect on phonemic awareness. This was interesting because research has shown that IQ is an irrelevant factor in diagnosing individuals as reading disabled (Share, Jorm, Maclean & Matthews, 1984; Siegel, 1993; Stanovich, 1993-1994). Juel et. al. (1986) found that phonemic awareness appeared to be correlated with year end performance in word recognition in grade 1 and to a lesser degree in grade 2.

2

Training studies provide further additional empirical support for the importance of phonological processing knowledge (Ball & Blachman, 1991; Bradley & Bryant, 1983; Castle, Riach & Nicholson, 1994; Lie, 1991; Stahl & Murray, 1994). For example, the purpose of Ball and Blachman's (1991) study was to explore 1. the effects of segmentation training in kindergarten on early reading and spelling ability and 2. the effects of letter name and letter sound training on segmentation skills and early reading and spelling ability. Students were assigned to one of three groups: 1. A Phoneme Awareness training group (this group also received letter sound and letter name instruction) 2. a Language Activities group (letter-name and letter sound instruction but no phoneme training) 3. A Control group in which there was no intervention. Pretests and posttests on phoneme, letter name and sounds and word reading measures were administered. Using only the post test scores of nonreaders identified in kindergarten (defined as those who read 1, 2 or 3 words on the Woodcock word identification subtest), the number and percentage of readers and nonreaders were calculated. The post test scores for each group was as follows: 1. phoneme awareness group 34.5% readers 2. Language activities group 13.3% readers 3. Control group 6.7% readers. In addition, differences between the three treatment groups in the number of readers after training were significant, χ^2 (2) = 8.4, p< .05. A second reading measure used in the post test measures called the phonetically regular word list reading measure further supported differences in favor of the phoneme awareness group.

Similar results in favor of phonological processing skills as a good predictor of early reading ability were found in the other training studies (e.g., Bradley & Bryant, 1983; Castle, Riach & Nicholson, 1994; Lie, 1991; Stahl & Murray, 1994;) and also in correlational studies of reading acquisition in other languages (Bruck, Genessee, Caravolas, 1997; So & Siegel, 1997). Castle et.al. provided phonemic awareness instruction in a whole language program. They found that although the phonemic awareness training group did not perform significantly better on the word reading measures (Burt word reading, Clay word reading) compared to the other two groups, they did perform significantly better on the pseudoword reading measure (Bryant pseudoword test).

Furthermore there is a great deal of evidence that these phonological processing skills are good predictors and components of successful reading development in English (Ball & Blachman, 1991; Bradley & Bryant, 1983; Castle, Riach & Nicholson, 1994; Lie, 1991; Stahl & Murray, 1994) and other languages (Bruck, Genessee, Caravolas, 1997; So & Siegel, 1997). This line of research implies that ESL students who do not have an awareness of the English alphabet, sounds, phonemes and graphemes when they enter the education system will likely

demonstrate poor early reading performance in English. The possibility of this implied disadvantage for ESL learners is only one prospect; however it raises an empirical question relevant to this research: Can ESL students become as successful English readers as their L1 peers, given their lack of experience with the English language prior to starting school, and the possible interference from their native language? Research related to this question is addressed in cross-linguistic comparison studies (Durgunoglu, Nagy, Hancin-Bhatt, 1993; Verhoeven, 1990), and other investigations on first language (L1) and second language (L2) early reading development (Cisero & Royer, 1995; Da Fontoura & Siegel, 1995; Chiappe & Siegel, 1999; Geva & Siegel, 2000). Some of these studies have addressed the possibility of L2 reading performance difficulties by incorporating and or discussing theories that either predict L2 difficulty, as in the Script Dependent Hypothesis or predict similarity between L2 and L1 reading performance as in the Linguistic Interdependence Hypothesis & Central Processing Hypothesis.

According to the Script Dependent Hypothesis, reading problems are related to the orthographic features of the language (Da Fontoura & Siegel, 1995). Alternatively The Linguistic Interdependence Hypothesis and Central Processing Hypothesis present an argument for similarity between L1 and L2 performance. Cummins (1979) proposed the Linguistic Interdependence Hypothesis, which is a blend of the Developmental Interdependence and Threshold Hypotheses. The Developmental Interdependence Hypothesis states that the level of second language competence achieved will be dependent on the level of competence developed in ones native language at the time that intensive instruction in the L2 begins. The Threshold Hypothesis proposes that there may be threshold levels of linguistic competence that second language learners must attain in order to avoid cognitive disadvantages and allow for the potential benefits of bilingualism to occur. In relation to L2 development and the influence of native language, the linguistic interdependent hypothesis suggests that there are underlying mechanisms in reading ability that cross languages and consequently an interdependent relationship between children's skills in acquiring a native language and a second language. Therefore, only those children experiencing difficulty in native language acquisition will experience difficulty in second language acquisition. The proposed underlying mechanisms in reading ability in all languages suggested by the Linguistic Interdependent Hypothesis relate to the Central Processing Hypothesis.

The Central Processing hypothesis posits that acquisition of reading skills in native language or second language depends on the development of underlying cognitive and linguistic skills not on the orthography of the language being acquired. Underlying cognitive and linguistic skills include verbal short-term memory, serial naming skills (digits and letters) and

4

phonological skills. The central processing hypothesis would predict that only those individuals with deficient cognitive and linguistic skills should experience difficulties in acquiring basic reading skills. Furthermore, according to the hypothesis these difficulties are not dependent on the orthographic and phonological system of the language. Given both of these hypotheses L1 learners with deficient cognitive and linguistic skills are equally likely to experience reading difficulties as L2 learners irrespective of the complexity of the language's orthographic and phonological systems.

The question of whether ESL students can become as successful English readers as their L1 peers given the lack of early English experience with English and the possible interference from their native language development has been addressed in the research on cross-language transfer and the research comparing first language and second language reading development.

Cross-Language Transfer Research

Studies in cross language transfer of phonological awareness skills in young children (Durgunoğlu, Nagy, Hancin-Bhatt (1993); Cisero & Royer (1995) have found support in favor of transfer of phonological awareness skills between native and second language. For example, Durgunoğlu et.al. (1993) investigated cross-language transfer in bilingual grade 1 readers. Participants spoke Spanish and English and were given tests in both languages for phonological awareness word recognition and pseudoword reading. In this study phonological awareness and word recognition measures in both languages were of interest as independent variables in predicting Spanish and English word reading and pseudoword reading performance. The results of their study demonstrated a positive relationship between Spanish phonological awareness and English word and pseudoword reading performance. Spanish phonological awareness skills were a significant predictor of performance of English word recognition and English pseudo word reading. Additionally Spanish word reading performance predicted English word reading, but it is important to note that "a child who has some Spanish word recognition skills but low phonological awareness tends to perform poorly on English transfer tests" (p463). This suggests support for the Central Processing Hypothesis and Linguistic Interdependent Hypothesis in that the underlying cognitive and linguistic skills in L1, which in this case is phonological awareness, was found to be predictive of L1 & L2 reading performance (Durgunoğlu et.al., 1993). Research by Cisero & Royer (1995) provide similar support for the cross language transfer of skills but in this study transfer was between L1 phonological awareness tasks to L2 phonological awareness tasks.

Cisero & Royer (1995) studied cross-language transfer in English speaking children and Spanish speaking children attending a Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) school. TBE children were taught all subjects in Spanish and taught English as a separate subject. Cisero & Royer examined phonological transfer of rhyme awareness, initial phoneme and final phoneme deletion tasks separately, and found evidence to support cross language transfer, but the significance of cross language transfer was only found in initial phoneme deletion task. The authors state that the reason for this was due to the low correlations found in the TBE group for initial and final phoneme deletion between L1 time 1 performance and L2 time 2 performance. As a consequence of this finding the authors noted that cross-language transfer of phonological awareness is dependent on how developed a skill is at the point in the development process of skill acquisition. This finding suggests support for Cummins's Linguistic Interdependence theory.

Together these two studies confirm that cross language transfer does occur and, most importantly, Durgunoglu et.al.'s (1993) study confirms that phonological awareness in ones native language can predict L2 reading and phonological performance. Evidence from these two studies support the Central Processing Hypothesis and Linguistic Interdependent Hypothesis and suggest that ESL students will not experience interference in their L2 development from their L1 skills. Rather L1 phonological awareness skills will contribute positively to L2 reading performance. However if L1 phonological awareness skills are low, ESL children will experience difficulties in their L2 development. Empirical evidence to support this suggestion is evident in the research comparing L1 and ESL learners.

Research comparing L1 and ESL early reading development.

The role of phonological processing skills has also been of interest to researchers comparing early reading development in L1 and ESL/L2 learners (Chiappe & Siegel, 1999; Chiappe, Siegel, & Gottardo, 1999; Da Fontoura & Siegel, 1995; Geva & Siegel, 2000; Lesaux, 2001) and the finding that phonological processing skills are a significant component in successful early reading development was replicated for ESL learners.

Cross-Sectional studies comparing ESL & L1

Researchers studying the early reading development of L1 and ESL students (Chiappe & Siegel, 1999; Chiappe, Siegel, & Gottardo, 1999; Da Fontoura & Siegel, 1995) have found converging evidence to support the importance of phonological processing skills as the best

predictor of reading in comparison to other reading components such as syntactic awareness and verbal memory. For example Chiappe & Siegel (1999) conducted a comparison study of English (L1) and Punjabi-speaking (ESL) Canadian children in grade 1. The purpose of their study was to examine the roles of phonological processing and syntactic awareness in reading acquisition for L1 and ESL speakers of English in the first grade. For each language group (L1 & ESL), participants were categorized as poor readers or normal readers based on their performance on the Wide Range Achievement Test-3 Reading subtest. No significant differences between the language groups were found for word reading and phonological measures suggesting that a child's native language does not predict early reading ability. Although phonological processing skills (phonological awareness & phonological recoding) did not discriminate between the 2 language groups it did discriminate between groups of children based on reading skill. That is, L1 and ESL poor readers performed significantly differently from L1 and ESL average readers, but there were no significant differences between ESL and L1 children on their phonological processing scores. In contrast to the phonological processing results however, syntactic sensitivity measures discriminated between the two language groups for good and poor readers. An interesting component of this research that was not included in other investigations comparing ESL and L1 reading development (Chiappe, Siegel, & Gottardo, 1999; Da Fontoura & Siegel, 1995; Geva & Siegel, 2000; Lesaux, 2001) was the study of error types on word reading.

Chiappe & Siegel (1999) studied error types, some of which indicated competence in the use of grapheme-phoneme correspondence. The study of error types allowed the researchers to examine the performance profile of ESL and L1 students in word reading, with regard to their phonological skills/strategies. Three main types of error were measured: 1. Overgeneralizing a phoneme-grapheme rule. For example overgeneralization of the English rule "ea" is pronounced "long e" and pronouncing the word "head" as "heed". 2 Deleting or inserting a phoneme in the pronunciation of a word, such as reading "heard as "her" or "four" as "floor". Both of these error types were categorized as -1errors because there was an error in reading one phoneme. They were further categorized as -1 vowel, -1 consonant, -1 deletion, and -1 insertion error types. The -1 vowel errors were errors in reading a vowel phoneme (e.g. "hat" and "hit") and -1 consonant errors were errors in reading a consonant phoneme (eg. "rat" and "ran") 3. Wild errors such as reading "bunny" for the word "rabbit" (semantic wild errors), reading "jar" for "jump" (wild first letters), and reading "kite" for the word "like" (other wild). The analysis of the error types demonstrated that both the ESL and English-speaking average readers relied on grapheme-phoneme correspondences when reading unfamiliar words to a greater extent than poor readers. The similar performance profiles of the ESL poor readers were indistinguishable

7

from the performance profiles of native English poor readers. Consequently the researchers found evidence that "ESL children with reading difficulties [could] be identified for reading remediation based on the same characteristics as poor readers who are native speakers of English" (p.27).

Da Fontoura & Siegel (1995) examined the reading, phonological, syntactic and working memory skills in bilingual gr. 4, 5, and 6 (ESL) Portuguese speakers in their native language and in English. They also studied the relationships between reading problems in English and reading problems in Portuguese by comparing ESL bilingual Portuguese speakers with monolingual English speakers. Pseudoword reading was used to measure phonological processing skills or more specifically phonological recoding. Statistically significant correlations were found between the English and Portuguese tasks measuring the same process. (English and Portuguese word reading = .52 p<.001; English & Portuguese pseudoword reading = .64, p<.0001; English & Portuguese oral cloze = .63, p<.01; English & Portuguese working memory = .48, p<.001) . Significant robust correlations were also found for phonological processing as measured by pseudoword reading with word recognition skills across and within languages. For example, English word reading & English pseudoword reading = .68, p < .0001; English word reading & Portuguese pseudo word reading = .51, p<.001; Portuguese word reading & Portuguese pseudoword reading = .63, p<.001; Portuguese word reading & English pseudoword reading = .53, p<.001 These results suggest evidence in support of cross language transfer of phonological processing skills as well as evidence that phonological processing is a strong predictor of word reading compared to syntactic awareness, as measured by an oral cloze task, and working memory. Furthermore comparing disabled readers with normal readers as measured by either English or Portuguese word reading measure revealed the same deficit in phonological processing for individuals with an English reading difficulty as for individuals with a Portuguese reading difficulty. This provided further evidence that reading difficulties were not language dependent.

There was also a deficit in working memory and syntactic skills for reading disabled Portuguese students. An interesting result to note regarding the developmental relationship among phonological processing, syntax, and memory skills is that when defining normal and reading disabled readers using the English reading measure, the Portuguese working memory task rather than the English working memory task discriminated between the two groups. However the English syntactic skills but not Portuguese syntactic skills differentiated between the two reading groups. Thus, we may hypothesize that poor ESL readers compared to normal ESL readers will exhibit significantly lower syntax scores and phonological processing skills, but

8

that working memory scores will not be significantly different between the reading disabled (RD) and normal achieving (NA) reading groups. The authors note that working memory may be a measure of individual difference variables. This may suggest that working memory indirectly affects L2 reading performance through the phonological processing and syntax skills or that L2 readers may be using more than one route in word reading, a route in which context clues are used. In contrast, when performing tasks in one's native language one may rely exclusively/more on the phonological route. Consequently L1 working memory performance appears to independently discriminate L2 reading ability performance because of its link with phonological processing. Lastly, this study found that the reading disabled Portuguese bilingual (ESL-RD) children performed significantly higher on the English pseudoword reading and spelling tasks than reading disabled English children (L1-RD) possibly as a reflection of the positive transfer from a more shallow orthographic language to a deeper orthographic language. Therefore this may suggest that ESL-RD children will outperform L1-RD children in phonological recoding skills if their native language has a more shallow orthography in comparison to English.

In addition to finding support for phonological processing skills as a good predictor of reading performance regardless of language, Chiappe, Siegel & Gottardo (1999) found that of all the specific phonological processing skills, phoneme awareness was one of the best predictors of reading performance for both ESL and L1 children. In their comparison study of Kindergarten children, they also found growth in the relationship between phonemic awareness and literacy for ESL children. There was no correlation between these constructs in the Fall but without special instruction or phonemic training, phonemic awareness measures correlated with the literacy measures in May.

In summary, the research provides evidence in favor of phonological processing skills as the best indicator of reading ability independent of language background. Phonological deficits as measured by phoneme skills and pseudoword reading are found to be a characteristic of reading disabled ESL and L1 children.

Longitudinal Research Comparing L2 and L1 learners

Longitudinal studies (Lesaux, 2001; Verhoven, 1990) provide research with the data to examine the development of phonological processing over time and this may clarify the role phonological processing skills plays in reading development for both L1 and L2 learners. However the number of longitudinal studies comparing L1 and L2 reading development is small particularly when we define the L2 learners as a minority language group acquiring a majority language. The definition is an important one according to Cummins (1979) because the success of bilingual education for the L2 learner will be a reflection of the interactions between . child input factors and educational programs. Phonological processing skills is only one example of child input factors, others include motivational and cognitive characteristics. Cummins recognized the external influence that significant others placed upon the second language and the native language of the L2 learner. A child's internal conceptions about learning the second language and his feelings about his own language will influence the L2 learner's academic performance overall. Cummins distinguished between submersion programs and immersion programs. Submersion programs were programs where the L2 was the majority language and the learners were the minority. This created a different dynamic between the L2 learner and their L1 peers and teacher compared to Immersion programs where the L2 was the minority language and the students spoke the majority language. In French Immersion programs for example, the status of the L2 learner is very different from the status of the ESL learner. Clearly then, French Immersion research should be not included as a parallel of L2 development for ESL students. Although phonological processing skills is an important predictor of reading ability in both English and French, the development of phonological skills and reading will differ for the L2 student. This limits the research to one longitudinal study comparing L1 and L2 learners of English. (Lesaux, 2001)

Lesaux (2001) studied the reading development of ESL and L1 kindergartens for 3 years. Two of the research questions were 1. Whether similar patterns of reading development existed between the two language groups in each reading category (reading disabled & average) and 2. Which skills at the beginning of kindergarten best identify grade 2 reading failure in ESL and L1 children. Lesaux found that despite the differences found in Kindergarten, by grade 2 differences by language group had disappeared and 2 groups of normal and disabled readers had emerged. Furthermore, Lesaux found the number of ESL children that develop strong phonological processing skills and read at an average level was comparable to the number of L1 average readers with strong phonological skills. However, in this study phonological awareness and explicit phonics instruction was provided for reading disabled students identified in Kindergarten and if needed the phonological awareness intervention continued in grade 1. Consequently we have to limit our generalization of the ESL findings. Of all the Kindergarten tasks, phonological processing skills, in particular phoneme deletion, was the best predictor of reading ability in grade 2 similar to the findings of Chiappe & Siegel (1999), Chiappe, Siegel, & Gottardo (1999), Da Fontoura & Siegel (1995), and Gottardo, Stanovich, & Siegel (1996). Additionally the significantly lower performance in syntactic skills among normal

ESL readers compared to L1 normal readers found in Da Fontoura & Siegel (1995) and Chiappe & Siegel (1999) was replicated in Lesaux's research.

In summary, the importance of phonological processing skills is evident in the research on L1 reading development in English. Phonological processing training studies have established phonological processing skills as a strong predictor of reading ability. Cross language transfer studies and L1 ESL comparison research that have included reading ability in their design allowing for a separate study of poor and average readers in each language group have confirmed that phonological processing skill and not language background is the important factor in predicting reading ability. However the number of longitudinal studies comparing L1 and L2 speakers is limited (Lesaux, 2001; Verhoeven, 1990) and if we focus on the ESL population, the number of studies is further limited (Lesaux, 2001) More longitudinal research is needed to provide a fuller understanding of ESL & L1 reading development and the role phonological processing skills play in predicting reading ability. Following the line of research in both longitudinal and cross-sectional research investigations on early reading development in L1 and ESL children, inclusion of other components such as syntax and verbal working memory will provide some perspective on the role phonological processing skills play with respect to other components in the development of reading in L1 and ESL students (Chiappe & Siegel, 1999; Chiappe, Siegel, & Gottardo, 1999). As well as to gain a better understanding of phonological development, it may be useful to conduct a separate analysis for each phonological processing skill task and analyze their effect on word reading over the years separately.

Problem Statement

The purpose of this study then will be to examine the role phonological processing skills play in identifying ESL children at risk of early reading failure, and whether early phonological processing skills continue to be good predictors of reading ability over time, and which specific phonological processing skills are good predictors of reading ability for L1 and ESL learners. ESL children will be compared to native speakers and their performance over four years will be analyzed. This study will also attempt to address how phonological processing skills develop with respect to the syntactical and working memory components of reading in ESL and L1 poor readers and good readers.

Main Research Questions

- 1. Are their differences in the reading and phonological processing skills development between L1 and ESL learners who are average readers (NA) or who are experiencing reading difficulty (RD)?
- 2. What is the relationship between the phonological processing skills and reading ability of ESL and native speakers?

Method

<u>Design</u>

Participants in this study attended one of two suburban elementary schools in Toronto Canada. These children spoke a variety of languages as their first language, but the three predominant first languages in this group were Punjabi, Cantonese or English as their first language. In 1996 a total of 359 children participated in the study. One hundred and twenty were in Junior Kindergarten, 128 were in Senior Kindergarten, and 111 were in grade 1. In 1997 there was a total of 413 participants: 139 Senior Kindergarteners, 146 grade 1 students, and 128 grade 2 students. In 1998 the total number of participants was 350: 108 in grade 1, 131 in grade 2, and 111 in grade 3, and in 1999 there was a total of 315 participants. Sixty-eight of the participants were in grade 2, 151 were in grade 3 and 96 were in grade 4. All students were given tasks to assess their reading, phonological awareness, syntactic awareness, spelling and working memory skills in English. Children were individually tested one or two times a year for a period of four years. However group testing was used to assess spelling, reading comprehension and math skills. Testing was conducted by trained graduate students and lasted for thirty to forty minutes.

Children were categorized by native language and reading ability. ESL children were defined as children whose first and primary language spoken at home was not English. In 1996, 156 ESL children were participants in this study and 195 children were native English speakers. ESL children varied not only by their first language but also by length of time they lived in Canada and the amount of written and spoken English exposure they had experienced.

Classification of participants by reading ability began in Junior Kindergarten if children were 5 years old or older. Based on their word reading score on the reading subtest of the Wide Range Achievement Test-3 (WRAT-3; Wilkinson, 1995) children were categorized as an "at-risk reader" or an "average reader". A child with a WRAT-3 reading percentile score of 25 or less was defined as an "at risk reader" and a child with a WRAT-3 reading percentile score of 30 or

higher was defined as an "average reader". In 1996, thirty-three children were identified as "at –risk readers" and 223 children were identified as "average readers". (Please see Table 1 in Appendix A for a description of the participants in each grade over the four years). Table 1 below shows the number of RD and NA children in each language category over the four years of this longitudinal study.

Grade/Year	L1	(RD, NA)	ESL	(RD, NA)
1996		<u></u>		
JK	70	(5, 6)*	50	(2, 8 <u>)</u> *
SK	74	(9, 58)*	54	(8, 44)*
G1	59	(4, 53)*	52	(5, 47)
<u>1997</u>				
SK	88	(10, 78)	51	(5, 46)
G1	91	(8, 83)	55	(4, 51)
G2	69	(8, 61)	59	(9, 50)
<u>1998</u>				
G1	58	(6, 52)	50	(4, 46)
G2	71	(13, 57)	60	(8, 50)*
G3	56	(4, 50)*	55	(5, 48)*
<u>1999</u>				
G2	43	(7, 24)*	21	(3, 17)*
G3	100	(7, 52)*	23	(5, 17)*
G4	58	(8, 44)*	25	(3, 21)*

Table 1 Number of RD and NA Participants for each Grade in each Year by Language Category

* Missing Values in data files

L1 =Native English Speakers, ESL=English as a Second Language Speakers, RD=Reading Disabled, NA=Normal Achieving Readers

In this longitudinal study a variety of tasks were used. Not all participants received the same task depending on what grade they were in. Tasks also differed over the years so the grade 2 tasks were not all the same for all the grade two participants in this study. For example grade 2 participants in 1997 and grade 2 participants in 1998 were administered the Rosner Auditory Analysis task but grade 2 participants in 1999 were not. Table 2 below lists the phonological processing skills measures administered to each grade in 1996, 1997, 1998 and 1999. Please see Table 2 in Appendix A for a complete list of the tasks administered to each grade over the years.

Table 2 List of Phonological Processing Skills Measures Administered to each Grade over the Years

Totals	Tasks	JK	SK	G1	SK	G1	G2	G1	G2	G3	G2	G3	G4
		96	<u>96</u>	96		97	97	98	98	98	99	99	99
/12	Phoneme	SVIL		EA30 *√		`√	\checkmark	✓	✓	✓	√		
/40*	Recognition												
	Phoneme			*									
/18	Recognition &			\checkmark		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	~		
/54*	Location							1			-		
16	Phoneme Deletion	\checkmark	✓	\checkmark	1	\checkmark	\checkmark	✓	\checkmark	\checkmark			
18	Phoneme Deletion			,		,	,		,	,			
	&Substitution			✓		~	√	 ✓	~	~	✓		
40	Rosner Auditory						\checkmark		\checkmark	~		\checkmark	\checkmark
	Analysis												
	Rapid Automized	,	,	,			,			,			
(seconds)	Naming RAN	~	✓	✓	×	~	✓	v	•	•	~		
	Phoneme & Syllable						,			,			
16	Identification	✓	✓	•	×	•	v	v	v	v			
	GFW Sound Mimicry								/	/			
55	Subtest		✓	~	v	V	V	V	v	v			
32	Pseudoword										~	\checkmark	~
	Repetition												
45	Woodcock Word											\checkmark	\checkmark
	Attack												
15	Pseudoword			~		\checkmark	✓	 ✓ 	\checkmark	\checkmark	~		
	Reading												
	Coltheart Nonword												
30	Reading											v	v
	Rhyme Production	\checkmark	✓	✓	√	\checkmark	\checkmark	~	\checkmark	\checkmark			
10	Rhyme Detection	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	~	\checkmark	\checkmark	 ✓ 	\checkmark	✓			
20	Real word Spelling			✓		\checkmark	~	 ✓ 	✓	\checkmark	 ✓ 		
10	Pseudoword			\checkmark		\checkmark	\checkmark	 ✓ 	\checkmark	\checkmark	√		
	Spelling												
21	Word Spelling											\checkmark	\checkmark
15	Nonword Spelling											✓	✓
55	WRAT-3 Spelling											\checkmark	✓
26	Letter Identification	\checkmark	✓	\checkmark	 ✓ 	~	\checkmark	\checkmark	~	\checkmark			

In total the measures included 5 main categories: phonological processing, word reading, working memory, and syntactic awareness, and spelling. Additionally, in 1999 reading comprehension and computational math skills were assessed. A description of each of the measures follows in the section below.

•

Phonological Processing Skills Measures

Phoneme Recognition Task (PRT) See Appendix B

In this task the ability to recognize a target phoneme in a word was tested. Children had to judge whether a target phoneme was present in a given word (Vandervelden & Siegel, 1995). The presence of the target phoneme was always in the initial position of the word. There were three practice trials for one practice phoneme and the child had to reply with a yes or no. For example, "Listen for /s/. /sock/. Does /sock/ have /s/?" (yes). "Listen for /s/. /fat/. Does /fat/ have /s/?" (no) "Listen for /s/. /soup/. Does /soup/ have /s/?" (yes) During the practice trials, feedback was provided for the child's incorrect responses. There were three target phonemes and four words for each phoneme for a total of 12 words altogether. The phoneme occurred in 2 of the 4 words. For example the target phoneme, *Im*/ was tested in the words *milk, map, paint,* and *cake*. Before each word, the target phoneme was presented as in the practice trials. Children scored one point for each correct response. All items were administered and the maximum attainable score for this task was 12. However participants in 1996 received the longer version of this task which consisted of 40 items.

Phoneme recognition and Location task. See Appendix B.

This task, developed by Vandervelden & Siegel (1995), measured the child's ability to judge the position of a target phoneme within a given word. There were three possible responses: initial position, final position or not in the word at all. There were four practice trials; two words for one phoneme and two words for another phoneme. For example "Listen for /s/ and tell me if it is the first sound in the word, the last sound in the word or if it is not in the word at all. /s/. /snake/. First, last or no." (first) In the practice trials, examiners explained the task and gave feedback. The total number of test items contained three phonemes and 6 words for each phoneme making the total number of words 18. All items were administered and the maximum score attainable was 18, except for the participants in 1996. They received a longer version of this task which consisted of 54 items.

Phoneme Deletion

This task measured the ability to delete a phoneme from a word and orally provide the new word without the deleted phoneme. There were 16 items in this task, divided into two sets. The first set contained 8 items that tested initial phoneme deletion. For example, "*Bus* without the */b/*, says _____" (us). The second set contained 8 items that tested final phoneme deletion. For example, "*foot* without the */t/*, says ____" (foo). There was a total of 8 practice trials, 4 before the 8 initial-phoneme deletion test trials and 4 before the 8 final-phoneme deletion test trials. Feedback was provided for the practice items and if needed on the first 4 test items in each set. Incorrect responses were recorded and each correct response received one mark. The maximum attainable score for this task was 16.

Phoneme Deletion and Substitution (PDS)) See Appendix B.

This task contained two practice items and 18 test items (Rosner, 1973) The 18 items were evenly distributed into three parts: 6 initial phoneme deletion or substitution items, 6 final phoneme deletion or substitution items. Nine word items required phoneme deletion, word initially or finally with three word items comprising a consonant cluster. The other nine word items required phoneme substitution, word initially or finally with three items comprising a consonant cluster. The examiner said a word and the child had to repeat the word and then say the word as it would sound if either a target phoneme was deleted or substituted by another phoneme. For example, "Say *fill*. (fill) Now say it again but don't say *ff* (ill). Now say *fill* again but instead of *ff* say */b/* (bill)." Both Phoneme deletion and substitution was practiced during the two practice items and feedback was given. Each test item was given one point if correctly answered and incorrect

responses were recorded. The examiner discontinued testing after 6 consecutive incorrect responses were made. The maximum score for this task was 18.

Phoneme deletion was further investigated by the *Rosner Auditory Analysis test* (AAT)

This phoneme and syllable deletion task required the child to repeat 40 individual words read by the examiner, and then remove a specific single phoneme or syllable indicated by the examiner and say the new shorter word/sound. For example, "Say *cowboy*. Now say *cowboy* again but without the *boy* sound" (cow)or "Say *sat*. Now say *sat* again but without the */s/* sound" (at). There were 3 trial items during which instruction and explanatory feedback for incorrect responses was given to teach the students the task and the correct answer. The examiner demonstrated the first trial item and the remaining two trial items are done by the child. If the child incorrectly responded to either of the 2 practice items, the item was re-presented to the child after feedback and an explanation of the correct response. If the child failed the second time to answer the practice item correctly, the test was discontinued and the child scored a zero for the test. Children who correctly responded to the practice items on the first or second attempt proceeded with the test items. There were 40 test items and the maximum score attainable for this test was 40. If a child made 5 consecutive incorrect responses, the test was discontinued. The examiner recorded incorrect responses next to each item.

Lexical access a.k.a. Phonological Recoding

Rapid Automized Naming (RAN)

The RAN task provided a measure of phonological recoding in lexical access or word retrieval (Chiappe & Siegel, 1999). The task consisted of an 8 x 5 matrix of 5 images randomly repeated 8 times in a line making the total number of pictorial stimuli 40 items. The images were line drawings of a bird, house, pear, tree, or chair. Children had to identify these objects by saying aloud their monosyllabic names as quickly as possible. Prior to presenting the matrix of the 40 items, the examiner presented the child with a practice chart of the 5 objects to ensure the child knew the names of the target items. The score for this task was the child's naming speed in seconds and the number of uncorrected naming errors made. Self-corrected errors were counted as correct.

Phoneme Identification

This task is similar to the *Syllable Identification* task. *Phoneme Identification* measured the ability to segment the names of pictures into their constituent phonemes. There were 2 practice items and 8 test items. The names of all of the picture objects were monosyllabic. The examiner would say the target word while presenting a picture of the word to the child, and then provide only the first phoneme of the target word. The child's task was to provide the last phoneme. For example, "This is a picture of a cat. I'll say the first part of the word, you finish it off. Here is a ca__" (t). Instruction and feedback was supplied on the 2 practice items and the first 2 test items if needed. All 8 test items were administered. Each correct response scored 1 point and incorrect responses were recorded. The maximum score on this task was 8.

Syllable Identification

This oral language measure tested the ability to segment a word into syllables. (Muter et al., 1997) There were 2 practice trials and 8 test trials. The names of all of the picture objects were disyllabic. The examiner would say the target word, while presenting the child with the picture of the target word, and then provide only the initial syllable of the target word. The child's task was to provide the final syllable of the target word. For example, "This is a table. Ta__" (ble). Instruction and feedback was supplied for the 2 practice trials and the first 2 test items if needed. All 8 test items were administered. Each correct response received 1 point and incorrect responses were recorded. This task had a maximum score of 8.

Sound Mimicry Subtest of the Goldman, Fristoe, Woodcock (GFW) Sound-Symbol Test (1974) This oral language task measured pseudoword repetition ability. There were 55 items in this task ranging from short monosyllabic to longer disyllabic and trisyllabic nonwords. For example, "ab, quibbest and depnoniel". Prior to administering the test items, three demonstration items were given. One point was assigned to each correct response and accent and articulation variability was not penalized. Testing was discontinued after 5 consecutive incorrect responses. The maximum score on this task was 55. A raw score and a percentile was calculated for this test.

Pseudoword Repetition (This task was administered to participants in 1999 only) This oral measure involved listening to a nonword read aloud by the examiner and orally repeating the word back to the examiner. If the child made an incorrect repetition of the nonword presented, the child's response was recorded by syllable on the scoring sheet. Each correct repetition answer received one point. There were 32 test items and thus the maximum score attainable was 32. The initial test items consisted of monosyllabic short nonwords, such as "sep". These increased in difficulty to longer polysyllabic nonwords such as "commerine" and "penneriful". This task was discontinued once the child made 5 consecutive errors. An error consisted of mispronouncing any or all syllables of the nonwords.

The Woodcock Word Attack Subtest from the Woodcock Reading Mastery tests-Revised (1987) measured the ability to apply phonic skills in pronouncing nonsense words. There were 45 items and each correctly pronounced item received one point. Incorrect pronunciations were recorded on the scoring sheet. Participants were not penalized for mispronunciations due to speech defects or dialect. All items were administered and the task was discontinued after 6 consecutive items were failed.

Pseudoword Reading

The *Pseudoword Reading* measure (Chiappe & Siegel, 1999) consisted of 15 monosyllable pseudowords composed of invariant consonants. The first 10 items were consonant/vowel/consonant (CVC) combinations (bav, dut, lod, tid, pov, mul, sep, lin, kef, hap). The last 5 items were CVC plus final "e" (CVC+e) combinations (beve, nade, lope, mude, tibe) All items were administered and children's pronunciation of the words was recorded. This task had a maximum score of 15.

Coltheart Nonword Reading. See Appendix B for a list of all the items.

Students were given two practice words before the test items. The test consisted of 30 items. Children had to read aloud the words the way they felt it was best to read. Their pronunciations were recorded according to the possible responses provided on the examiner's sheet. If a pronunciation did not fit the possible responses on the sheet, the examiner would note the pronunciation on the lines provided. This task had a maximum score of 30.

Rhyme Detection. See Appendix B for a list of all the items.

The *Rhyme Detection* test is an oral language measure of the ability to match 2 rhyming words (Muter, Hulme, Snowling, 1997). The examiner read aloud a word followed by three other words. Pictures accompanied the test word and the three possible word responses. Students had to choose the word that rhymed with the test item. The rhyming words had different onsets but the same rhyme. For example, "What rhymes with *cat? Fish, sun*, or *hat?* There were three practice trials and 10 test items. During the practice trials, the examiner gave feedback providing and explaining the correct responses as needed. All 10 items were administered. If necessary the examiner could give instructions on the first 4 test items. This test had a maximum score of 10.

Rhyme Production

The *Rhyme Production* task measured rhyming ability (Muter et al., 1997) This task consisted of 2 items. The examiner orally provided the test word and also gave one possible example rhyming word. For example the examiner would say, "Let's take the word *day*. Another word that rhymes with *day* is *say*, *Day-say*. Can you tell me some others?" Each legitimate rhyme produced by the student including the example rhyme provided by the examiner was recorded and given 1 mark. Legitimate rhyming words did not have to be real words; They could include pseudowords such as *day-tay*. Duplicate responses were not counted in this task, and children were given a time limit. They had 30 seconds to produce as many rhyming words as possible.

Orthographic Choice

The Orthographic Choice task required children to choose from a pair of pseudowords the one that best resembled the spelling of a real word. In contrast to the oral measures of phonological awareness, this task involved choosing between two sets of graphemes combined to create a pseudoword. Each item contained two pseudowords and children were asked to point to the one whose spelling they felt best approximated a real word. This task contained 17 items and had a maximum possible score of 17.

Strip Initial Consonant (Grade 2 participants in 1999 and some Grade 1 participants in 1996 were administered this task)

This phoneme deletion task required the child to delete the initial phoneme of a word and say the new shorter word created (Stanovich, Cunningham, & Freeman, 1984). For example, "Listen to the word *pink*. If you take away the /p/ sound, what word is left?" (ink). There were ten test items (pink, told, man, nice, win, bus, pitch, car, hit, pout) and one practice item (task). The practice item was repeated if incorrect and additional examples were permitted if necessary before starting the test items. During the test trial, the examiner explained that removing the first sound from the word would create a different and shorter word. The examiner recorded incorrect responses and discontinued testing after three consecutive errors were made. The maximum score for this task was 10.

Spelling

Real Word Spelling. See Appendix B

The spelling words in this task were 20 monosyllabic high-frequency words of 3 to 5 letters such as *food, year,* and *stove* (Wade-Woolley & Siegel, 1997). The examiner administered the spelling words in the context of a sentence. Eleven of the words had a consonant vowel consonant (CVC) structure, for example, *top*. The remaining 9 words contained word-initial or final consonant clusters such as *plane* and *wild*. All items were administered. Each correct word scored one point making the maximum total score 20.

Pseudoword Spelling See Appendix B

In this task children had to spell 10 monosyllable pseudowords such as *nad, ves* and *meeve* (Wade-Woolley & Siegel, 1997). The ten spelling items were equally divided into one of two category types: lax vowels items and tense vowel items. Both categories contained the basic CVC syllable structure. The 5 items in the lax vowel category included short vowels such as [æ] in the word *hat*, and therefore could only be spelled using a one-to-one grapheme-phoneme relationship. The other 5 tense vowel items included diphthongs and long vowels such as the **long e** sound, in the word *meet*. These phonemes could have a many to one grapheme-phoneme relationship; consequently they could be spelled using a combination of vowels such as "oa", "ea" or by word-final silent "e". Correct spellings followed regular spelling rules, e.g. meeve or mieve was acceptable. All items were administered and the maximum score for this task was 10.

Word Spelling

This spelling task consisted of 21 words (blame, bear, shoe, child, puff, yacht, dive, debt, swear, ghost, tiff, paid, cove, walk, sword, broad, aisle, smoke, shove, rhyme, press). All words were dictated to the students, and each correctly spelled word received one point.

Nonword Spelling

There were 15 items in this task (stull, vood, vind, fump pold, tralf, pask, hane, bove, drack, slear, bould, hile, drace, trome. The examiner dictated each word and the child had to spell the word on a piece of paper. Spellings were correct if they followed the spelling patterns of real English words, for example, tralf could also be spelled traff, or traph. Correct spellings were given one point. All items were administered.

WRAT-3 (TAN) Spelling, 1993

In this task students were dictated words to spell on paper. Each test word was read aloud once followed by a sentence with the test word and another read aloud of the test word. Each correctly spelled word scored one point. The first 15 items were letter spelling items and the remaining 40 items were word items. The letter spelling items were only administered to students 7 years or younger, or to children 8 years and older who did not get at least 5 correctly spelled items on the word spelling section. Students automatically received credit for the letter spelling portion of the test if 5 or more words are spelled correctly. Each correct spelling scored one point. Letter reversals and plural spellings for singulars were scored as incorrect. Students were not penalized for undotted "i's" and uncrossed "t's". The test was discontinued after 10 consecutive mistakes.

Letter Identification /Letter Knowledge

This task measured basic letter naming ability. Students were shown in random order the 26 capital letters of the alphabet and asked to name them. The maximum score attainable for this task was 26. All items were administered.

Working Memory Measures

Stanford Binet (Thorndike, Hage, & Sattler, 1986) Memory for Sentences Subtest This task was administered to JK and SK participants only. There were 42 items in this task. Each item could score one point, making the total maximum score possible 42. In this task children heard a sentence read aloud by the examiner and had to repeat the sentence. The sentences increased in length and syntactic complexity as the test progressed. There were three practice items prior to testing. Testing was discontinued after the child made 5 consecutive mistakes. The examiner made a record of the incorrect responses on the scoring sheet.

Working Memory: Words

In this task, children heard sets of sentences (2-5), each missing the final word to make them complete. Children had to complete the sentences by supplying each with an appropriate word, and then repeating the words they had provided to complete the sentences (Siegel & Ryan, 1989). For example, "*In a baseball game, the pitcher throws the* _____" (ball). "*On my two hands, I have ten* _____" (fingers). (ball, fingers). There were 4 levels in this task (levels 2,3,4,& 5). Each level contained 3 sets of sentences (e.g. 2a, 2b, 2c; 3a, 3b, 3c,etc.) but the number in the set of sentences varied by level. In level 2 there were 2 sentences in each set. Children had to provide 2 words to complete the set of sentences and also had to remember the two words and repeat them in the same order as they were submitted. In level 3 there were 3 sentences in each set and children had to provide 3 words to complete the set of sentences. In

level 4 there were 4 sentences and so on. Prior to testing, the examiner administered a level 2 practice set of sentences. Testing was discontinued if all 3 sets of sentences in a level were incorrect. Children scored one point for recalling words in the correct order as provided. If the right words were recalled but in the wrong order a child received scored zero. The maximum attainable score for this task was 12.

Syntactic Measures

Syntactic Error Judgement. See Appendix B.

All participants were administered the Syntactic Error Judgement task, but all 1996 participants (JK, SK and G1) and grade 3 and 4 1999 participants received a longer version of this task with 15 more items. However the first 20 items were identical to the total items in the task administered to the JK, SK, Gr.1, and Gr.2 children in 1997 and 1998 and 1999. The examiner read aloud sentences and the child had to choose whether the sentence sounded right or wrong. For example, "To school go I. Is I right or wrong" (wrong) "Yes. To school go I. is wrong." If a child attempted to correct the sentence, the examiner reminded the child that only a right or wrong response was required. If needed or requested the examiner could repeat the sentence twice. The number of times a sentence was repeated was recorded on the score sheet. Each correct response scored one point and incorrect responses were not penalized. There were three practice items prior to testing during which instruction and feedback were given. At this time the examiner gave an explanation of what was meant by labelling a sentence right or wrong in this task, and made the distinction between true and false sentences and right or wrong sentences. There was a total of 20 items in the JK, SK Gr. 1 and Gr. 2 test forms and the maximum score attainable was 20. In the 1996 and Gr. 3 and Gr. 4 1999 test forms there were 35 items and consequently the maximum score was 35.

Oral Cloze (Administered to Grade 1 1996 participants and Grade 2 1999 participants only) See Appendix B

In this oral task, the children heard 12 incomplete sentences read aloud by the examiner, and had to fill in the missing word to make the sentence complete (Siegel and Ryan, 1989) The examiner said *"blank"* where the word was missing from the sentence. For example, "The *blank* little pigs ate corn." (three, pink, hungry) The missing word required to complete the sentence covered different parts of speech, such as nouns, verb, adjectives, prepositions or conjunctions. A correct response had to make grammatical and semantic sense to score one point. There were three practice trials and the examiner gave instruction and corrective feedback at this time. All 12 items were administered. The test was discontinued when the child failed the practice items and or the first three task items. The maximum score for this task was 12.

Syntactic Error Correction. See Appendix B

This task was administered to grade 3 and 4 students only. There were 25 test items, making the maximum score for this test 25. Each item consisted of a sentence that contained an error and was therefore wrong. There were 5 types of errors and each sentence contained one type of error. The 5 types of errors included 1. Function word error (eg. They went at school) 2. Copula verb error (eg. The flock of geese are on the lake.) 3. Lack of subject-predicate agreement (eg. The boy run quickly.), 4. Incorrect phrase order within sentence (eg. Clapped his hands Mark.) and 5. Incorrect word order (eg. The bear brown growled). The test contained 5 examples of each type of error. In this task, the examiner read aloud each sentence and the child had to fix the sentence and tell it to the examiner. For example, "*Clapped his hands Mark.* Can you fix it?" (Mark clapped his hands.) Responses were recorded on the score sheet. If the child said the sentence was okay, the examiner encouraged the child to make a correction to the sentence by asking the child to say the sentence in a different way. The examiner could repeat the sentences a maximum of three times. Two practice items were administered prior to

testing and during this time the examiner would provide instruction and a correct response if the child did not correct the sentence. All test items were administered.

Reading Measures

WRAT-3 Reading Subtest

All students from Junior Kindergarten (JK) and Senior Kindergarten (SK) to grade four were administered the *Wide Range Achievement Test-3 (WRAT-3)* Reading subtest. The WRAT-3 provided a standardized measure of word reading and letter identification skill. Fifteen letters in capital format were randomly presented to test letter identification, followed by a list of 42 words to test word reading. Students read aloud the words which increased in difficulty. Some of the first and easier words to read were monosyllabic 2-4 letter words such as *in, cat, book* and *tree.* Some of the more difficult words at the end of the test were *heinous, egregious, omniscient* and *assuage*. If students made 10 consecutive incorrect responses or non-responses, the test was discontinued.

Bridge Word Reading

The *Bridge Words Reading measure* consisted of 69 high frequency words. These words increased in difficulty from simple monosyllabic words such as *a* and *on* to more difficult polysyllabic words such as *giraffe* and *writing*. The examiner recorded participants' pronunciation of each word. The Bridge Words reading measure had a maximum score of 69.

Linda Experimental Words

The Linda Experimental Words test measured word reading. It consisted of 40 experimental words that varied in regularity and consistency. Words were classified into one of three categories. There were 9 regular-consistent words (came, set, when, soon, game, like, deep, best, and feet) and 14 regular-inconsistent words (five, now, but, gave, beard, days, home, food, moth, paid, that, lost, goes, and seen). Both categories of words follow a regular English rule, however the English rule indicating the pronunciations of the regular-inconsistent words does not always apply. For example the words "five" and "live". The pronunciation of the word "five" follows the CVC+e rule where the vowel is pronounced as a long vowel; however this rule does not always apply to all English words such as in the word "live". The third category of words were comprised of 17 exception words (have, most, come, full, both, heard, shown, says, head, what, said, put, move, good, give, and four). Pronunciation of the words was recorded. The maximum attainable score on this task was 40.

British Ability Scales (BAS) Reading Subtest

The *British Ability Scales (BAS) Reading Subtest* measures word reading. Students in grades SK, 1 and 2 were presented with 90 real words to read. The first few words were short high frequency words. Words gradually increased in length and difficulty. Testing was discontinued after 10 consecutive incorrect responses.

Woodcock Word Identification

The Word Identification Subtest from the Woodcock Reading Mastery tests-Revised (1987) consisted of 106 items. Each item consisted of a word that the participants read aloud. The starting item for each participant depended on their grade level. Correctly pronounced words received one point. Incorrect pronunciations were recorded on the score sheet. The test was discontinued after 6 consecutive incorrect responses.

Coltheart Words. See Appendix B for a list of al the items.

This word reading measure consisted of 48 items. Participants read aloud words and scored one point for every correct pronunciation. Incorrect pronunciations were recorded on the scoring sheet.

Stanford Reading Comprehension

This measure assessed reading comprehension and consisted of 8 scenarios. Each scenario was composed of a short reading passage followed by four multiple choice cloze questions. The maximum score for this test was 48. There was one practice trial.

One Minute Reading-WRAT (TAN)

The WRAT-3 tan form was administered to Grade 3 and 4 participants. Students had to read as many words as possible within a one minute time limit. They were told to skip a word if they did not know it and go onto the next one. The examiner recorded student pronunciations and the number of words the child read correctly. The maximum score for this task was 42.

Speech Rate

Speech Rate

This task measured speech rate and required children to repeat the word "*buttercup*" 10 times, as quickly as possible. There were 3 test trials and one practice trial. During the practice trial, the child repeated his/her name 10 times. The speed for this practice trial was then recorded by the examiner. In the three test trials, the examiner similarly recorded the time to complete each test trial but the total score for this task was the mean speech rate based on the three trials.

Math Measures

WRAT-3 (TAN) Math

In addition to the measurement of linguistic skills such as phonology, memory and syntax, Grade 3 and 4 students were also administered a Math task. A variety of skills were assessed including computational skills such as multiplication, addition, subtraction and division, and other math skills such as converting the number of hours into minutes, changing a fraction into a percent and judging which fraction was more. The total number of items in this task was 55. The first 15 items were oral items; the remaining 40 items were written items. The written items started with easy computation questions such as 2+1=____, and progressed to more difficult questions such as 3 digit by 1 digit multiplication and the multiplication of three fractions. Students had 15 minutes to complete all of the questions. Each question received one point for each correct answer. If a child correctly answered 5 or more of the written items, then 15 points for the oral sections was automatically given even though the oral items were not administered.

Results

and RD students

To examine whether there were differences in the reading and phonological processing skills between ESL and L1 learners, the means for each task were calculated. The participants in 1996 were from one of 3 grades, junior kindergarten, senior kindergarten and grade 1 and were further categorized as either ESL or L1. Additionally participants were arouped into one of two reading categories according to their percentile score on the WRAT-3 Reading Subtest. A participant with a percentile score of 25 or below was labeled as Reading Disabled (RD); whereas a participant with a percentile score of 30 or above was labeled as a Normal Achieving Reader (NA). Participants with a score between 27 and 30 were not given a reading category. Consequently, in 1996 a total of 12 different means were calculated, four means for each grade. For example means were calculated for JK L1 NA, JK L1 RD, JK ESL NA, JK ESL RD participants. Thus, there are 3 tables displaying the means for each variable longitudinally from 1996-1999: one for the Junior Kindergarten participants, one for the Senior Kindergarten participants, and one for the grade one participants in 1996. Tables 3a, 3b, and 3c in Appendix C show the complete mean reading and phonological processing skills scores for each grade in 1996 longitudinally, and the mean scores are calculated separately for the normal achieving and reading disabled readers. See tables 3b and 3c below for a shortened version of Tables 3b and 3c in Appendix C. Only the means for the NA group of readers are included in table 3c below because the number of participants in the RD group was too small.

SK	NA				RD			
Measure								
	L	.1	ESL		L1		ES	SL .
	Μ	SD	М	SD	М	SD	М	SD
Phoneme D	eletion							
96	6.17	5.48	4.16	5.28	2.67	3.24	.00	.00
97	13.08	3.93	12.88	4.15	8.57	5.19	9.00	6.71
98	15.62	1.01	15.61	1.28	13.50	3.51	13.57	2.23
Phoneme D	eletion &	Substitut	ion					
97	10.10	4.43	8.76	4.48	5.71	3.77	6.14	5.61
98	13.79	3.43	14.40	3.15	10.67	3.72	11.57	4.31
RAN								
96	60.34	15.73	59.58	15.87	60.23	25.20	73.40	14.11
97	50.16	12.96	49.40	11.94	65.57	10.42	50.43	10.66
98	42.49	8.36	39.99	8.22	57.29	15.90	46.43	8.48
Phoneme &	Syllable I	Identifica	tion					
96	9.69	4.04	9.30	3.73	5.11	5.04	6.38	3.42
97	13.40	1.88	13.19	1.55	11.00	3.11	12.86	.90
98	14.79	1.05	14.77	1.23	14.33	1.51	14.43	1.27

Table 3b Mean SK Scores on Reading and Phonological Processing Skills Measures For NA

24

SK	NA				RD			
Measure	1	1	F	si	1	1	ES	SL
	м	SD	м	SD	м	SD	M	SD
GFW Sound Mimicry Subtest (%ile score)								
96	63.21	24.40	61.49	23.14	28.78	29.50	48.38	32.61
97	76.76	21.20	76.90	19.59	62.43	32.45	67.14	32.43
98	74.79	20.41	48.67	22.43	65.90	23.50	53.57	23.64
Pseudoword	Reading				-			
97	7.27	4.32	6.29	4.29	5.00	3.56	4.43	3.87
98	10.70	3.05	10.47	3.30	8.20	4.97	7.71	3.20
Rhyme Prod	uction							
96	4.97	3.75	3.35	3.37	1.78	2.54	.38	.74
97	10.58	4.51	10.69	4.84	5.57	4.86	5.29	5.06
98	13.83	4.02	14.48	3.58	11.00	2.45	9.71	2.69
Rhyme Dete	ction							
96	6.66	3.07	4.65	3.63	4.89	4.31	2.50	2.51
97	9.00	1.58	7.93	2.19	5.71	3.86	4.29	2.81
98	9.64	1.46	9.88	.40	9.00	2.00	8.57	.98
Real word S	pelling							
97	9.00	5.28	8.10	5.52	2.86	2.48	3.86	3.13
98	15.81	3.37	16.28	4.27	10.50	5.13	13.14	5.27
Pseudoword	Spelling							
97	3.44	2.06	3.31	2.51	1.86	1.95	2.43	1.27
98	5.26	2.37	4.83	2.77	3.80	1.79	3.17	1.60
Letter Identif	ication							
96	21.31	4.55	21.23	4.22	11.11	7.03	6.38	2.67
97	24.94	1.58	25.29	1.04	21.29	6.65	25.29	.49
98	25.86	.35	25.85	.48	25.83	.41	25.71	.49
Working Me	mory							
97	2.33	1.42	1.79	1.26	2.29	2.21	1.29	1.25
98	3.83	1.19	3.65	1.37	3.00	2.00	3.14	1.57
99	4.61	1.58	4.31	1.47	5.20	1.64	5.00	1.83
Syntactic Err	ror Judgn	nent (% s	score)					
96	51.33	19.06	42.19	16.79	39.05	22.13	38.57	18.33
97	70.90	14.59	61.43	11.96	62.86	11.85	57.14	14.96
98	80.71	11.56	77.63	9.20	72.50	18.10	67.14	14.68
99	77.33	10.61	74.05	8.25	72.00	7.11	62.86	12.99
WRAT Read	ling Subte	est (Raw	score)					
96	14.98	3.35	14.73	2.36	5.33	3.00	6.50	2.62
97	24.02	5.22	22.69	4.94	16.57	6.65	19.14	2.54
98	28.74	3.86	28.24	4.69	23.00	3.74	24.86	2.73
99	32.03	3.07	32.27	4.31	26.80	2.05	25.75	2.87

•

Table 3c Grade 1 Mean Scores on Reading and Phonological Processing Skills Measures For

NA Students

Grade 1	L	.1	ESL					
Measure								
	М	SD	M	SD				
Phoneme Recognition and Location (%score)								
96	93.85	14.35	93.26	15.38				
97	96.38	7.23	98.61	4.30				
98	99.54	1.56	99.70	1.27				
Phoneme D	Phoneme Deletion							
96	12.58	4.79	12.04	4.97				

Table 3c Continued.....

Grade 1	1		ES	SL.
Measure	_			
	М	SD	М	SD
Phoneme Del	etion			
97	15.15	1.76	15.21	1.34
98	15.67	.99	15.86	.35
Phoneme Del	etion and	l Substitu	ution	
96	10.87	5.42	9.40	4.88
97	13.32	4.12	12.73	3.74
98	15.75	2.94	16.05	1.87
Rosner Audito	ory Analy	sis		
97	24.29	9.38	26.06	9.22
98	30.92	8.42	30.86	7.38
99	32.71	7.94	31.74	7.16
RAN	50.40	40.40	40.07	0.00
96	50.43	12.18	40.87	9.69
97	42.98	8.91	40.00	8.39
90 Decudoward [30.29 Deading	0.03	30.23	1.52
	v on	4 20	7 4 7	4 02
90	0.02	4.29	1.11	4.UZ
97	10.01	3.31 294	9.09	3.45
90 Dhuma Bradu	12.14	2.04	12.00	2.92
		1 81	6 60	1 03
90	11 28	5.63	11 15	5 25
97	16.25	1 93	15.35	5.42
Rhyme Detec	tion	4.00	10.00	0.42
96	8.53	2 64	7 51	2 85
97	9.55	83	9 4 4	1 23
98	9.92	.37	9.97	.16
Real word spe	ellina			
96	12.47	4.07	11.00	5.77
97	16.60	3.70	16.62	3.12
98	19.00	1.59	18.70	2.22
Pseudoword s	spellina			
96	4.40	2.10	4.25	2.06
97	4.85	2.44	3.92	2.01
98	5.61	1.42	5.57	2.21
Working Mem	nory: Woi	ds		
96ັ	2.04	1.54	1.78	1.33
97	3.53	1.65	3.26	1.46
98	5.58	1.66	4.76	1.71
99	6.81	5.72	5.68	1.89
Syntactic Erro	or Judger	nent (%s	core)	
96	58.06	16.39	54.16	11.73
97	75.64	12.32	71.41	12.19
98	84.31	9.11	85.16	8.54
99	77.42	7.11	76.99	8.60
WRAT Readi	ng Subte	st (Raw s	score)	
96	25.43	4.76	24.04	3.86
97	29.91	4.35	28.87	3.58
98	34.68	5.68	33.11	4.64
99	37.48	5.23	35.37	3.22
Bridge Words	;			
96	54.23	15.31	50.40	15.01
97	66.26	5.11	66.15	5.14
98	68.86	.49	68.86	.67

Table 3c Continued.....

Grade 1									
Measure	Ľ	1	ESL						
	М	SD	М	SD					
Linda Experimental Words									
96	29.02	10.86	26.77	9.44					
97	35.81	6.30	34.72	7.29					
98	39.14	1.36	39.03	1.86					
BAS									
96	41.30	19.19	34.68	16.74					
97	65.26	15.62	59.72	14.33					
98	77.11	8.18	74.68	9.53					

Due to the small number of reading disabled and normal readers classified in Junior Kindergarten, another longitudinal table of means was calculated without categorizing participants into reading groups. See table 4 in Appendix C. A shortened version of the means scores is shown in table 4 below. Grouping both the NA and RD students increased the N in the cells and allowed for statistical tests to be done comparing the means between the ESL and L1 groups. It also made more sense not to categorize the JK participants into reading groups because they were very young and most likely unable to read at this stage of development.

Grade JK Measure	L	.1	ESL		
	М	SD	М	SD	
Phoneme deletion					
96	1.93	3.72	1.70	3.22	
97	6.51	4.91	5.63	5.21	
98	13.67	4.01	11.19	6.50	
Phoneme deletion and su	bstitution				
98	10.26	4.13	8.22	5.41	
99	12.65	3.57	10.94	3.51	
RAN					
96	73.92	22.23	76.61	27.28	
97	63.97	18.55	67.88	18.88	
98	49.48	22.36	50.16	14.99	
99	43.05	9.48	41.76	7.38	
Phoneme & syllable iden	tification				
96	5.68	4.59	5.30	4.95	
97	10.20	3.61	9.07	4.43	
98	13.93	2.31	13.59	2.70	
GFW Sound Mimicry					
96	38.45	10.21	36.88	11.55	
97	47.24	6.18	43.81	9.20	
98 ·	48.60	5.14	47.70	4.71	

Table 4 Mean Scores on Reading and Phonological Processing Skills Measures

Table 4 continued.....

Grade JK Measure	L1	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	ESL		
	м	SD	М	SD	
Pseudoword Repetition	26.26	5.07	25.94	1 84	
99 Decudeward Banding	20.20	5.97	25.04	4.04	
Pseudoword Reading	6 91	2 07	5.81	3 78	
98	0.01	2.87	7 76	3 33	
99 Dhume Broduction	9.12	2.00	7.70	0.00	
Rhyme Production	2.61	3.08	2 32	3 50	
90	5.78	4 15	7.02	5 16	
97 08	11 19	7 21	11 05	4.96	
Rhyme Detection	11.10	· . <u>.</u> ·			
96	4 57	3.13	3.52	2.95	
97	647	2.61	5.63	2.92	
98	9.33	1.30	8.62	1.77	
Real word spelling					
98	8.81 [·]	5.41	8.95	5.44	
99	15.06	4.08	14.59	3.47	
Pseudoword Spelling					
98	3.08	2.36	2.66	2.27	
99	4.18	2.13	3.24	1.71	
Letter identification					
96	11.94	7.77	11.20	8.94	
97	19.96	6.74	20.45	6.24	
98	25.36	.88	25.30	1.00	
Stanford Sentence Repe	etition				
96	13.83	4.04	10.48	3.90	
97	15.19	3.74	13.12	3.28	
Working Memory					
98	2.95	2.07	2.16	1.46	
99	3.74	1.37	3.58	1.74	
Syntactic Error Judgmer	nt % score		o 4 40	00.54	
96	42.6087	18.46	34.46	22.51	
97	56.73	16.25	52.52	15.21	
98	/0.48	13.43	66.22	14.30	
99	85.00	19.86	82.89	20.16	
Oral Cloze	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
99	8.29	2.28	6.29	2.23	
WRAT Reading Raw	0.00	E 0E	0.24	5.67	
96	8.80	5.25	0.34	5.07	
97	15.11	4.52	14.72	4.22	
98	23.17	4.01	22.04	4.00	
99 Deider	29.00	4.37	27.11	3.41	
Bridge	AE	10.60	AE 02	10.14	
30	40.00	5 60	40.92 63 ng	6/0	
33 Linda wordo	00.00	5.09	05.00	0.43	
	24 22	12 12	23.03	12 15	
90	24.00	12.13	25.05	2 82	
99 BAS	30.24	~1 .∠1	33.00	5.05	
07	5.05	13 40	2 95	5 68	
98	31 71	19 78	31 24	19 73	
90	31./1	19.70	31.24	19.13	

.

. .

A final table of means was calculated for the participants in this study by grouping participants into their grade levels. For example, the scores of all grade 1 participants regardless of what year they were in grade 1 were pooled together and their means on the various tasks were calculated. See table 5 below for the means used in this study. (Table 5 in Appendix C shows a complete table of the means of all the variables.)

JK Measures		NA & RD				
	М	SD	N			<u>.</u>
Phoneme Deletion						
L1	1.93	3.72	69			
ESL	1.70	3.22	50			
RAN		~~ ~~				
L1	73.92	22.23	68			
ESL	76.61	27.28	49			
Stanford Sentence Repetit	ion					
L1	13.83	4.04	69			
ESL	10.48	3.90	50			
Syntactic Error Judgement	t (% score	e)				
L1	42.61	18.46	69			
ESL	34.46	22.51	49			
SK Measures		NA			RD	<u> </u>
	М	SD	N	М	SD	Ν
Phoneme Deletion	<u></u>					
L1	6.05	5.06	136	2.38	3.07	16
ESL	4.75	5.15	88	.62	1.56	13
Rhyme Production	•					
L1	5.57	4.03	136	4.59	3.20	17
FSI	4.83	3.29	88	3.08	2.33	13
Rhyme Detection			•••			
11	6 51	2 85	136	4 59	3.20	17
FSI	4.83	3.29	88	3.08	2 33	13
Stanford Sentence Repetit	tion	0.20	00	0.00	2.00	
	15 73	3 95	136	11 94	<u> </u>	17
	21 74	3 76	88	11.04	3.84	13
Syntactic Error Judgemen	21.74 t (% scor	e)	00	11.00	0.04	10
	46 57	18 18	136	35 80	19 39	17
EQI	37 80	14 51	88	35.93	16.00	13
Wrat Peading (%ile score)	07.00	14.01	00	00.00	10.00	10
	64 76	17.06	136	10 12	8 62	17
	70.00	16.07	00	10.12	7.55	12
ESL	10.22	10.97	00	12.31	7.00	15
G1 Measures		NA			RD	
<u>01 Middouroo</u>	м	SD	N	М	SD	Ν
Phoneme Deletion						
11	12 79	4 33	188	7 61	5.57	18
ESI	12.10	4.00	144	5 77	6.02	13
E3L	12.47	7.30		5.11	0.02	10

Table 5 Mean scores merged by Grade over the Four Years
Table 5 continued.....

G1 Measures		NA	<u> </u>				
<u>O (modouroo</u>	M	SD	Ν	М	SD	Ν	
RAN							
L1	51.75	14.59	188	60.11	22.41	18	
ESL	46.94	10.64	144	57.54	18.89	13	
Pseudoword Reading							
L1	7.07	3.99	188	3.22	3.46	18	
ESL	6.70	3.94	144	1.69	2.36	13	
Syntactic Error Judgemen	t (% scor	e)					
L1	65.60	15.46	188	57.46	14.95	18	
ESL	61.01	13.71	144	60.71	9.06	13	
Wrat Reading							
L1 -	23.88	4.44	188	15.00	4.27	18	
ESL	23.65	4.22	144	17.62	1.45	13	
Bridge Words							
L1	47.91	17.12	188	17.39	13.84	18	
ESL	48.21	17.92	144	20.25	10.39	12	
G2 Measures							
Rosner Auditory Analysis							
L1	23.84	9.14	112	14.20	5.68	20	
ESL	26.72	8.52	93	12.53	6.64	17	
RAN							
L1	43.93	10.28	142	50.58	14.73	28	
ESL	39.45	8.09	117	49.46	12.84	20	
GFW Sound Mimicry							
L1	51.76	2.70	117	48.43	3.96	21	
ESL	50.54	2.81	99	47.59	4.91	17	
Syntactic Error Judgemen	it (% scor	e)					
L1	79.33	11.56	141	69.64	12.47	28	
ESL	75.60	12.58	116	68.75	9.58	20	
Oral Cloze							
L1	8.50	2.06	24	6.86	2.79	7	
ESL	7.35	2.32	17	6.67	2.52	3	
Wrat Reading							
L1	30.16	3.37	142	22.00	2.14	28	
FSI	29.18	3.54	117	22.45	1.82	20	
Bridge Words							
11	66.83	4.07	142	50.61	12.51	28	
FSI	66.73	4.05	117	51.95	12.22	20	
Linda Experimental Word	s			••			
I 1	36 88	4 36	141	25.86	9.12	28	
ESI	36 45	5.03	116	27.95	7.13	20	
BAS Reading	00.10	0.00					
11	63 38	14 72	117	28 57	10.03	21	
FSL	61.93	14 52	99	28.57	10.03	21	
	01.00	1 6.VL		_0.07	10.00	- ·	

Table 5 continued.....

G3 Measures		NA			RD	
<u> </u>	М	SD	Ν	М	SD	Ν
Rosner Auditory Analysis						
L1	29.07	9.10	103	14.00	7.68	11
ESL	30.49	7.04	67	18.40	7.35	10
RAN						
L1	38.95	7.92	51	42.39	10.34	4
ESL	35.16	7.34	50	41.17	8.96	5
Wrat Spelling (standard so	core)					
L1	107.81	9.92	142	83.89	6.36	28
ESL	106.09	8.57	117	83.95	4.32	20
Woodcock Word Identifica	ation					
L1	62.89	12.07	52	45.43	5.00	7
ESL	65.12	8.69	16	51.00	6.75	5
Coltheart Words						
L1	35.48	7.51	52	22.14	5.52	7
ESL	36.19	4.34	16	24.80	6.98	5
Stanford Reading Compre	ehension					
L1	37.71	9.60	49	24.57	13.13	7
ESL	40.12	4.33	17	29.40	11.76	5
Wrat Math						
L1	26.90	2.43	49	26.71	1.60	7
ESL	29.94	2.14	17	28.00	2.55	5

To determine whether the observed mean differences were statistically significant between the two language groups, a repeated measures one way Analysis of Variance was used for the longitudinal data. ANOVAs were conducted on each task and time was the repeated measure. Separate analyses were performed for the reading disabled and normal readers. However, it is important to note that there was an insufficient number of grade 1 RD participants so the analysis was only conducted on the NA participants in grade 1. See table 6 below for a list of the measures with significant differences between ESL and L1 students from the ANOVA procedure.

Table 6 F-Values of the Significantly Different Mean Scores found between ESL and L1 Students

Participants	F value	p value	
IK Rd and Na Students			
Phoneme Deletion and Substitution	5.056	.032	
Rhyme Detection	5.263	.025	
Stanford Sentence Repetition	11.945	.001	
Oral Cloze	6.672	.015	

Table 6 continued.....

Participants	Fvalue	P value	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
SK NA Students			-
Rhyme Detection	9.285	.003	
Syntactic Error Judgement	8.506	.005	
<u>SK RD Students</u> Syntactic Error Judgement	15.561	.006	
Grade 1 NA Students BAS Reading	5.309	.024	

Table 5 provided information to observe whether there were differences between ESL and L1 participants at certain levels of development. In this case, participants were classified by grade and time was not a factor. For example, all grade one participants irrespective of what year it was when they were in grade one were included in the grade one mean calculations. Bar graphs of the means in table 5 were created to illustrate the observed mean differences. (See Bar Graphs in Appendix D) A simple one factor ANOVA was employed to test whether these observed mean differences were statistically significant. See Table 7 below for a list of significantly different mean scores between ESL and L1 students. Note there were no significant differences between language groups among the Senior Kindergarten, Grade 2 and Grade 3 RD students. Also no significant differences were found among the Grade 4 participants in this study. Consequently they are not included in table 7 below.

Table 7 Mean scores and F values for significantly different mean scores between ESL and L1 students by Grade

Participants	L1 M (N)	ESL M (N)	Mixed M (N)	F	р
* #\$0.7 27999					
JK NA and RD Students					
S tanford Sentence					
Repetition	13.83 (69)	10.48 (50)		20.50	.001
Syntactic Error	42 61 (60)	34 46 (40)		1 616	033
Judgement (%score)	42.01 (09)	34.40 (49)		4.040	.000
SK NA Students					
Rhyme Detection	6.51 (136)	4.83 (88)		16.508	.001
Stanford Sentence					
Repetion	15.73 (136)	12.74 (88)		31.433	.001
Syntactic Error					
Judgment (% score)	46.57 (136)	37.89 (88)		14.185	.001
WRAT (%ile score)	64.76 (136)	70.22 (88)		5.495	.020

Table 7 continued					
Participants	L1 M (N)	ESL M (N)	MIxed M (N)	F	р
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Grade 1 NA Students					
RAN Syntactic Error	51.75 (188)	46.94 (144)		11.106	.001
Judgement (%score)	65.60 (188)	61.01 (144)		7.900	.005
Grade 1 RD Students					
Wrat (Raw score)	15.00 (18)	17.62 (13)		4.469	.043
Grade 2 NA Students					
Rosner AAT	23.84 (112)	26.72 (93)		5.372	.021
RAN	43.93 (142)	39.45 (117)		14.651	.001
GFW Sound Mimicry Syntactic Error	51.76 (117)	50.54 (99)		10.649	.001
Judgement (% score)	79.33 (141)	75.60 (116)		6.092	.014
WRAT Reading	30.16 (142)	29.18 (117)		5.206	.023
Grade 3 RD Students					
Wrat Spelling					
(standard score) Woodcock Word	89.00 (7)	92.00 (5)	80.00 (3)	4.719	.031
Ident.	45.43 (7)	51.00 (5)	39.00 (3)	4.525	.034
Coltheart Words	22.14 (7)	24.80 (5)	11.00 (3)	5.444	.021
Grade 3 NA Students					
RAN	38.95 (51)	35.16 (50)		6.193	.014
Wrat Math	26.90 (49)	29.94 (17)	28.05 (21)	11.001	.001

Tables 4, 3b and 3c show the means of Junior Kindergarten, Senior Kindergarten, and Grade 1 ESL and L1 participants for each measure over the four years. Overall the means do not appear to be dramatically different between the language groups. The results of the ANOVA calculations confirm that this is true in most cases. However, statistical significance was found for 4 measures in the JK group of participants, 2 measures in the SK group, and 1 measure in the G1 group.

In the JK group, a statistically significant difference in performance between the two language groups was detected for phoneme deletion and substitution ($\underline{F}_{1,32} = 5.056$, $\underline{p}=.032$), rhyme detection ($\underline{F}_{1,77} = 5.263$, $\underline{p}=.025$), Stanford Sentence repetition ($\underline{F}_{1,93} = 11.945$, $\underline{p}=.001$), and Oral cloze ($\underline{F}_{1,32} = 6.672$, $\underline{p}=.015$) measures. In all of these tasks the mean performance of the L1 group was higher than the ESL group. For the SK group, separate ANOVA's were calculated for reading disabled and normal readers. Mean differences on the Rhyme Detection task between the ESL and L1 participants were only significant for the normal group of readers ($\underline{F}_{1,80} = 9.285$, $\underline{p}=.003$) with a higher mean performance for the L1 group; but both normal and

disabled readers showed significant mean differences between the 2 language groups on the Syntactic Error Judgment measure ($\underline{E}_{1,7} = 15.561$, $\underline{p}=.006$ for the RD group; $\underline{E}_{1,57} = 8.506$, $\underline{p}=.005$ for the NA group) and the mean performance was higher for the L1 group. Among the grade 1 1996 participants the number of RD participants was too small (less than 5) so analyses of variance were performed for the NA group only. Only the British Ability Scales (BAS) Reading measure showed significant differences between the 2 language groups ($\underline{E}_{1,71} = 5.309$, $\underline{p}=.024$) with the L1 mean performance higher than the ESL mean performance. The results of this analysis indicate that overall there are no differences between the two language groups differed decreases as the group of learners gets older, that is the JK ESL and L1 participants were significant differences on only 2 and 1 measures respectively. Additionally, the analyses of variance provided multivariate tests that showed the mean performance on most tasks differed significantly over time ($\underline{p}_{-1,01}$)

In summary, the results of the analyses of variance provide evidence that there are no significant differences in early reading development between the native learners and English as a second language learners overall. Both L1 and ESL group of learners develop similarly in their reading and phonological processing skills. Among the group of participants who were pre-readers in 1996 (JK and SK) certain phonological processing and syntactic awareness measures discriminated between the two language groups, but for the Grade 1 1996 participants only one word reading measure was able to discriminate between the ESL and L1 learners

Graphs of the 3 longitudinal tables of means (See Appendix D) suggest a general trend of improvement in phonological processing and reading skill performance over time. The multivariate tests in the repeated measures analyses of variance support that observation. See Table 8 below

Table 9 E values for Time factor for Massures Employed in ANOVA	orocedure
Table & F-values for Time factor for Measures Employed in ANOVAT	JIOOCUUIO

Grade JK Na & Rd Students	I	=	p)
		074	0	14
Phoneme Deletion	131	.6/4	.00))
Phoneme Deletion & Substitution	39.	496	.00	
RAN	65.	185	.00	J1
Phoneme & Syllable Identification	125	.061	.00	J1
GFW Sound Mimicry	51.	671	.00	J1
Pseudoword Reading	48.	798	.00	01
Rhyme Production	92 .	493	.00	01
Rhyme Detection	53.	360	.00	D1
Real word Spelling	284	.797	.00	01
Pseudo word Spelling	18.	529	.00	D1
Letter Identification	82.	261	.0	01
Stanford Sentence Repetition	42.	562	.0	01
Working Memory	31.	964	.0	01
Syntactic Error Judgment (%score)	46.	418	.0	01
Wrat Reading	185	.285	.0	01
BAS Reading	260	682	.0	01
Bridge Word Reading	163	242	.0	01
Linda Experimental Mords	185	285	0	01
	100	F	<u></u>	0
Grade SK Measures	NA	RD	NA	RD
Phoneme & Syllable Identification	80 525	30,162	.001	.001
Pseudo word spelling	46 177	6.063	.001	.036
Pool Word Spelling	219 734	49 519	001	.001
Real Word Spelling Rhymo Dotoction	52 727	16 277	001	001
Rhyme Delection	218 116	77 462	001	001
Righter Froudcion	57 607	ns	001	Ns
Syntactic Error Judgement (% Score)	71 105	51 013	001	001
VVorking Memory for Words	14 505	51.915	.001	Ne
GFW Sound Mimicry (%ile score)	14.090	20 706	.001	001
Phoneme Deletion & Substitution	143.040	20.790	.001	.001
Phoneme Deletion	100.022	144.140	.001	.001
Wrat Reading	423.243	142.900	.001	.001
Pseudoword Reading	92.075	21.234	.001	.001
RAN	99.168	NS .	.001	ns
Letter Identification	47.739	85.321	.001	.001
Grade 1 Measures only for NA students	,	F		p
Phoneme & Syllable Identification	13	.051	.0	01
Pseudo word spelling	11	.368	.0	02
Real Word Spelling	35	961	.0	01
Rhyme Detection	18	306	.0	01
Rhyme Droduction	72	749	0	01
Syntactic Error Judgement (% score)	45	190	0.0	01
Marking Mamony for Marda	40	173	0. 0	01
Working Memory for Words	40	. 175	.0	01
	38	.030	.0	01
).// \ 940	.0	01
vvrat Reading	120	1.019		
BAS Reading	35	9.907	.0	
Bridge Word Reading	50	.033	0.	
Linda Experimental Words	56	.888	.0	101
Pseudoword Reading	47	.539	.0	101
Rosner Auditory Analysis	5.	305	.0)11
Phoneme Recognition and Location	•	106	~	02
(%score)	8.	120		102

There were significant differences over time for all measures in all groups of learners (JK, SK, G1) excluding the syntactic error judgment and RAN measures for the Senior Kindergarten reading disabled participants. This finding may not be so unusual, as RAN is a measure of speed and not accuracy in naming objects, therefore even if phonological processing skills improved over time, speed performance on the RAN task may not be affected. However a measure such as RAN error performance that is more responsive to phonological processing skills may show significant differences over time. Similarly, the lack of significant differences found over time for the syntactic error judgment measure may be expected if we accept the theory that a certain level of competence in phonological processing skills needs to be reached in order for improved performance in more complex levels of reading development. It is interesting to note that among the normal JK and SK readers, performance on syntactic awareness measures discriminated between the two language groups despite the absence of word reading difficulty for the ESL group because support for this result was documented in other studies (Chiappe & Siegel, 1999; Da Fontoura & Siegel, 1995; Lesaux, 2001).

In order to answer the second question of this study, "what is the relationship between the phonological processing skills and reading ability of ESL and native speakers?", correlations were computed using the longitudinal data. Due to the small number of RD participants in this longitudinal data set, correlations including both RD and NA subjects were individually calculated between each of the phonological processing (PP) skills and the WRAT reading scores. Correlations between 1996 PP scores and WRAT reading scores were computed within time 1, 1996, and across the time periods (1997, 1998 and 1999). For example, 96 PP measure correlated with WRAT reading measure in 1996, 96 PP measure correlated with WRAT reading measure in 1997, etc. Correlations were separately calculated for the native and ESL participants. Please see Tables 9a, 9b and 9c in Appendix C for the correlation tables.

In each of the primary grades in 1996 (JK, SK and G1) positive significant correlations were found between phonological processing skills and word reading measures. Additionally, the number of positive correlations was greatest in 1996 and generally tended to decrease over the years for both the L1 and ESL students. Within each grade grouping in 1996 and across the two language groups, the phonological processing task with the strongest correlation to the WRAT reading subtest changed over time. The discussion of the correlation results that follow will be organized into three areas. First I will discuss the correlations found within the L1 group, second I will discuss the correlations found within the ESL group, and lastly I will compare the two groups and note what I observe.

JK 1996 Correlations

For native English speaking JK participants in 1996, the phoneme deletion task had the strongest correlation with the1996 WRAT word reading measure. However, the strongest correlation between PP skill and WRAT word reading changed over the years. In 1997 and 1998, the strongest correlation with the WRAT measure was the Rhyme Production task and in 1999 the strongest correlation with the WRAT was the GFW Sound Mimicry.

Within the ESL 1996 JK group of participants, phoneme and syllable identification was the task with the strongest correlation to WRAT reading. However, the phoneme deletion task had the second most significant correlation coefficient. In 1997 and 1998 the GFW Sound Mimicry task had the strongest correlation and in 1999 there were no significantly positive correlations. See table 9 below. Table 9 in the Appendix shows the complete table of correlations

¥							
Phonological	96	i	9	7	9	8	. 99
Processing Skill	L1	ESL	L1	ESL	L1	ESL	L1 ESL
Phoneme Deletion							
R ²	.420**	.428**	.331*		.483	.378*	
Sig. (2 tailed)	.000	.002	.014		.001	.021	
N	69	50	55		42	37	
RAN							
R ²	450**	341*	307**	421**	409		
Sig. (2 tailed)	.000	.016	.024	.005	.007		
NČ	68	49	54	43	42		
Phoneme & Syllable							
Identification							
R ²	.248*	.438**		.339* ்		.326*	
Sig. (2 tailed)	.040	.001		.026		.049	
N	69	50		43		37	
GFW Sound Mimicry							
R^2	.291*	.398**		.589**		397*	.466*
Sig. (2 tailed)	.015	.004		.000		.015	.045
N	69	50		43		37	19
Rhyme Production							
R^2	.358**		.461**		.508**		
Sig. (2 tailed)	.003		.000		.001		
N	69		55		42		
Rhyme Detection							
R ²	403**		.420**	.311*		.375*	
Sig (2 tailed)	001		.001	.043		.022	
N	69		55	43		37	
Letter Identification	•••						
R ²	725**	902**	.491**	.631**	.572**	.589**	
Sig (2 tailed)	000	000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
N	69	50	55	43	42	.37	
	. 04 (0.1	- :(a a)					<u> </u>

Table 9 Significant Correlations for JK group of Participants across the Four Years

*<u>p</u> < .05 (2-tailed), **<u>p</u> < .01 (2-tailed)

It is interesting to note that Rhyme production had a significant correlation with WRAT reading among the L1 participants in 1996, 1997 and 1998, but it did not have a significant correlation with WRAT reading among the ESL group. Also, the number of significant correlations in 1996 in the L1 group exceeds the number of significant correlations in the ESL group in 1996 by two. This may be a reflection of the lack of familiarity with the English language and its phonological structure given that the 2 tasks missing significant correlations with the WRAT were Rhyme Production and Rhyme detection. Lastly, the phonological recoding measure, RAN, remained a significant negative correlation with WRAT reading in both language groups over the four years. The speech rate measure, Buttercup, also demonstrated a negative correlation with the reading measure but the correlation was insignificant. As mentioned earlier in the results section of the first research question, it is logical that both the RAN and the Buttercup measure correlated negatively with WRAT word reading performance because the RAN and Buttercup measure are measures of speech rate while the WRAT measure is a measure of correct word reading. This means that longer speech rates (higher numerical score) are correlated with lower scores on the word identification WRAT measure. This makes sense because the logic is that both speed in lexical retrieval tasks such as the RAN measure and accuracy in word identification tasks rely on the establishment of a clearly defined phonological processing pathway between words and their pronunciation in the brain. Hence a longer speech rate, indicating a slower reading speed, demonstrates that the cognitive processes involved in lexical retrieval are not well formed; and this lack of an established phonological processing pathway to words in one's lexicon will mean lower scores on the word identification measure. Similarly, it makes sense that shorter speech rates (lower numerical score on RAN) are correlated with higher scores on the WRAT word identification task because the same well formed phonological pathway involved in lexical retrieval task is also used in producing accurate word readings.

SK Correlations

In grade SK, the phoneme and syllable identification task had the strongest correlation with the 1996 WRAT word reading measure for both the L1 and ESL language groups. In 1997, the 1996 PP measure with the strongest correlation with WRAT reading in 1997 is phoneme and syllable identification. The 96 PP task with the strongest correlation with WRAT reading in 1998 and 1999 changes to the 1996 GFW and 1999 phoneme deletion task.

For the SK ESL learners in 1997, the phoneme deletion task (96) is the strongest correlate with WRAT reading (97). This stays true in 1998 but in 1999 the 96 Rhyme production task has the highest correlation. See table 10 below. Table 10 in the Appendix shows the complete table of correlations.

Similar to the observation noted in the JK correlations, the number of significant correlations is greater for the L1 participants than the ESL participants. Also, the RAN and Buttercup measures continued to have negative correlations with word reading in the SK group of learners.

Phonological	96	 }	9	7	9	8	9	9
Processing Skill	L1	ESL	L1	ESL	L1	ESL	L1	ESL
Phoneme Deletion						•		
R ²	.412**	.439**	.431**	.543**	.306*	.418*	.527**	
Sig. (2 tailed)	.001	.001	.001	.000	.033	.003	.001	
N	67	51	57	49	49	48	36	
RAN								
R ²	156	329*	299*	432**	327*	272		538**
Sig. (2 tailed)	.208	.020	.024	.002	.022	.064		.001
Ň	67	50	57	48	49	47		33
Phoneme & Syllable								
Identification								
R ²	.562**	.459**	.478**	.380**				.389*
Sig. (2 tailed)	.000	.001	.000	.007				.023
N	67	51	57	49				34
GFW Sound Mimicry								
R ²	.515**		.443**		.517**		.415**	
Sig. (2 tailed)	.000		.001		.000		.012	
N	67		57		49		36	
Rhyme Production								
R ²	.294*	.359**		.398**	.284*	.285*	.400*	.542**
Sig. (2 tailed)	.016	.010		.005	.048	.050	.016	.001
N	67	51		49	49	48	36	34
Rhyme Detection								
R ²			.427**	.228	.350*			
Sig. (2 tailed)			.001	.114	.014			
N			57	49	× 49			
Letter Identification								
R ²	.756**	.875**	.536**	.477**	.368**	.463**	.399*	.597**
Sig. (2 tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.001	.009	.001	.016	.000
N	67	51	57	49	49	48	36	34
+	04 (0 +	- 1111						

Table 10 Significant Correlations for SK group of Participants across the Four Years

*<u>p</u> < .05 (2-tailed), **<u>p</u> < .01 (2-tailed)

Within the Grade 1 students the similarities between the two language groups is evident in that the tasks with the highest correlation with reading across the years are the same across the two language groups. Either the phoneme deletion and substitution task (PDS) or the pseudoword reading task (PR) has the strongest correlation with the WRAT over the 4 years. In 1996 the PDS task has the strongest correlation with reading for both the L1 and ESL learners. In 1997 the task with the strongest correlation remains the same for the L1 students, changing to PR in 1998 and 1999. In contrast, among the ESL students in 1997 the strongest correlate is PR, and in 1998 the strongest correlation is PDS. In 1999 there were no significant correlations for the ESL students. See table 11 below. Table 11 in the Appendix shows the complete table of correlations.

The negative correlation between RAN and WRAT word reading remains for this group of participants across the years but is significant only in 1996 and 1997. The lack of significance between 96 RAN measure and 1998 and 1999 WRAT reading measures, may be due to the effects of learning over time which result in 1996 phonological scores no longer being robust enough to be significant with reading scores at a certain developmental level.

				±				
Phonological	96		97	7	98	3	99	
Processing Skill	L1	ESL	L1	ESL	L1	ESL	L1 ES	
Phoneme Recognition								
R ²	.282*	.333*		.305*	.382*			
Sig. (2 tailed)	.033	.016		.049	.014			
NČ	57	52		42	41			
Phoneme Recognition								
& Location								
R^2	.335*				.361*			
Sig. (2 tailed)	.011				.020			
N	57				41			
Phoneme Deletion								
R^2	.569**	.639**	.495**	.616*	.477*			
Sig. (2 tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.002			
Ň	57	52	51	42	41			
Phoneme Deletion &								
Substitution	.756**	.706**	.639**	.627**	.543**	.484**	.455*	
R ²	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.029	
Sig. (2 tailed)	57	52	51	42	41	41	24	
Ň								
RAN								
R ²	343**	302*	339*					
Sig. (2 tailed)	.009	.030	.015					
N	57	52	51		<u></u>			

Table 11 Significant Correlations for Grade 1 Participants across the Four Years

Table 11 continued.....

Phoneme & Syllable				<u> </u>				
Identification								
R ²	321*	.357**	.326*	.383*				
Sig. (2 tailed)	.015	.009	.019	.012				
N	57	52	51	42				
GFW Sound Mimicry								
R^2	.408*	.316*	.346*	.396**	.359*			
Sig. (2 tailed)	.002	.023	.013	.009	.021			
Ň	57	52	51	42	41			
Pseudoword Reading								
R ²	.701**	.681**	.604**	.658**	.419**	.505**	.658**	
Sig. (2 tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.006	.001	.000	
N	57	52	51	42	41	41	24	
Rhyme Production								
R^2	.360**	.352*	.328*					
Sig. (2 tailed)	.006	.010	.019					
Ň	57	52	51					
Rhyme Detection								
R ²	.385**	.307*	.288*					
Sig. (2 tailed)	.003	.027	.040					
N	57	52	51					
Real word Spelling								
R^2	.857**		.621*	.961*		.696**	.882**	
Sig. (2 tailed)	.000		.018	.039		.008	.004	
N	16		14	4		13	8	
Pseudo word Spelling								
R^2	.542*		.699**			.561*		
Sig. (2 tailed)	.030		.005			.046		
Ň	16		14			13		
Letter Identification								
R ²	.348**		.352*				.476*	
Sig. (2 tailed)	.008		.011				.019	
N	57		51				24	

*<u>p</u> < .05 (2-tailed), **<u>p</u> < .01 (2-tailed)

Overall, the results of the correlations demonstrate that early phonological processing skills measured before reading instruction occurs are positively related to word reading. This is shown in the number of positive significant correlations between phonological processing tasks in 1996 and the WRAT word reading measure in 1996, 1997, 1998 and 1999. See table 12 below. Although the number of positive significant correlations decreases greatly over the four years for the 1996 Junior Kindergarten learners and 1999 grade 1 learners, this may be a reflection of growth or changes in reading and reading related skill development that these early phonological processing measures cannot account for. Stated another way, a confounding variable excluded from the list of independent variables (1996 phonological processing measures) may be contributing to the dependent variable (1999 word reading) such as pseudoword reading performance, working memory or phonological processing performance in the immediately following years. It is important to note that the JK students in 1999 are now in

grade 2 and the growth that occurs in their cognitive and linguistic abilities from grade 1 to grade 2 is developmentally significant enough that it is plausible that the JK measures will have less of an association with reading performance at this age. The same is true for the Grade 1 children in 1999 who are now grade 4 children.

Grade	9	6	ç)7	9	8	9	9
0.000	L1	ESL	L1	ESL	L1	ESL	L1_	ESL
JK	6	4	4	4	3	5	1	0
SK	5	4	5	4	5	.3	4	3
G1	12	8	10	7	6	4	4	0

Table 12 Number of Positive Significant Correlations by Grade from over the Four Years

In conclusion, the results of the correlations suggest that phonological processing skills performance is positively related to word reading. This finding is true for L1 and ESL learners suggesting similar development patterns in both language groups. Furthermore, phonological processing skills measured in the early pre-reading stages of literacy development prove to be robust in their relationship with word reading over a period of four years. Despite the waning number and strength of correlations over the four years, significant correlations are found between early phonological processing skills and word reading.

Discussion

The presence of ESL students in English speaking schools concerns many parents of ESL and L1 children. Some questions that may be raised are "Do ESL students become literate within the existing school system and instructional programs? Do L1 students suffer because teachers must simplify and alter their instruction to meet the needs of the L1 learner? And do ESL students perform more poorly than L1 students on measures of reading and reading related skills because their mother tongue is not English? This last question has implications for when and whether to enroll an ESL child into an English school.

In the United States of America, ESL and Bilingual programs exist for students with limited English proficiency (LEP students). These ESL programs differ from English programs in that the child is not immersed into the English language. Special instructors introduce the English language slowly and English language concepts are taught in a controlled and systematic manner. Most importantly, the child's first language is not spoken in the school, except to help the child make the social adjustment to the new environment and to communicate with parents. In contrast, in Bilingual programs, the child's native tongue is used as the language of instruction. This ensures that subject matter is acquired and students do not fall behind their native English-speaking peers. Much government spending goes into educating LEP students (12 billion/year in 1995), the majority of which is allocated to Bilingual programs, but do students in Bilingual programs fare better than those in ESL programs do not do better than students in ESL program in terms of how soon they qualify to exit the LEP program and join regular English classrooms. This study can provide some insight into why ESL programs may be better than Bilingual programs.

Bilingual and ESL programs such as those found in the United States and other instructional programs for teaching reading to ESL students are grounded in theories, and these theories are in turn based on beliefs about whether ESL and L1 students are different in their reading development. Consequently it is reasonable to question whether ones' beliefs have any validity. Empirical research studying the probable differences between ESL and L1 reading development can provide some objective, scientific evidence to prove or disprove a belief about ESL students and their reading development. This study is one example of a research attempts to scientifically address the validity of these beliefs by examining the differences in reading development between ESL and L1 students. The second question of this study addresses whether the importance of phonological processing skills for reading development found in previous research is similar for ESL students. Research findings from studies on English

speaking and non English speaking students (e.g. Bruck Genessee, & Caravolas, 1997;Chiappe, Siegel, & Gottardo, 1999; Geva & Siegel, 2000; So & Siegel, 1997) support the importance of phonological processing skills for successful early reading ability and this study sought to determine whether this finding was true for ESL learners and also explore just how stable these early phonological processing skills are with respect to their relationship with word reading.

Overall, the findings of this study support previous research findings comparing L1 and ESL learners (e.g., Chiappe & Siegel, 1999; Da Fontoura & Siegel, 1995; Lesaux, 2001) ANOVA results comparing L1 and ESL mean performance on phonological processing and word reading tasks indicated that most of the tasks did not show significant difference between the 2 language groups, thus indicating a similarity in ESL and L1 reading development. In the few cases where significant differences were found between the language groups, most of the results support past research.

For example, the larger number variables showing significantly different mean scores in the JK-G2 grade and the decrease in the number of variables that were significantly different between the 2 language groups in the older SK and G1 groups of learners echo the findings in Lesaux's research (2001) on early reading development of L1 and ESL learners. Lesaux conducted a longitudinal study of children from Kindergarten to Grade 2. In Kindergarten there were significant differences between ESL and L1 children, but by grade 2 the differences by language status had disappeared. Similarly, in this study the participants in the older G1-G4 group had generally no differences in reading and reading related skill performance except for one word reading measure (BAS reading task) compared to the JK-G2 group of learners who showed significant differences between ESL and L1 children on 4 measures (Phoneme Deletion and Substitution, Rhyme Detection, Stanford Sentence Repetition, and Oral Cloze) Although the participants across the 2 groups of learners (JK-G2 and G1-G4) are not the same, this cross sectional examination suggests that ESL children are able to learn and catch up to L1 children within the same instructional literacy program. An additional finding that buttresses the claims made in past research involves the syntactic awareness measure.

Among the JK and SK participants, the mean L1 performance on the Syntactic awareness tests, as measured by either the Oral Cloze or Syntactic Error Judgment task, was significantly higher than the mean ESL performance despite the absence of word reading difficulty for the ESL group. That is, a significant mean score difference on the Syntactic measure between the language groups was found among the Senior Kindergarten normal readers. This finding fits with the findings of other studies (Chiappe & Siegel, 1999; Da Fontoura & Siegel, 1995; Lesaux, 2001). Chiappe and Siegel (1999) found that while phonological processing skill measures did not discriminate between the 2 language groups, the syntactic awareness measure did. They suggest that the exposure to the English syntax was not sufficient to bring them to the same level as their native English-speaking peers. Another possible explanation for this may be that syntactic awareness affects a different level of reading performance such as sentence level reading or reading comprehension. Thus matching participants from the two language groups based on the 2 word level reading performance categories (RD and NA) may superficially show differences on Syntactic awareness performance between the ESL and L1 groups. However, if ESL and L1 participants were matched based on reading comprehension scores, syntactic awareness differences between the language groups may not be observed. Lastly, the observed differences between the L1 and ESL participants on the syntactic awareness measure may be an indication, not that syntactic skills lag behind in development while phonological processing skills do not, but that a certain level of phonological processing is necessary for syntactic development.

It is interesting to note that in this study syntactic awareness did not discriminate between ESL and L1 students in the grade 1-4 group of participants, that is performance on this measure was not significantly different between the 2 language groups. This finding is inconsistent with the findings of Chiappe & Siegel (1999), Da Fontoura & Siegel (1995) and Lesaux (2001). Chiappe and Siegel, for example, studied grade 1 ESL and L1 children and found that the ESL group of participants had significantly lower scores on an oral cloze task very similar to the one used in this study compared to L1 participants. Furthermore, Da Fontoura & Siegel (1995) found that this lag in syntactic skill continues in grades 4, 5, and 6. This finding was not replicated in this longitudinal study.

The relationship between phonological processing skills and reading ability of ESL and L1 speakers was investigated by conducting correlations between 1996 phonological processing measures and word reading measures in 1996, 1997 1998 and 1999. In summary the results confirmed that the important role of phonological processing skills in reading acquisition is the same for L1 learners as it is for ESL learners. Although the number and order of the strongest significant correlations were not identical across the language groups in each of the 3 grade levels in 1996, significant correlations with word reading were found in all of the age groups (JK, SK, G1). This finding supports the importance of phonological processing skills for word reading established by research in the past (e.g.. Ball & Blachman, 1991; Bruck, Genessee, & Caravolas, 1997; Chiappe & Siegel, 1999; Chiappe, Siegel, & Gottardo, 1999; Da

Fontoura & Siegel, 1995; Stahl & Murray, 1994) However, this study is limited by the correlational analysis employed. Although the relationship between the variables is positive and strong, we can neither claim that phonological processing skills predict word reading nor conclude that instruction in phonological processing facilitates early word reading success. Nonetheless the findings suggest that this is likely. Furthermore, the results of past longitudinal research (Torgesen, J.K. & Burgess, S.R., 1998; Torgesen, J.K. & Wagner, R.K., 1994) on phonological processing and reading have shown that reading related phonological skills are stable across the elementary grades during early reading instruction (K-grade 5). Additionally Torgesen & Wagner (1994) found the relationships among phonological processing skills (analytic awareness, synthetic awareness, phonological memory, serial naming and isolated naming) also very consistent across the elementary period suggesting that phonological "abilities are not simply a reflection of knowledge and skills [acquired] as a result of learning to read [but] should be considered to be important human abilities in their own right, similar to the intellectual abilities assessed on measures of general intelligence" (p. 283). The correlations between phonological processing skills and word reading also remain fairly stable over time. For example, although the number and strength of significant correlation coeffecients may change over the years, such as the decline in the number of significant correlations in the JK-G2 and G1-G4 groups, there are still significant correlations between phonological processing skills and word reading in 1997, 1998 and 1999.

Past research (Torgesen, J.K.. & Burgess, S.R., 1998;Torgesen, J.K. & Wagner, R.K., 1994) confirms that phonological processing skills are stable across the elementary grades. The correlation results of this research show that the positive relationship between phonological processing skills and word reading is also stable. Additionally, the ANOVA results in this research show that ESL and L1 students are not significantly different in their reading and reading related skills performance. Consequently, this study shows support for literacy intervention programs that focus on phonological processing skills for children at risk of reading failure that can be used with both native English speaking and ESL students.

It is interesting to note that according to past research (Castle, Riach & Nicholson; 1994; Stanovich, 1988) pseudoword reading is associated with word reading. This suggests that pseudoword reading may even be a better measure of word reading because of the different routes available to access phonological information in working memory when reading words. This study included measures of pseudoword reading, although not all grades in each year received this measure. Correlations between phonological processing skills and pseudoword reading were calculated; however, a comparison of the significant correlations between phonological processing skills and word reading versus phonological processing skills and pseudoword reading (See tables 13, 14, 15 and 16, 17, 18 in APPENDIX C) shows that within and across both language groups there is no trend showing a higher number of significant correlations between pseudoword reading and phonological processing skills. There is also no clear trend that the strength of the significant correlations with pseudoword reading are consistently greater than the strength of the significant correlations with word reading. Consequently, in this study pseudoword reading was not a better measure of word reading.

To further our understanding of the role of phonological processing skills in reading acquisition of ESL learners, future longitudinal research could be conducted employing multiple measures of the phonological and other reading related skills to allow for the study of latent variables, or one could employ composite measures which require standardized tests. The use of latent variables, according to Torgesen and Burgess (1998) provides the most accurate estimate of the true degree of relationship among constructs. Future research in this area could also benefit from following a research design that is similar to the one employed by Good, Simmons and Kame'enui (2001).

Good et. al. (2001) proposed a theory of phonological processing skill development and identified the benchmark skills required to measure success along the continuum of the larger goal of learning to read. This work could be extended to include other reading related variables such as syntactic awareness and working memory. A "backward" examination of the longitudinal data collected would allow researchers to examine what level of skill development is required at a certain stage of development across phonological awareness, syntax, and working memory, and also across other population s including ESL learners, in order to achieve the larger goal of successful reading in the future. This would allow one to create a type of historic profile of good and poor readers.

Works Cited

Ball, E. W., & Blachman, B. A. (1991). Does phonemic awareness training in kindergarten make a difference in early word recognition and developmental spelling? <u>Reading</u> Research Quarterly, 26, 49-66.

Bradley, L. & Bryant, P. E. (1983). Categorizing sounds and learning to read-a causal connection. Nature, 301, 419-423.

Bruck, M., Genessee, F., & Caravolas, M. (1997). A Cross linguistic study of early literacy acquisition. In B. Blachman (Ed.), <u>Foundations of Reading Acquisition and Dyslexia</u> (pp. 145-162). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Castle, J., Riach, J., & Nicholson, T. (1994) Getting off to a better start in reading and spelling: The effects of phonemic awareness instruction within a whole language program. Journal of Educational Psychology, 86, 350-359.

Chiappe, P. & Siegel, L.S. (1999) Phonological awareness and reading acquisition in English and Punjabi-speaking Canadian children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 9, 20-28.

Chiappe, P., Siegel, L.S., & Gottardo, A. (1999). <u>Reading-related skills of kindergartners</u> from diverse linguistic background. Unpublished manuscript.

Cisero, C.A., & Royer, J.A. (1995). The development and cross-language transfer of phonological awareness. <u>Contemporary Educational Psychology</u>, 20, 275-303.

Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence & the educational development of bilingual children. <u>Review of Educational Research</u>, <u>49</u>, 222-251.

Da Fontoura, H.A. & Siegel, L.S. (1995). Reading, syntactic, and working memory skills of bilingual Portuguese – English Canadian children. <u>Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary</u> Journal 7, 139-153.

Durgunoğlu, A. Y., Nagy, W. E., Hancin-Bhatt, J. (1993). Cross-language transfer of phonological awareness. Journal of Educational Psychology, 85, 453-465.

Geva, E. & Siegel, L. S. (2000). Orthographic and cognitive factors in the concurrent development of basic reading skills in two languages. <u>Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary</u> <u>Journal, 12,</u> 1-30.

Good, R.H. Simmons, D.C., & Kame'enui, E.J. (2001). The importance and decisionmaking utility of a continuum of fluency-based indicators of foundational reading skills for thirdgrade high-stakes outcomes. <u>Scientific Studies of Reading</u>, *5*, 257-288.

Gottardo, A., Stanovich, K.E., & Siegel, L.S. (1996). The relationships between phonological sensitivity, syntactic processing, and verbal working memory in the reading performance of third-grade children. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 63, 563-582.

Griffith, P. L. & Olson, M. W. (1992). Phonemic awareness helps beginning readers break the code. <u>The Reading Teacher</u>, 45, 516-523.

Juel, C., Griffith, P. L., Gough, P. B. (1986). Acquisition of literacy: A longitudinal study of children in first and second grade. Journal of Educational Psychology, 78, 243-255.

Katz, L. & Frost, R. (1992). The reading process is different for different orthographies: The orthographic depth hypothesis. In R. Frost & L. Katz (Eds.) <u>Orthography, Phonology,</u> <u>Morphology, and Meaning</u>. (pp. 67-84). North Holland: Elsevier Science Publishers.

Lesaux, N. K. (2001). <u>Early identification and intervention for children at-risk for reading</u> <u>failure from both English-speaking and English as a second language (ESL) speaking</u> <u>backgrounds</u>. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia. (M.A. Thesis, Microfiche 2001-0234)

Liberman, I.Y. & Shankweiler, D. (1985). Phonology and the problems of learning to read and write. <u>Remedial and Special Education</u>, 6, 8-17.

Mujica, B. (1995). Findings of the New York City Longitudinal Study: Hard Evidence on Bilingual and ESL Programs. <u>READ:Perspectives, 2(</u>2), 7-35.

Phillips, L. M., Norris, & Mason (1996). Longitudinal effects of early literacy concepts on reading achievement: A K intervention and follow-up.

Share, Jorm, Maclean, & Matthews (1984). Sources of individual differences in reading acquisition. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 1309-1324.

Siegel, L. S. (1993). The development of reading. <u>Advances in Child Development and</u> <u>Behaviour, 24</u>, 63-97.

Siegel, L. S. (1993, June). The Discrepancy Definition of Dyslexia. <u>Special Interest</u> Divisions, <u>Neurophysiology and Neurogenic Speech and Language Disorders</u>, 3(2), 7-11.

Siegel, L. S., & Ryan, E. B. (1988). Development of grammatical-sensitivity, phonological, and short-term memory skills in normally achieving and learning disabled children. <u>Developmental Psychology</u>, 24, 28-37.

So, D., & Siegel, L. S. (1997). Learning to read Chinese: Semantic, syntactic, phonological, & working memory skills in normally achieving and poor Chinese readers, Reading and Writing: An Interdisiplinary Journal, 9, 1-21.

Stahl, S. A. & Murray, B. A. (1994). Defining phonological awareness and its relationship to early reading. Journal of Educational Psychology, 86, 221-234.

Stanovich, K. (1993-1994). Romance and reality. The Reading Teacher, 47, 280-291.

Teale, W.H. (1987). Emergent literacy: Reading an writing development in early childhood. In J. E. Readence & R. S. Baldwin (Eds.), <u>Research in Literacy : Merging</u> <u>perspectives</u> (pp.45-75). Thirty-sixth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference. Rochester, NY: National Reading Conference.

Torgesen, J.K. & Burgess, S. R. (1998). Consistency of reading –related phonological processes throughout early childhood: Evidence from longitudinal-correlational and instructional studies. In J.L. Metsala & L.C. Ehri (Eds.) <u>Word Recognition in Beginning Literacy (pp.161-188)</u>. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Torgesen, J.K. & Wagner, R.K. (1994) Longitudinal studies of phonological processing and reading. Journal of Learning Disabilities, May 94, 27, 276-286.

Torneus, M. (1984). Phonological awareness and reading: A chicken and egg problem?. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 1346-1358.

Verhoeven, L. T. (1990). Acquisition of reading in a second language. <u>Reading</u> Research Quarterly, 25, 91-111.

Wagner, R.K. & Torgesen, J.K., Laughon, P., Simmons, K. & Rashotte, C. A. (1993). Development of young reader's phonological processing abilities. <u>Journal of Educational</u> <u>Psychology, 85</u>, 1, 83-103. APPENDIX A

ć

.

	Gender (M, F)	Reading Group (RD, NA)	Language (L1, ESL, MIX)
JK 1996	120 (60, 60)	(7,14)*	(70, 50)
SK 1996	128 (74, 54)	(17, 108)*	(74, 54)
G1 1996	111 (51, 60)	(9, 101)	(59, 52)
SK 1997	139 (61, 78)	(15, 124)	(88, 51)
G1 1997	146 (80, 66)	(12, 134)	(91, 55)
G2 1997	128 (52,76)	(17, 111)	(69, 59)
G1 1998	108 (52,56)	(10, 98)	(58, 50)
G2 1998	131 (72, 59)	(21, 107)*	(71, 60)
G3 1998	111 (42, 69)	(9, 102)	(56, 55)
G2 1999	68 (31, 31)*	(11, 55)*	(43, 21)*
G3 1999	151 (64, 63)*	(15, 92)*	(100, 23, 28)
G4 1999	96 (29, 48)*	(12, 78)*	(58, 25, 13)

*Missing Values

M=male, F=female, RD=reading disabled, NA=normal reader, ESL=English as a second language, L1=native English speaker

Totals	Tasks	JK 96	SK 96	G1 96	SK 97	G1 97	G2 97	G1 98	G2 98	G3 98	G2 99	G3 99	G4 99
PHONOLO	GICAL PROCESSING	SKIL	LS M	<u>EAS</u>	JRES		,						
/12	Phoneme			*√		•	V	v	v	v	ľ		
/40*	Recognition												
(4.0	Phoneme			*		1	1	1	✓	✓	~		
/18 /54*	Recognition &			•	-	•	•						
704	Location			,		,	,						
16	Phoneme Deletion	\checkmark	~	\checkmark	~	~	~	~	✓	~			
18	Phoneme Deletion						1	1	1	1	1		
	&Substitution			v	1	•	•		•			. ,	,
40	Rosner Auditory						✓	1	✓	✓	ł	✓	•
	Analysis												
	Rapid Automized									1	1		
(seconds)	Naming RAN	v	v	v	ľ	v	•		•	•			
	Phoneme & Syllable	,											
16	Identification	v	v	v	v	v	•	•	•	•			
	GFW Sound Mimicry												
55	Subtest	•	v	v	V	v	v		•	•		,	,
32	Pseudoword										√	~	~
	Repetition										6		
45	Woodcock Word											\checkmark	\checkmark
	Attack												
15	Pseudoword			\checkmark		\checkmark	\checkmark	√	\checkmark	\checkmark	 ✓ 		
	Reading												
	Coltheart Nonword												,
30	Reading											V	v
	Rhyme Production	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	~	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark			
10	Rhyme Detection	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	1	\checkmark	\checkmark	1	\checkmark	\checkmark			
20	Real word Spelling			\checkmark		\checkmark	✓	1	. ✓	✓	 ✓ 		
10	Pseudoword			\checkmark		✓	\checkmark	 ✓ 	\checkmark	\checkmark	1		
	Spelling												
21	Word Spelling											\checkmark	\checkmark
15	Nonword Spelling											\checkmark	\checkmark
55	WRAT-3 Spelling											\checkmark	\checkmark
26	Letter Identification	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	1	\checkmark	\checkmark	1	\checkmark	\checkmark			
WORKING	MEMORY				1			'			•		
42	Stanford Sentence							1					
	Repetition	✓	✓		 ✓ 								
12	Working Memory:			\checkmark		✓	✓	1	\checkmark	✓	√	\checkmark	\checkmark
	Words										ł		
					I			i.					

T I.I. O.I. State of Manageme	 Administered to 	anch Grade ave	r the Veare
I able 2 List of Measure	es Administered to	each Graue ove	i ule reals

								01		00	00	<u></u>	<u>C1</u>
Totals	Tasks	JK	SK	G1	SK	G1	G2	GI	G2	63		63	G4 00
		96	96	96	97	97	97	98	90	90	99	33	33
<u>SYNTAX</u>					1.	,	,			,			/
/20	Syntax Error	*√	*√	*√	✓	✓	✓	✓	V	v	v	v	v
/35*	Judgement												
12	Oral Cloze										√		
	Syntactic Error												,
25	Correction							ļ				~	✓
READING					•								
57	WRAT-3 Reading	✓	\checkmark	\checkmark	 ✓ 	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	~	\checkmark	~	\checkmark	\checkmark
69	Bridge Words			\checkmark		\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	✓	✓	✓		
40	Linda Experimental			~		✓	\checkmark	~	\checkmark	\checkmark	1		
	Words												
90	British Ability Scales		1	\checkmark	 ✓ 	\checkmark	\checkmark	1	\checkmark	\checkmark			
	Woodcock Word												
106	Identification											\checkmark	\checkmark
48	Coltheart Words											\checkmark	✓
	Stanford Reading												
48	Comprehension											\checkmark	\checkmark
42	One Minute Reading												
	WRAT-Tan											~	✓
55	WRAT-3 Math											\checkmark	\checkmark

Table 2 List of Measures Administered to each Grade over the Years

• •

. . .

Phoneme Recognition

<u>Pretrials</u>: During the pretrials, say to the child:

Listen for /s/, sock. Does sock have /s/?	(/s/; sock)
Listen for /s/, fat. Does fat have /s/?	/s/; fat)
Listen for /s/, soup. Does soup have /s/?	(/s/; soup)

Test Trials:

In the test trials, always present the target phoneme prior to each word, using the format used in the pretrials.

1.	/s/:	sock,	fat,	soup,	meat
2.	/t/:	pen,	take,	top,	duck
3.	/b/:	cook,	hot,	book,	beard
Total se	core:	/	12		

Phoneme Recognition & Location Identification

Pretrials: During the pretrials, say to the child:

Listen for /s/, and tell me if it is the first sound in the word, the last sound in the word, or if it is not in the word: /s/; snake: (first, last, or no)

(first, last, or no) /s/; mess Now listen for /k/: first last or no?

(first, last, or no) /k/; ten

Test Trials:

In the test trials, always present the target phoneme prior to each word, using the format used in the pretrials.

/k/; park

1.	/m/:	milk,	ham,	sit,	pen,	moan,	comb
2.	/t/:	sit,	top,	milk,	grass,	toe,	cat
3.	/b/:	bike,	milk,	cab,	bus,	tub,	nose
Subsco	ore:	first	/6	last	/6	no	_/6
Total S	Score:		/18				

Phoneme Deletion & Substitution

<u>Pretrials:</u> Say to the child, "Now we are going to change the way words sound. I'm going to say a word, and I want you to say it back to me. After that, I'll tell you how to change the word. "Say *doll*." After the child repeats it, say "Now say *doll* again, but don't say /d/." "Say doll." After the child repeats it, say "Now say doll, again, but instead of /d/ say /w/."

Initial:		•
fill (remove /f/)	fill (change /f/ to /b/)	
cup (remove /k/)	cup (change /k/ to /p/)	<u> </u>
bat (remove /b/)	bat (change /b/ to /s/)	
<u>Final:</u>		
goat (remove /t/)	fill (change /l/ to /t/)	
make (remove /k/)	cup (change /p/ to /t/	
seal (remove /l/)	bite (change /t/ to /k/)	
Blends:		
slip (remove /l/)	crest (change /s/ to /p/)	
slip (change /l/ to /n/)	stick (remove /t/)	
nest (remove /s/)	stick (change /t/ to /l/)	
Total:/18		

Coltheart Nonwords

Instructions: I am going to show you some funny words, or what we call nonwords. I want you to read out loud what you see written. These are not real words. Read each of them whatever way you thing best, or however you think they could sound. Let's try it!

Practice 1: dep Practice 2: flope Other Possible Responses (circle one) Nonword stool (bull) 1. stull stull (dull) 2. ving ving (wing) vingg 3. vood vood (food) vood (hood) vud (blood) 4. sost (lost) soast (most) sost 5. vind vind (wind) vind (kind) 6. nush nush (hush) nosh (push) 7. tralf tralf traf (calf) tauf traulf 8. poald (cold) pold pold 9. bove boave (stove) buv (love) boov (move) 10. fump fump fum fup 11. grall graul (hall) gral 12. trome trum (some) troam(home) 13. bould bood (could) boald (mould) bood bowld boold bowd 14. zuv (love) zoov (move) zoav (stove) zove 15. drace drase drake drass drak 16. naulk nalk nauk (chalk) nalk 17. jook jook (book) juke (spook) joke

Coltheart Nonwords (cont'd)

Nonword Possible Res			oonses (circle o	ne)		<u>Other</u>
18.	biss	biss	biz			
19.	paskk	pask (task)	paske			
20.	hane	hane	han			
21.	drack	drack	drake	dake		
22.	fralt	frault	fralt	fraut		
23.	fown	fown (down)	foan (grown)			
24.	rild	rild (wild)	rild (hill-d)			
25.	lail	lale	lell	lill	lell	<u></u>
26.	slear	slear (ear)	slair (bear)	slar (heart)		
27.	fide	fide (hide)	fid			
28.	hile	hile (mile)	hill			
29.	yone	hoan (bone)	yawn (gone)	yun (one)		
30.	stell	stell	steel			

Instructions:

Examiner: "Here is a picture of a cat. Down here are three more pictures..." (the examiner points to and names each of the 3 choices pictures). "Now which of these three - fish, gun or hat rhymes with cat?" Provide the correct answer (hat) if necessary and explain that hat rhymes with cat.

Continue as above with the other 2 demonstration items, giving explanations. The instructions for the ten items are the same as for the demonstration item. Feedback may be given for the first 4 test items, and the child supplied with the correct response if necessary. Give no further help after test item 4.

Demonstration Items

Stimulus Word		Response Items		
1.	cat	fish	gun	hat
2 .	ball	wall	bell	bag
3.	chip	cup	ship	cheese

...

Test Items

Stimulus Word		Respo	<u>nse Items</u>		
1)	boat		foot	bike	coat
2)	key		cow	tree	door
3)	chair		car	table	bear
4)	house		mouse	horse	window
5)	head		hand	bed	eye
6)	bell		bottle	dress	shell
7)	sock		clown	clock	shoe
8)	train		rain	tractor	spoon
9)	egg		bag	spoon	leg
10)	car		star	bike	cake

/10 score:

•

Spelling List

"I am going to read some real words to you and I would like you to print them on the lines on the page in front of you. Try to spell them correctly. I will say the word, then read a sentence with the word in it, and then say the word again. Please write the first word here (point to the first line) and then go down this way as I say each word. Try your best. If you are not sure how to spell a word, it is ok to take a guess."

1.	top	The book is on the <u>top</u> of the pile	top
2.	some	Some of the children have brown eyes.	some
3.	food	The baby ate his <u>food.</u>	food
4.	ball	The Raptors play basket- <u>ball.</u>	ball
5.	jump	How high can you jump?	jump
6.	year	A <u>year</u> has 365 days.	year
7.	love	l <u>love</u> bright, sunny days.	love
8.	walk	Many children walk to school	walk
9.	back	He went <u>back</u> to school on Monday.	back
10.	lost	They found their <u>lost</u> puppy.	lost
11.	wear	She will <u>wear</u> a dress to the party	wear
12.	told	He <u>told</u> us to enjoy ourselves at the park	told
13.	king	The <u>king</u> and queen rule the country.	king
14.	home	l live at <u>home</u> .	home
15.	grow	Farmers <u>grow</u> corn.	grow
16.	look	Look in the drawer for socks.	look
17.	plane	The <u>plane</u> flew from Toronto to Montreal.	plane
18.	stove	The <u>stove</u> is hot.	stove
19.	done	After they finished, the were done.	done
20.	wild	A bear is a <u>wild</u> animal.	wild

"Now I am going to read some made-up silly words to you and I would like you to print them. Try to spell them as well as you can. I will say the silly word up to three times. Please write the first word here (point to the first clear line) and then go down this way as I say each word. Try your best. If you are not sure how to spell a made-up word, it is ok to take a guess."

- 1. bup 2. kib
- 2. KIU 2. nov
- 3. nad 4. pob
- 4. pot
- 5. ves 6. cabe
- 6. cabe 7. voke
- 8. yite
- 9. meve
- 10. pume

I am going to say some sentences and would like you tell me which sentences are right and which are wrong. You can tell if a sentence is true or not, can't you? For example, you know that 2 + 2 = 4 is true? [Wait for child's response] and 2 + 2 = 5 is false? Ok that's one kind of right and wrong. But there is another kind. When we talk, there are right and wrong ways to say things. So if I say 2 + 2 is 4, I have said it right, but if I say 2 + 2 = 4 is, I have said it wrong. And so is 2 + 2 be 4. Nobody would say that, it sounds funny. Let's try some for practice.

Examples: To school go I. Is it right or wrong? (child's response)

To school go I is wrong.

This is a chair. Is it right or wrong? (child's response) This is a chair is right. I am sit. Is it right or wrong? (child's response) I am sit is wrong.

(This task is a forced choice task. No correction should be done in this section. If the child attempts to correct the sentence tell him or her "Now I just want you to tell me if the sentence is right or wrong.") Sentences may be repeated twice. Please indicate number of repetitions on score sheet.

		Child's Response	
1.	Clapped his hands Mark.	Right	Wrong
*2.	The sun shone brightly.	Right	Wrong
3.	The bear brown growled.	Right	Wrong
4 .	They went at school.	Right	Wrong
*5.	He answered the ringing phone.	Right	Wrong
6.	l are happy.	Right	Wrong
7.	The boy run quickly.	Right	Wrong
8.	We thanked him much very.	Right	Wrong
*9.	The waiter dropped the tray of plates.	Right	Wrong
10.	The boy be sad.	Right	Wrong
11.	The child the letter wrote.	Right	Wrong
*12.	The woman turned on the light.	Right	Wrong
13.	The lion and the tiger lives in the jungle.	Right	Wrong
14.	The tourists traveled on car.	Right	Wrong
*15.	Many of the children dressed up for the party.	Right	Wrong
16.	The children's mother work very hard.	Right	Wrong
17.	The art the many artists displayed.	Right	Wrong
18.	They went to visit their relatives on England.	Right	Wrong
*19.	The boy was chased by the dog.	Right	Wrong
20.	They watched sadly as the cowboy rode the sunset into.	Right	Wrong
21.	The flock of geese are on the lake.	Right	Wrong

22.	Was reading the young woman the mystery novel.	Right	Wrong
*23.	When it rains, we wear our boots.	Right	Wrong
24.	The tall, thin man playing was basketball.	Right	Wrong
25.	The presentation for the award was done by the Queen.	Right	Wrong
*26.	The class was eager to see the movie.	Right	Wrong
2 7.	The children with the young teacher enjoys the school trip.	Right	Wrong
*28.	The school of brightly coloured fish swam past the boat.	Right	Wrong
29.	The new television were watching the people.	Right	Wrong
30.	The plan was developed to cooperation with famous scientists.	Right	Wrong
31.	One of the children are sick.	Right	Wrong
*32.	The child, raking the leaves, helps her parents.	Right	Wrong
33.	The business person, waiting for the flight, travel to Europe often.	Right	Wrong
34.	The visitor who wears the dark glasses are friendly.	Right	Wrong
35.	The racing car traveled quickly quite.	Right	Wrong

62

The following task was developed by Alexandra Gottardo; however the task instructions have been modified.

,

.

.

ORAL CLOZE

Name _____

Instructions: This time I will read something to you and there will be word missing. Where the word is missing. I will say "blank". I want you to think of a word that would sound right in the blank. For example, I might say "The moon shines bright in the ______." (pause and repeat) and I want you to say "sky". So, it would be "The moon shines bright in the <u>sky.</u>" O.K. let's try another one. I'll say "The children ______ with the toys." (pause and repeat) What's the missing word? If the child fails to respond, say "How about, play? Then it would be "The children play with toys." Let's try another one. "The puppy wags its ______." (pause and repeat) and repeat) Good!

- 1. The _____ little pigs ate corn.
- 2. Fred put the big turkey _____ the oven.
- 3. The _____ put his dairy cows in the barn.
- 4. Jane _____ her sister ran up the hill.
- 5. It was a sunny day with a pretty ______ sky.
- 6. Betty _____ a hole with her shovel.
- 7. Jim set the lamp on the desk so he could _____.
- 8. The boy had big brown eyes and a pleasant _____.
- 9. The children put on their boots ______ it snows.
- 10. Jeffrey wanted to go _____ the roller coaster.
- 11. When we go ______ the building, we must be quiet.
- 12. Dad _____ Bobby a letter several weeks ago.

Syntactic Error Correction Task

"I am going to say some sentences that are wrong. I want you to fix them for me. Let's try one. Horse is running. Can you fix it? Horse is running." (If the child gives a grammatical response, continue.) Otherwise say, "The horse is running is the right way. Let's try another one. I am stand. Can you fix it? I am stand." (Allow the child to respond). "I am standing is the right way to say it. Let's try some more."

Sentences can be repeated a maximum of 3 times. Record exactly what the child said for later scoring. Try not to accept a response such as the sentence is OK. If the child says the sentence is correct, ask him/her to "Say it in a different way."

~

. . . .

. . .

2. The bear brown growled. (C 3. They went at school. (F 4. I are happy. (C 5. The boy run quickly. (S 6. We thanked him much very. (C 7. The boy run quickly (S	
3. They went at school. (F 4. I are happy. (C 5. The boy run quickly. (S 6. We thanked him much very. (C 7. The boy run quickly (S	WO)
4. I are happy. (C 5. The boy run quickly. (S 6. We thanked him much very. (C 7. The boy run quickly (S	UN)
5. The boy run quickly.(S6. We thanked him much very.(C7. The boy run quickly(S	COP)
6. We thanked him much very. (C 7. The boy run quickly (S	3-P)
7. The boy run quickly (S	CWO)
	3-P)
8. The child the letter wrote. (S	SPO)
9. The lion and the tiger lives in the jungles (S	3-P)
10. The tourists traveled on car. (F	-UN)
11. The children's mother work very hard. (S	3-P)
12. The art the many artists displayed (S	SPO)

64

 $\langle o n o \rangle$

13. They went to visit their relatives on England.			(FUN)	
14. They	watched sadly as the cow	boy rode the	sunset into.	(CWO)
15. The	flock of geese are on the la	ke.		(COP)
16. Was	reading the young woman	the mystery	novel.	(SPO)
17. The	tall, thin man playing was b	asketball.		(CWO)
18. The	presentation for the award	was done by	y the Queen.	(FUN)
19. The	children with the young tea	cher enjoys	the school trip.	(S-P)
20. The	new television were watchi	ng people.		(SPO)
21. The	plan was developed to coo	peration with	n famous scientists.	(FUN)
22. One	of the children are sick.			
23. The	business person, waiting fo	or the flight,	travel to Europe often.	(S-P)
24. The	visitor who wears the dark	glasses are	friendly.	(COP)
25. The	racing car traveled quickly	quite.		(CWO)
FUN:	function word error	SPO:	incorrect phrase order within se	entence
COP:	copula verb error	SCO:	incorrect word order within clau	ISE
S-P:	lack of subject predicate	e agreement		
Bridge Word List

find	orange	bike	car	truck	rabbit
colour	sandwich	duck	circle	good	little
boy	join	mother	the	а	happy
yes	came	chair	in	is	on
put	shoe	under	here	jumping	make
running	walk	they	giraffe	me	monster
down	out	up	cleaning	drawing	reading
you	zebra	go	box	says	went
going	all	some	had	over	stop
z00	rain	cut	dirty	house	jumps
stairs	writing				

BAS Word List

the	up	on	go	he
at	jump	you	box	fish
one	cup	van	if	out
said	water	bird	wood	running
window	ship	clock	men	dig
ring	gate	money	thin	light
coat	brick	oil	heel	paper
carpet	skin	knock	switch	sport
building	writing	glove	army	harvest
travel	climb	ladies	calf	leather
believe	idea	chain	lawn	collect
invite	enemy	favour	drab	guest
territory	behaviour	massive	error	beard
groceries	encounter	statue	ceiling	transparent
universal	experience	dough	tentacle	obscure
character	exert	diameter	curiosity	environment
mosquito	nomadic	velocity	lethal	divulge
chaos	emphasise	jeopardy	aborigine	criterion

67

Coltheart Words

• .

1.	bead	25.	worse
2.	bear	26.	blame
3.	glide	27.	brace
4.	fold	28.	ocean
5.	debt	29.	tribe
6.	cove	30.	dive
7.	walk	31.	shove
8.	paid	32.	doubt
9.	wood	33.	half
10.	pint	34.	shoe
11.	stiff	35.	rhyme
12.	sweat	36.	aisle
13.	child	37.	smoke
14.	broad	38.	speak
15.	yacht	39.	hind
16.	phone	40.	hull
17.	ghost	41.	crane
18.	mild	42.	puff
19.	dome	43.	bind
20.	steak	44.	sword
21.	press	45.	muscle
22.	island	46.	malt
23.	halt	47.	amoeba
24.	slave	48.	receipt

APPENDIX C

Table 3a Mean Phonological Processing and Reading Scores of JK Students by Year as a Function of Language (L1, ESL) and Reading Group (RD, NA)

	ΝΑ					B D			
		N			11 FSI				
Measure	L1		ESL			NI		N	
	M (SD)	N	M (SD)	N	M (SD)	IN	WI (SD)		
PHONOLOGIC	AL PROCESSINC	SKILL	<u>s</u>						
Phoneme Reco	gnition (% score)			_		-	0	0	
98	100.0 (.00)	5	100.0 (.00)	7	100.0 (.00)		()	0	
99	100.0 (.00)	2	100.0 (.00)	4	100.0 (.00)	1	f	•	
Phoneme Reco	gnition & Location) (% sc	ore)	_	00 45 (0.04)	2	100.0 ()	1	
98	100.0 (.00)	<u>5</u>	100.0 (.00)	7	98.15 (3.21)	3		1	
99	100.0 (.00)	<u>2</u>	100.0 (.00)	4	100 (.00	1	88.89 (-)	•	
Phoneme Dele	tion /16				0.40.000	-	00 (00)	2	
96	1.33 (3.27)	6	4.13 (4.58)	8	2.40 (2.88)	5	.00 (.00)	1	
97	10.80 (3.83)	5	8.00 (3.56)	7	7.50 (6.24)	4	4.00 (-)	1	
98	15.60 (.55)	5	16.00 (.00)	7	13.33 (4.62)	3	.00 (-)		
Phoneme Dele	tion & Substitution	/18		-		~	0	0	
98	12.40 (2.07)	5	10.86 (2.19)	7	12.00 (3.61)	3	()	0	
99	13.00 (2.83)	2	12.75 (3.20)	4	13.00 (-)	1	?	Ŭ	
RAN (seconds))			_		~	00.00 (15.56)	2	
96	67.02(14.15)	6	54.90 (10.86)	8	77.47 (12.73)	5	90.00 (15.56)	2	
97	58.71 (9.88)	5	53.86 (16.89)	7	57.75 (12.82)	4	78.00 (-)	ò	
98	39.96 (7.47)	5	41.11 (11.16)	7	52.67 (17.21)	3	? (-)	0	
99	39.80 (3.12)	2	34.73 (6.37)	4	42 (-)	1	? (-)		
Buttercup Spee	ech Rate (seconds	5)				_		•	
96	7.52 (1.03)	6	7.87 (1.24)	8	. 8.90 (1.41)	5	11.59 (4.22)	2	
97	6.46 (1.18)	5	7.59 (1.26)	7	19.37 (24.70)	4	8.00 (-)	ò	
98	6.03 (.99)	4	7.60 (2.02)	7	6.50 (1.18)	2	-	-	
Phoneme & Sy	Ilable Identificatio	n /16				_		•	
96	6.17 (3.92)	6	12.38 (1.77)	8	7.40 (6.15)	5	3.00 (4.24)	2	
97	11.40 (2.07)	5	11.86 (2.54)	7	11.00 (216)	4	8.00 (-)	0	
98	15.20 (.84)	5	14.29 (1.25)	7	12.67 (4.93)	3	?	Ŭ	
GFW Sound N	limicry Subtest /55	5						_	
96	44.17 (5.56)	6	43.88 (6.10)	8	33.80 (12.30)	5	20.50 (10.61)	2	
97	49.40 (4.10)	5	46.43 (7.18)	7	51.75 (1.26) [.]	4	46.00 (-)	1	
98	50.40 (4.62)	5	50.29 (1.70)	7	50.33 (4.16)	3	? (-)	0	
GFW Sound M	% limicry Subtest	6ile sco	re)						
96	67.17 (21.28)	6	65.50 (23.78)	8	38.20 (27.76)	5	10.00 (11.31)	2	
97	76.80 (21.29)	5	65.71 (33.67)	7	88.25 (8.06)	4	62.00 (-)	1	
98	73.40 (30.69)	5	73.00 (12.44)	7	72.00 (24.27)	3	? (-)	0	
Pseudoword F	Repetition32								
99	28.67 (2.89)	3	29.00 (1.41)	5	30.00 (-)	1	? (-)	0	
Pseudoword F	Reading /15								
98	8.80 (3.63)	5	6.43 (2.30)	7	7.33 (3.06)	3	? (-)	0	
99	9.50 (2.12)	2	10.75 (2.87)	4	8.00 (-)	1	? (-)	0	

			NA			F	RD	
	L1		ESL		L1		ESL	
Measure	M (SD)	Ν	M (SD)	Ν	M (SD)	N	M (SD)	N
Rhyme Produ	uction					_		•
96	5.83 (4.02)	6	5.38 (3.93)	8	4.20 (3.27)	5	.00 (.00)	2
97	8.40 (3.91)	5	8.57 (6.11)	7	8.50 (5.74)	4	.00 (-)	ò
98	13.40 (3.78)	5	13.71 (3.35)	7	14.33 (7.77)	3	? (-)	-
Rhyme Detec	ction /10					_	0.50 (0.54)	~
96	7.67 (1.75)	6	6.25 (3.06)	8	5.80 (3.70)	5	2.50 (3.54)	2
97	8.00 (2.00)	5	7.71(1.70)	7	6.75 (4.03)	4	4.00 (-)	ò
98	9.80 (.45)	5	9.29 (1.11)	7	10.00 (-)	3	? (-)	-
Realword Sp	elling /20					_		~
98	12.00 (5.79)	5	12.43 (3.69)	7	8.67 (4.73)	3	? (-)	0
99	17.50 (.71)	2	17.75 (1.26)	4	17.00 (-)	1	? (-)	U
Pseudoword	Spelling /10					_		~
98	5.33 (1.53)	3	4.00 (2.31)	7	4.00 (1.00)	3	? (-)	0
99	5.50 (.71)	2	4.75 (1.71)	4	4.00 (-)	1	? (-)	0
Letter Identif	ication /26							
96	11.50 (7.37)	6	17.25 (8.58)	8	7.60 (6.62)	5	2.00 (1.41)	2
97	22.00 (4.30)	5	24.33 (1.86)	6	23.50 (1.73)	4	21.00 (-)	1
98	25.60 (.55)	5	25.43 (1.30)	7	25.67 (.58)	3	? _(-)	0
WORKING N	<u>MEMORY</u>							
Stanford Ser	ntence Repetition /42							-
96	17.00 (2.53)	6	13.13 (1.81)	8	11.80 (5.17)	5	4.50 (3.54)	2
97	17.75 (4.19)	4	15.33 (1.97)	6 ·	17.00 (3.46)	3	15.00 (-)	1
Working Me	mory : Words /12							
98	3.60 (1.52)	5	2.57 (1.90)	7	3.33 (1.53)	3	.00 (-)	1
99	4.00 (1.73)	3	3.80 (.84)	5	3.00 (-)	1	? (-)	U
SYNTAX								
Syntactic Er	ror Judgement (% sc	ore)						-
96	55.24 (18.40)	6	38.93 (23.21)	8	46.86 (15.98)	5	7.14 (10.10)	2
97	76.00 (9.62)	5	52.14 (18.68)	7	67.50 (10.41)	4	35.00 (.00)	1
98	83.00 (10.37)	5	70.00 (15.28)	7	78.33 (7.64)	3	? (-)	0
99	105.00 (35.00)	3	94.00 (25.84)	5	85.00 (0)	1	? (-)	0
Oral Cloze /	12							
99	10.00 (.00)	2	8.75 (2.50)	4	7.00 (-)	1	? (-)	0
READING								
Wrat Readir	ng (raw score) /57							
96	11.00 (4.60)	6	12.50 (3.78)	8	2.60 (1.67)	5	1.50 (.71)	2
97	18.40 (5.64)	5	17.29 (2.56)	7	18.00 (6.78)	4	14.00 (-)	1
98	24.40 (6.19)	5	23.14 (4.26)	7	23.33 (4.93)	3	? (-)	0
99	31.67 (6.03)	3	28.80 (1.30)	5	31.00 (-)	1	? (-)	0
Wrat Readii	na (%ile score)	-	. ,					
96	63.83 (28.60)	6	69.50 (23.23)	8	13.40 (6.02)	5	9.00 (1.41)	2
07 07	58 60 (24 30)	5	58.14 (24.25)	7	53.00 (11.52)	4	39.00 (-)	1
98	45.20 (24.75)	5	49.71 (24.82)	7	39.33 (7.51)	3	? (-)	0
90	60 00 (22 51)	3	44 60 (11 87)	5	61.00 (-)	1	? (-)	0

	L1				ESL			
	NA		RD		NA		RD	
	M (SD)	Ν	M (SD)	Ν	M (SD)	N	M (SD)	N
Wrat Readi	ing (standard score)							
96	102.50 (13.44)	2	103.80 (7.80)	5	86.50 (2.12)	2	74.00 (-)	1
97	104.40 (11.13)	5	104.14 (11.08)	7	101.25 (4.57)	4	96.00 (-)	1
98	98.40 (10.36)	5	100.14 (10.42)	7	96.00 (3.00)	3	? (-)	0
99	105.33 (15.04)	3	98.00 (4.64)	5	104.00 (-)	1	? (-)	0
Bridge Wio	ords /69							
98	50.20 (17.20)	5	52.00 (16.87)	7	49.33 (17.04)	3	? (-)	0
99	68.50 (.71)	2	68.25 (.96)	4	68.00 (-)	1	? (-)	0
Linda Expe	erimental words / 40							
98	28.80 (10.13)	5	27.43 (10.15)	7	24.33 (13.64)	3	? (-)	0
99	39.00 (1.41)	2	38.75 (.50)	4	39.00 (-)	1	? (-)	0
British Abil	ity Scales / 90							
97	16.80 (33.74)	5	7.71 (9.25)	7	9.25 (18.50)	4	.00 (.00)	1
98	37.80 (27.50	5	36.00 (18.23)	7	33.67 (17.47)	3	? (-)	0

,

72

Table 3b Mean Phonological Processing and Reading Scores of SK Students by Year as a

Function of Language (L1, ESL) and Reading Group (RD, NA)

		N	10		<u></u>	F	RD	
	14	Г			11	•	FSI	
Measure			EGL	NI	M (SD)	N		N
	M (SD)	N	M (SD)	N				
PHONOLOGIC	AL PROCESSING	SKILL	<u>S</u>					
Phoneme Reco	ognition (% score)					-	0 A DE (0 07)	7
97	97.57 (7.68)	48	97.62 (6.45)	42	83.33 (25.91)		94.05 (9.27)	7
98	100.00 (.00)	43	100.00 (.00)	41	97.22 (6.80)	6	100.00 (.00)	•
Phoneme Reco	ognition & Location	1 (% SC	ore)		00.05 (00.76)	7	02.06 (7.07)	7
97	93.87 (12.03)	<u>48</u>	91.80 (15.19)	42	80.95 (23.76)	6	92.00 (7.07)	7
98	99.61 (1.88)	<u>43</u>	99.60 (1.92)	41	100.00 (.00)	ю	99.21 (2.10)	
Phoneme Dele	tion / 16				0.07 (0.04)	0	00 (00)	Q
96	6.17 (5.48)	58	4.16 (5.28)	43	2.67 (3.24)	9 7	.00 (.00)	7
97	13.08 (3.93)	50	12.88 (4.15)	42	8.57 (5.19)	6	9.00 (0.71)	7
98	15.62 (1.01)	42	15.61 (1.28)	41	13.50 (3.51)	ю	13.57 (2.23)	
Phoneme Dele	tion & Substitution	/ 18		40	C 74 (0 77)	-7	6 14 (5 61)	7
97	10.10 (4.43)	48	8.76 (4.48)	42	5.71 (3.77)	6	0.14 (0.01)	7
98	13.79 (3.43)	43	14.40 (3.15)	40	10.67 (3.72)	0	11.57 (4.51)	•
RAN (seconds	5)				00 00 (05 00)	•	72 40 (14 11)	9
96	60.34 (15.73)	58	59.58 (15.87)	42	60.23 (25.20)	9	73.40 (14.11) 50.42 (10.66)	7
97	50.16 (12.96)	50	49.40 (11.94)	42	65.57 (10.42)		50.43 (10.00) AC 43 (9.49)1	7
98	42.49 (8.36)	43	39.99 (8.22)	41	57.29 (15.90)	o	40.43 (0.40) 1	1
Buttercup Spe	ech Rate (seconds	5)			7.00 (05)	~	0.00 (1.50)	Q
96	? (-)	0	7.91 (1.31)	43	7.30 (.95)	9	0.00 (1.00) 7 19 (66)	7
97	? (-)	0	7.08 (1.39)	41	7.58 (1.10)	6		5
98	? (-)	0	6.58 (1.04)	33	6.59 (.67)	ю	0.07 (.72)	
Phoneme & S	yllable Identificatio	n / 16			5 44 (E 04)	0	6 20 (2 12)	Q
96	9.69 (4.04)	58	9.30 (3.73)	43	5.11 (5.04)	97	0.30 (3.42)	0 7
97	13.40 (1.88)	50	13.19 (1.55)	42	11.00 (3.11)	6	12.00 (.90)	7
98	14.79 (1.05)	42	14.77 (1.23)	40	14.33 (1.51)	0	14.43 (1.27)	
GFW Sound N	/limicry Subtest / 5	5				~	C 20 (2 42)	0
96	45.07 (8.01)	58	43.88 (6.54)	43	5.11 (5.04)	9	0.30 (3.42)	0 7
97	50.22 (3.98)	50	50.17 (3.63)	42	11.00 (3.11)	(12.00 (.90)	7
98	51.24 (2.69)	42	50.40 (2.99)	40	14.33 (1.51)	6	14.43 (1.27)	1
GFW Sound N	/limicry Subtest (%	ile scor	e)			~	40.00 (00.64)	0
96	63.21 (24.40)	58	61.49 (23.14)	43	28.78 (29.50	9	48.38 (32.61)	8 7
9 7	76.76 (21.20)	50	76.90(19.59)	42	62.43 (32.45)	(67.14 (32.43)	7
98	74.79 (20.41)	42	65.90 (23.50)	40	48.67 (22.43)	6	53.57 (23.64)	1
Pseudoword F	Repetition / 32					_	04 50 (0.00)	4
99	29.45 (2.43)	31	28.97 (2.86)	29	28.80 (2.95)	5	24.50 (3.32)	4
WoodCock W	ord Attack					_		
99	26.32 (8.70)	31	26.93 (8.92)	29	16.40 (3.21)	5	14.25 (11.30)	4
Woodcock We	ord Attack (standa	r d)						
99	97.48 (13.70)	31	98.83 (14.09)	29	82.40 (4.93)	5	78.50 (17.25)	4
Woodcock W	ord Attack (%ile)							
99	45.23 (29.51)	31	48.59 (29.55)	29	13.00 (5.66)	5	17.00 (29.36)	- 4
Pseudoword	Reading /15							-
98	7.27 (4.32)	48	6.29 (4.29)	42	5.00 (3.56)	7	4.43 (3.87)	7
99	10.70 (3.05)	43	10.47 (3.30)	40	8.20 (4.97)	5	7.71 (3.20)	1

			NA			ŀ	RD	
Measure	L1		ESL		L1		ESL	
	M (SD)	Ν	M (SD)	Ν	M (SD)	N	M (SD)	N
Coltheart Nor	word Reading /30				00.00.(0.44)	E	17 00 (9 97)	٨
99	25.06 (5.34)	31	27.20 (3.86)	30	23.00 (2.41)	5	17.00 (0.07)	-
Rhyme Produ	uction					~	20 (74)	0
96	4.97 (3.75)	58	3.35 (3.37)	43	1.78 (2.54)	9	.30 (.74)	7
97	10.58 (4.51)	50	10.69 (4.84)	42	5.57 (4.86)	1	5.29 (5.00)	
98	13.83 (4.02)	42	14.48 (3.58)	40	11.00 (2.45)	6	9.71 (2.69)	1
Rhyme Detec	ction /10					_		~
96	6.66 (3.07)	58	4.65 (3.63)	43	4.89 (4.31)	9	2.50 (2.51)	8
97	9.00 (1.58)	50	7.93 (2.19)	42	5.71 (3.86)	7	4.29 (2.81)	7
98	9.64 (1.46)	42	9.88 (.40)	40	9.00 (2.00)	6	8.57 (.98)	7
Orthographic	Choice / 17				40.75 (0.00)		10 75 (2 20)	٨
99	13.60 (2.50)	30	14.32 (2.18)	28	12.75 (3.30)	4	12.75 (3.30)	4
Realword Sp	elling /20	40	9 10 (5 52)	42	2 86 (2 48)	7	3,86 (3,13)	7
97	9.00 (0.20)	40	16 28 (4 27)	40	10.50 (5.13)	6	13.14 (5.27)	7
Pseudoword	Spelling /10	42	10.20 (1.27)	10			ζ, ,	
97	3.44 (2.06)	48	3.31 (2.51)	42	1.86 (1.95)	7	2.43 (1.27)	7
98	5.26 (2.37)	38	4.83 (2.77)	35	3.80 (1.79)	5	3.17 (1.60)	6
Word Spellin	g /21 (99 g3&4)	~~		00	C 00 (E 90)		5 50 (4 20)	4
99	11.00 (3.47)	30	11.18 (3.98)	28	0.00 (5.69)	4	5.50 (4.20)	-
Nonword Sp	elling / 15 (99 good 7 23 (2 73)	4) 30	8 68 (3 51)	28	3,75 (3,86)	4	4.00 (1.41)	4
99 Wrat-3 Spelli	ina / 55 ('99 a3&4)	50	0.00 (0.01)					
99	28.33 (3.63)	30	28.93 (3.40)	28	24.50 (4.04)	4	23.25 (4.72)	4
Wrat-3 Spell	ing ('99 G3&4) %ile	score						
99	60.38 (23.86)	30	65.04 (21.88)	28	33.00 (25.65)	4	27.25 (34.76)	4
Wrat-3 Spell	ing ('99 g3&4) Stand	dard So	ore					
99	105.1 (11.07)	30	107.50 (10.94)	28	92.50 (10.97)	4	88.00 (16.55)	4
Letter Identif	ication / 26		. ,					
96	21 31 (4.55)	58	21,23 (4.22)	43	11.11 (7.03)	9	6.38 (2.67)	8
97	24.94 (1.58)	50	25.29 (1.04)	42	21.29 (6.65)	7	25.29 (.49)	7
98	25.86 (.35)	42	25.85 (.48)	40	25.83 (.41)	6	25.71 (.49)	7
			20.00 ()				•	
Stanford Sou	vicivion I stance Panatition / /	12						
		72 58	12 03 (3 01)	43	11 89 (4 43)	9	12.38 (2.83)	8
90	10.95 (4.17)	50	12.33 (3.31)	40	11.00 (1.10)	·	,	
		40	1 70 (126)	42	2 29 (2 21)	7	1 29 (1 25)	7
97	2.33 (1.42)	4ð	1.13 (120)	42 40	2.23 (2.21)	, 6	3 14 (1 57)	7
98	3.83 (1.19)	42	3.00 (1.37)	40	5.00 (2.00)	5	5.00 (1.93)	
99	4.61 (1.58)	31	4.31 (1.47)	29	5.∠U (1.0 4)	Э	5.00 (1.03)	4
<u>SYNTAX</u>								
Syntactic Er	ror Judgement (% s	core)			00 07 (00 (C)	~	00 57 (40 00)	
96	51.33 (19.06)	58	42.19 (16.79)	43	39.05 (22.13)	9	38.57 (18.33)	ک -
97	70.90 (14.59)	50	61.43 (11.96)	42	62.86 (11.85)	(57.14 (14.96)	-
98	80.71 (11.56)	42	77.63 (9.20)	40	72.50 (18.10)	6	67.14 (14.68)	Ī
99	77.33 (10.61)	31	75.05 (8.25)	30	72.00 (7.11)	5	62.86 (12.99)	4

					RD			
	NA L4				11		FSI	
	L1			NI		N	M (SD)	N
	M (SD)	N	W (SD)	IN		11		
READING								
Wrat Reading	Subtest (Raw Score	e) /57			E 00 (0 00)	0	6 50 (2 62)	8
96	14.98 (3.35)	58	14.73 (2.36)	44	5.33 (3.00)	97	0.00 (2.02)	7
97	24.02 (5.22)	50	22.69 (4.94)	42	16.57 (6.65)	1	19.14 (2.04)	7
98	28.74 (3.86)	43	28.24 (4.69)	41	23.00 (3.74)	0	24.00 (2.13)	' A
99	32.03 (3.07)	31	32.37 (4.31)	30	26.80 (2.05)	5	25.75 (2.87)	4
Wrat Reading	Subtest (%ile score	e)				0	10 60 /7 65)	8
96	66.41 (17.40)	58	65.64 (16.22)	44	10.78 (6.55)	9 7	12.02 (7.00)	7
97	73.58 (22.85)	50	70.74 (21.38)	42	35.71 (29.80)	6	44.00 (20.09) 21 42 (21 69)	7
98	59.88 (22.24)	43	55.80 (24.87)	41	23.5U (16.86)	0	31.43 (21.00) 18 25 (10.10)	ι Δ
99	57.03 (19.31	31	57.77 (24.16)	30	23.00 (9.03)	5	10.20 (19.19)	-
Wrat Reading	Subtest (Standard	score)		40	04 75 (8 40)		2 ()	n
96	105.5 (9.09)	28	106.8 (10.21)	10	91.75 (0.40)	4 7	· (-) 07 20 (11 20)	7
97	113.26 (14.11)	50	111.24 (13.08)	42	91.14 (16.42)	í e	91.29 (11.29) 01.00 (10.60)	י 7
98	104.51 (10.03)	43	102.83 (8.16)	41	80.33 (11.57)	D E	91.00 (10.00) 94.50 (0.71)	, Д
99	103.03 (8.16)	31	103.63 (11.45)	30	88.00 (4.34)	ວຸ	04.00 (8.71)	7
Bridge Words	/ 69			40	00.00 (40.40)	7	24 67 (14 02)	6
97	48.13 (18.68)	48	41.74 (21.19)	42	22.80 (18.19)	í e	24.07 (14.92) 58 13 (7 80)	7
98	65.77 (6.80)	43	64.44 (9.44)	41	48.00 (15.43)	0	00. 4 0 (7.0 8)	
Linda Experim	nental Words / 40		05 00 40 50	40	10 E7 /44 00	7	17 42 (14 50)	7
97	27.64 (10.57)	47	25.62 (12.54)	42	13.57 (11.00) 24.67 (40.05)	1	17.40 (14.08) 21.20 /2 74)	' 7
98	36.55 (4.54)	42	35.90 (6.04)	40	24.07 (10.25)	o	51.29 (0.74)	1
British Ability	Scales / 90		۰.				0 ()	<u>^</u>
96	5.57 (8.82)	28	6.30 (11.20)	10	.00 (.00)	3	? (-)	0
97	33.78 (20.20)	50	28.79 (20.10)	42	12.86 (9.56)	7	12.71 (9.12)	1
98	59.12 (15.82)	42	57.95 (18.90)	40	30.00 (13.36)	6	37.57 (13.00)	1
Woodcock We	ord Identification (R	aw sco	ore) / 106			_		
99	61.17 (13.36)	31	63.00 (8.46)	29	45.40 (6.15)	5	43.75 (9.14)	4
Woodcock We	ord Identification (%	le sco	ore)	-		-		,
99	54.84 (26.02)	31	57.17 (24.79)	29	13.60 (7.83)	5	12.25 (17.25)	4
Woodcock W	ord Identification (S	tandar	d score)					
99	98.94 (21.45)	31	103.21 (10.86)	29	82.40 (5.94)	5	78.25 (12.12)	4
Coltheart Wo	rds / 48							
99	33.68 (8.13)	31	33.10 (8.37)	29	25.00 (4.69)	5	21.25 (14.97)	4
Stanford Rea	ding Comprehensic	on (Rav	v score) / 48					
99	37.93 (9.01)	30	37.18 (7.63)	28	24.75 (18.95)	4	23.50 (8.58)	4
Stanford Rea	ding Comprehensic	on (%ile	e score)					
99	53.70 (28.16)	30	46.46 (20.73)	28	27.75 (27.78)	4	15.25 (13.99)	4
One Minute F	Reading WRAT-TAN	1/42		<i></i>		-	04.05 (4.00)	
99	30.68 (3.64)	31	30.59 (4.13)	29	26.60 (1.14)	5	24.25 (4.99)	4
WRAT-3 Mat	h (Raw score) / 55							
99	26.50 (2.40)	30	29.04 (1.86)	28	26.50 (2.08)	4	26.50 (5.20)	4
WRAT-3 Mat	h (Standard Score)							
99	101.10 (9.29)	30	111.04 (7.15)	28	100.75 (5.38)	4	99.25 (22.44)	4
WRAT-3 Mat	h (%ile score)							
99	51.90 (21.16)	30	74.79 (13.37)	28	51.74 (14.06)	4	42.00 (38.51)	4

Table 3c Mean Phonological Processing and Reading Scores of Grade 1 Students by Year as

a Function of Language (L1, ESL) and Reading Group (RD, NA)

		NA	RD					
Measure	11	I	ESI		L1		ESL	
MCCOULC	M (SD)	N	M (SD)	N	M (SD)	Ν	M (SD)	N
PHONOLOGI	CAL PROCESSING	SKILL	<u>_S</u>		<u> </u>			
Phoneme Rec	cognition (% score)							
96	96.79 (11.67)	53	96.12 (11.53)	47	97.50 (5.00)	4	98.50 (2.24)	5
97	100 (.00)	23	99.48 (2.08)	16	100.00 (.00)	2	100.00 (.00)	2
98	100 (.00)	36	100.00 (.00)	37	100.00 (.00)	4	97.92 (4.17)	4
Phoneme Rec	cognition & Location	n (% so	core)					
96	93.85 (14.35)	53	93.26 (15.38)	47	94.44 (8.82)	4	90.37 (9.57)	5
97	96.37 (7.23)	23	98.61 (4.30)	16	97.22 (3.93)	2	100.00 (.00)	2
98	99.54 (1.56)	36	99.70 (1.27)	37	100.00 (.00)	4	100.00 (.00)	-
Phoneme Del	etion / 16							_
96	12.58 (4.79)	53	12.04 (4.97)	47	11.25 (3.59)	4	7.80 (5.54)	5
97	15.15 (1.76)	47	15.21 (1.34)	39	15.75 (.50)	4	12.33 (3.51)	3
98	15.67 (.99)	36	15.86 (.35)	37	15.50 (.58)	4	15.75 (.50)	-+
Phoneme Del	letion & Substitution	/ 18						_
96	10.87 (5.42)	53	9.40 (4.88)	47	6.75 (3.86)	4	6.80 (4.21)	5
97	13.32 (4.12)	34	12.73 (3.74)	26	10.00 (4.36)	3	10.00 (4.24)	2
98	15.75 (2.94)	36	16.05 (1.85)	37	13.50 (1.00)	4	14.75 (4.57)	7
RAN (second	s)							
96	50.43 (12.18)	53	46.87 (9.69)	47	58.00 (3.16)	4	44.60 (7.83	5
97	42.98 (8.91)	47	40.00 (8.39)	39	48.25 (3.95)	4	43.67 (13.58)	3
98	38.29 (8.03)	36	36.23 (7.42)	37	40.98 (5.49)	4	30.50 (6.24)	4
Buttercup Sp	eech Rate (seconds	5)						
96	6.98 (1.53)	52	7.65 (2.01)	47	6.49 (.37)	4	7.18 (1.62)	5
97	6.41 (1.04)	47	6.89 (1.12)	39	7.35 (1.35)	4	6.55 (.69)	3
98	5.80 (.90)	36	5.77 (.94)	37	5.36 (1.01)	4	6.33 (.47)	4
Phoneme & S	Syllable Identification	n / 16						
96	12.64 (3.20)	53	12.23 (2.88)	47	11.75 (2.63)	4	11.20 (1.64)	5
97	13.32 (2.29)	47	13.51(2.29)	39	12.50 (2.08)	4	14.33 (1.53)	3
98	14.36 (1.97)	36	14.49 (2.08)	. 37	13.75 (1.71)	4	14.75 (1.50)	4
GFW Sound	Mimicry Subtest / 5	5						
96	50.11 (4.40)	53	47.64 (8.84)	47	44.25 (11.30)	4	45.60 (4.45)	5
97	51.91 (2.87)	47	50.49 (2.86)	39	51.75 (.50)	4	49.33 (4.16)	3
98	52.08 (2.32)	36	51.86 (2.59)	37	51.25 (2.87)	4	50.50 (3.00)	4
GFW Sound	Mimicry Subtest (%	ile sco	re)		•			
96	76.26 (23.05)	53	69.28 (28.88)	47	51.75 (41.87)	4	45.20 (28.07)	5
97	79.37 (20.11)	46	71.15 (20.38)	39	77.25 (5.50)	4	58.67 (32.88)	3
98	75.67 (21.20)	36	74.97 (21.47)	37	67.25 (24.23)	4	61.50 (22.46)	4
Pseudoword	Repetition / 32		· ·					
99	30.10 (1.81)	21	29.58 (2.39)	19	30.33 (1.53)	3	28.00 (2.83	2
Woodcock W	/ord Attack / 45		· · ·					
99	31.67 (7.95)	21	33.89 (5.51)	19	20.00 (10.82)	3	36.00 (2.83)	2

	1	N	NA			F	RD	
Moosure	11		FSI	•	L1		ESL	
Inteasure	M (SD)	N	M (SD)	N	M (SD)	Ν	M (SD)	Ν
Moodcock Word	Attack (standard)							
	103 33 (14 20)	21	107 11 (11 12)	19	83.33 (17.47)	3	110.00 (5.66)	2
88 Woodoock Word	Attack (%ile)	<u> </u>			,			
	57 00 (29 34)	21	65 05 (23 26)	19	22.00 (21.52)	3	74.50 (12.02)	2
99 Decudeword Doo	57.90 (20.34) ding (15	21	00.00 (20.20)	10			, , ,	
Pseudoword Rea	a ng / 10	52	7 17 (4 02)	47	3 25 (3 59)	4	2.80 (3.11)	5
96	0.UZ (4.29)	47	0.50(3.45)	30	6.00 (3.37)	4	8.00 (4.36)	3
97	10.31(3.37)	26	9.09 (0.40) 12 00 (2 02)	37	9.50 (1.29)	4	11.25 (3.30)	4
98 Cellbeert Nerwo	12.14 (2.04) rd Booding / 20	30	12.00 (2.32)	57	0.00 (1.20)	•		
	28 10 (3 080	21	28.79 (1.18)	19	24.67 (4.04)	3	28.50 (2.12)	2
Rhyme Productio	20.10 (0.000		2011 0 (1110)					
06	9 06 (4 81)	53	6.60 (4.03)	47	5.50 (3.32)	4	5.60 (5.32)	5
90	11 28 (5 63)	47	11.15 (5.25)	39	8.00 (2.16)	4	11.33 (11.85)	3
97	16 25 (4 93)	36	15 35 (5 42)	37	14.25 (1.50)	4	20.00 (3.37)	4
90 Phyma Detection	10.20 (4.90)	00	10.00 (0.12)	•••			, <i>,</i> ,	
	8 53 (2 64)	53	7 51 (2 85)	47	9.00 (.82)	4	6.00 (4.00)	5
90	0.55(2.04)	47	9.44 (1.23)	39	9.50 (.58)	4	8.00 (3.46)	3
97	9.00 (.00)	36	9.97 (16)	37	9 75 (.50)	4	9.75 (.50)	4
98	9.92 (.37)	30	9.97 (.10)	0,	0.10 (.00)	•		-
Orthographic Ch	oice / 17	04	40.00 (0.54)	10	15 33 (1 53)	з	14 00 (1 41)	2
99 Reclword Spollin	14.10 (2.30)	21	13.69 (2.51)	19	10.00 (1.00)	Ŭ	14.00 (1.17)	—
	12 47 (4 07)	15	11.00 (5.77)	4	3.00 (-)	1	? (-)	0
97	16.60 (3.70)	47	16.62 (3.12)	39	11.50 (1.00)	4	12.00 (.00)	3
98	19.00 (1.59)	36	18.70 (2.22)	37	15.50 (3.70)	4	18.25 (.96)	4
Pseudoword Spe	elling / 10	4 -		4	00()	1	2()	Ο
96 97	4.40 (2.10)	15 47	4.25 (2.00)	4 30	.00 (-) 2 75 (1 71)	4	2.67 (2.08)	3 3
97	4.00 (2.44) 5.61 (1.42)	18	5.57 (2.21)	14	3.50 (.71)	2	9.00 (-)	1
Word Spelling / 2	21 (99 g3&4)		0.07 (===)				.,	
99	14.29 (4.38)	21	13.42 (3.34)	19	8.33 (7.37)	3	12.50 (2.12)	2
Nonword Spellin	ig /15 ('99 g3&4))	/		0.07 (4.40)	•	0.50 (2.54)	2
99	9.00 (2.85)	21	8.95 (3.26)	19	6.67 (4.16)	3	6.50 (3.54)	2
Wrat-3 Spelling	('99 g3&4) Raw s	core /	55 21 26 (5 13)	10	26.00 (3.46)	3	29.00 (1.41)	2
99 Must 0. On alling a	31.71 (4.93)	21	31.20 (3.13)	13	20.00 (0.40)	Ŭ	20.00 (111)	-
wrat-3 Spelling	('99 G3&4) %ile s	score	64 69 (29 19)	10	27 00 (17 32)	3	46.00 (12.73)	2
99	66.62 (30.57)	۲۱ میرا (۲۵	01.00 (20.10)	19	27.00 (17.02)	0	40.00 (12.70)	-
Wrat-3 Spelling	('99 g3&4) Stand	ard Sc	01e	10	00 22 (0 91)	з	08 50 (4 95)	2
99	109.67 (15.97)	21	107.37 (15.93)	19	09.00 (9.01)	5	30.00 (4.00)	-
Letter Identificati	ion / 26		05 47 (75)	47	24.00 (4.44)		25 40 (55)	5
96	25.36 (.76)	53	25.47 (.75)	4/	24.00 (1.41)	4	25.40 (.53)	3
97	25.83 (.43)	47	25.54 (1.93)	39	25.75 (.50)	4	25.67 (.56)	3
98	25.83 (.38)	36	25.54 (1.99)	37	26.00 (.00)	4	26.00 (.00)	4
WORKING MEN	MORY							
Working Memor	y: Words / 12						0.00 (0.47)	~
96	2.04 (1.54)	53	1.78 (1.33)	46	1.50 (1.91)	4	2.20 (2.17)	5
97	3.53 (1.65)	47	3.26 (1.46)	39	2.00 (.82)	4	4.33 (.58)	3
98	5.58 (1.66)	36	4.76 (1.71)	37	4.75 (.96)	4	5.75 (2.99)	4
99	6.81 (5.72)	21	5.68 (1.89)	19	5.33 (1.53)	3	5.50 (2.12)	2

NA					RD				
Mogeure	11		FSI		L1		ESL		
weasure		N	M (SD)	N	M (SD)	N	M (SD)	Ν	
SYNTAX	1								
Syntactic Error		50 50	EA 16 (11 72)	47	53 57 (11 52)	4	62 86 (9.04)	5	
96	58.06 (16.39)	23	04.10 (11.73) 71.41 (12.00)	20	70.00 (7.07)	4	78 33 (10 41)	3	
97	75.64 (12.32)	47	71.41 (12.90)	39 37	76.00 (1.07)	ч Д	88 75 (8 54)	4	
98	84.31 (9.11)	36	85.13 (8.54)	37	73.00 (11.33)	3	82.86 (8.08)	2	
99	77. 4 2 (7.11)	21	76.99 (8.60)	19	74.29 (2.00)	5	02.00 (0.00)	-	
Oral Cloze / 12			0.00 (0.70)	47	4 25 (1 90)	A	2 80 (3 56)	5	
99	6.19 (2.84)	53	3.89 (2.78)	41	4.25 (1.69)	4	2.00 (0.00)	U	
Syntactic Error	Correction / 25	2	2	2	2	?	?	?	
99	f	•	:	·	•	-			
READING	When the Annual of the Annual	~) / 57							
vvrat Reading a		52	24 04 (3 86)	47	16 25 (3 20)	4	18.60 (.55)	5	
96	25.43 (4.76)	33	24.04 (3.00)	30	25 50 (1 73)	4	25 33 (3.21)	3	
97	29.91 (4.35)	47	20.07 (0.00)	37	27 50 (1.70)	4	30 75 (4 35	4	
98	34.68 (5.68)	31	35.11 (4.04) 35.37 (3.33)	10	21.33 (5.69)	3	38.00 (5.66)	2	
99	37.48 (5.23)	21	35.37 (3.22)	19	51.55 (5.65)	U	00.00 (0.00)	_	
Wrat Reading &	Subtest (%ile score	e) 50	70.01 (01.61)	47	16 75 (9 60)	4	20 00 (4 24)	5	
96	75.62 (21.15)	53	(2.91 (21.01)	41 20	28 75 (7 50)	ч Л	26.00 (18.36)	3	
97	66.15 (24.66)	41	01.47 (21.71)	39 27	20.75 (7.59)	4	A2 25 (28 16)	4	
98	71.00 (21.96)	37	00.03 (23.10)	37	20.30 (0.33)	7	69 50 (31 82)	2	
99	71.29 (26.03)	21	61.53 (21.36)	19	30.07 (29.37)	3	09.00 (01.02)	~	
Wrat Reading S	Subtest (Standard	score)	440.00 (40.04)	47	04 75 (6 19)	4	87 10 (2 30)	5	
96	115.34 (15.19)	53	112.23 (12.61)	4/	04.75 (0.10)	4	80.33 (8.50)	2	
97	108.45 (13.48)	4/	105.36 (9.73)	39	91.50 (3.32)	4	09.00 (0.00)	1	
98	111.65 (13.87)	37	108.43 (13.04)	37	90.25 (4.19)	4	97.00 (11.00)	2	
99	111.48 (14.17)	21	105.21 (9.37)	19	92.33 (15.55)	3	110.00 (13.30)	2	
Bridge Words /	69				00.75 (40.04)		20.00 (5.24)	5	
96	54.23 (15.31)	53	50.40 (15.01)	4/	28.75 (10.24)	4	29.00 (3.24)	2	
97	66.26 (5.11)	47	66.15 (5.14)	39	56.50 (6.81)	4	57.07 (7.09) 69.75 (50)	3	
98	68.86 (.49)	36	68.86 (.67)	37	64.00 (8.68)	4	66.75 (.50)	4	
Linda Experim	ental Words / 40						44.00 (0.70)	F	
96	29.02 (10.86)	53	26.77 (9.44)	47	12.25 (9.07)	4	11.80 (6.72)	5	
97	35.81 (6.30)	47	34.72 (7.29)	39	30.50 (1.29)	4	30.00 (6.24)	3	
98	39.14 (1.36)	36	39.03 (1.86)	37	35.25 (5.68)	4	37.50 (2.65)	4	
Ozone Vocabu	ılarv								
96	55.30 (17.35)	53	53.13 (16.78)	47	28.25 (6.29)	4	30.60 (7.09)	5	
British Ability S	Scales / 90								
96	41.30 (19.19)	53	34.68 (16.74)	47	13.75 (2.63)	4	15.40 (3.21)	5	
97	65.26 (15.62)	47	59.72 (14.33)	39	38.25 (8.88)	4	37.33 (4.93)	3	
98	77.11 (8.18)	36	74.68 (9.53)	37	50.00 (15.94)	4	64.50 (11.82)	4	
Woodcock Wo	rd Identification (F	aw sco	ore) / 106						
99	74 81 (12 14)	21	74.39 (12.55)	18	64.00 (15.39)	3	77.00 (22.63)	2	
Woodcock Wo	rd Identification (%	6ile scc	ire)						
	62 00 (30 22)	21	61 17 (29 24)	18	37.33 (32.53)	3	57.00 (55.15)	2	
Jan Moodoock Wr	vid Identification (S	r - tandar	d score)		,				
		21 21	106 83 (15 24)	18	92,33 (17 79)	3	106.00 (28.28)	2	
99 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	(86.01) 04-001 do / 49	21	100.00 (10.24)		02.00 (11.10)	-			
	40 20 /4 0C	21	30 05 (4 12)	19	30 33 (14 15)	3	42.00 (4.24)	2	
99	40.29 (4.00)	21	33.03 (4.12)	10	00.00 (14.10)	5		-	

			NA				RD	
	L1 M (SD)	N	ESL M (SD)	N	L1 M (SD)	N	ESL M (SD)	N
Stanford Read	ling Comprehensio	n (Raw	/ score) / 48					
99	30.90 (7.36)	21	39.32 (7.68)	19	24.33 (17.95)	3	35.00 (18.38)	2
Stanford Read	ling Comprehensio	n (%ile	score)					•
99	50.14 (27.23)	21	49.37 (30.24)	19	16.00 (15.52)	3	50.50 (65.76)	2
One Minute R	eading WRAT-TAN	/ 42				_		•
99	36.67 (4.55)	21	34.84 (6.52)	19	32.00 (5.20)	3	34.00 (7.07)	2
WRAT-3 Math	(Raw score) / 55					_		•
99	31.29 (2.85)	21	31.63 (3.17)	19	27.33 (4.04)	3	29.00 (.00)	2
WRAT-3 Math	(Standard Score)						07 00 (00)	•
99	108.52 (11.09)	21	108.63 (11.51)	19	90.67 (13.65)	3	97.00 (.00)	2
WRAT-3 Math	n (%ile score)							0
99	63.81 (25.51)	21	67.79 (23.56)	19	31.67 (26.50)	3	42.00 (.00)	2

Table 41996 Junior Kindergarten Students' Mean Phonological Processing andReading Scores by Year as a Function of Language Group

Measure	L1		ESL	
	M (SD)	Ν	M (SD)	N
PHONOLOGIC	AL PROCESSING	SKIL	LS	
Phoneme Reco	gnition (% score)			
98	99.00 (4.20)	42	96.62 (7.72)	37
99	100.00 (.00)	17	100.00 (.00)	17
Phoneme Reco	gnition & Location	(% s	score)	
98	96.56 (10.11)	47	94.59 (10.35)	37
99	99.35 (1.85)	17	98.69 (3.12)	17
Phoneme Delet	tion /16			
96	1.93 (3.72)	69	1.70 (3.22)	50
97	6.51 (4.91)	55	5.63 (5.21)	43
98	13.67 (4.01)	42	11.19 (6.50)	37
Phoneme Dele	tion & Substitution	/18		
98	10.26 (4.13)	42	8.22 (5.41)	37
99	12.65 (3.57)	17	10.94 (3.51)	
RAN (seconds))			
96	73.92 (22.23)	68	76.61 (27.28)	49
97	63.97 (18.55)	55	67.88 (18.88)	43
98	49.48 (22.36)	42	50.16 (14.99)	37
99	43.05 (9.48)	17	41.76 (7.38)	17
Buttercup Spee	ech Rate (seconds)			
96	8.96 (1.97)	68	9.13 (2.38)	50
97	8.39 (6.81)	54	8.03 (1.58)	43
98	7.09 (1.49)	32	7.33 (1.28)	32
Phoneme & Sy	Ilable Identification	/16		
96	5.68 (4.59)	69	5.30 (4.95)	50
97	10.20 (3.61)	55	9.07 (4.43)	43
98	13.93 (2.31)	42	13.59 (2.70)	37
GFW Sound M	imicry Subtest /55			
96	38.45 (10.21)	69	36.88 (11.55)	50
97	47.24 (6.18)	55	43.81 (9.20)	43
98	48.60 (5.14)	42	47.70 (4.71)	37
GFW Sound M	imicry Subtest (%il	e sco	re)	
96	58.25 (27.54)	69	54.80 (30.16)	50
97	73.20 (22.81)	55	62.95 (26.58)	43
98	67.02 (25.72)	42	62.95 (22.99)	37
Pseudoword R	epetition / 32			
99	26.26 (5.97)	19	25.48 (4.84)	19
Pseudoword R	eading / 15			
98	6.81 (3.97)	42	5.81 (3.78)	17
99	9.12 (2.85)	17	7.76 (3.33)	17

.

۶.

.

,			NA	
	L1		ESL	
Measure	M (SD)	Ν	M (SD)	Ν
Rhyme Produ	uction			
96	2.61 (3.08)	69	2.32 (3.50)	50
97	5.78 (4.15)	55	7.02 (5.16)	43
98	11.19 (7.21)	42	11.05 (4.96)	37
Rhyme Detec	ction / 10			
96	4.57 (3.13)	69	3.52 (2.95)	50
97	6.47 (2.61)	55	5.63 (2.92)	43
98	9.33 (1.30)	42	8.62 (1.77)	37
Realword Sp	elling /20			
98	8.81 (5.41)	42	8.95 (5.44)	37
99	15.06 (4.08)	17	14.59 (3.47)	17
Pseudoword	Spelling /10			
98	3.08 (2.36)	37	2.66 (2.27)	29
99	4.18 (2.13)	17	3.24 (1.71)	17
Letter Identifi	cation / 26			
96	11. 94 (7.77)	69	11.20 (8.94)	50
97	19.96 (6.74)	55	20.45 (6.24)	42
98	25.36 (.88)	42	25.30 (1.00)	37
WORKING N	IEMORY			
Stanford Ser	tence Repetition / 4	2		
96	13.83 (4.04)	69	10.48 (3.90)	50
97	15.19 (3.74)	53	13.12 (3.28)	42
Working Mer	nory : Words / 12			
98	2.95 (2.07)	42	2.16 (1.46)	37
99	3.74 (1.37)	19	3.58 (1.74)	19
<u>SYNTAX</u>				
Syntactic Err	or Judgement (% so	core)		
96	42.61 (18.46)	69	34.46 (22.51)	49
97	56.73 (16.25)	55	52.33 (15.21)	43
98	70.48 (13.43)	42	66.22 (14.36)	37
99	85.00 (19.86)	19	82.89 (20.16)	15
READING	/			
Wrat Readin	g (raw score) / 57			
96	8.80 (5.25)	70	8.34 (5.67)	50
97	15.11 (4.52)	55	14.72 (4.22)	43
98	23.17 (4.61)	42	22.84 (4.56)	37
99	29.00 (4.37)	19	27.11 (3.41)	19
Wrat Readin	g (%ile score)			
96	50.53 (31.15)	70	48.06 (32.02)	50
97	62.74 (21.28)	55	62.86 (23.50)	43
98	59.43 (24.78)	42	63.90 (23.79)	37
99	53.58 (26.08)	19	43.89 (18.93)	19

~

	L1			
	NA		RD	
	M (SD)	Ν	M (SD)	Ν
Wrat Readin	ng (standard score)			
96	100.75 (14.27)	69	98.55 (15.54)	49
97	104.91 (14.25)	55	105.77 (11.80)	43
98	105.57 (13.35)	42	107.27 (12.36)	37
99	101.58 (12.19)	19	97.23 (8.11)	19
Bridge Word	is / 69			
98	45.45 (19.60)	42	45.92 (19.14)	37
99	65.53 (5.69)	17	63.06 (6.49)	17
Linda Exper	imental words / 40			
98	24.33 (12.13)	42	23.03 (12.15)	17
99	36.24 (4.27)	17	35.06 (3.83)	17
British Abilit	y Scales / 90			
97	5.05 (13.40)	55	2.95 (5.68)	43
98	31.71 (19.78)	42	31.24 (19.73)	37

.

Table 5 Table of Mean Phonological Processing Skills and Reading Scores by Grade, Language Group (L1 & ESL) and Reading Category (RD & NA)

Grades JK, SK, and G1

$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$, <u>,,,,,</u> ,,	SK				G1					
Measure NA RD Phomeme Recognition & Score) Phomeme Recognition & Location (% score) Phomeme Recognition &		11	ESL		_1	E	SL	L	.1	E	SL
PHONOLOGICAL PROCESSING SKILLS Promeme Recognition (% score) 97.63 91.57 96.82 93.01 M SD (N) (B8) (18) (18) (18) (14) (13) Phoneme Recognition & Location (% score) (B8) (B8) (18) (144) (13) Phoneme Recognition & Location (% score) (B8)	Measure	2.		NA	RD	NA	RD	NA	RD	NA	RD
Phoneme Recognition (% score) M Phoneme Recognition & Location (% score) M M 100 Phoneme Recognition & Location (% score) M 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155 1155		PROCESS	SING SKILLS								
M 97.63 97.63 96.82 93.01 SD 821 17.15 96.82 93.01 (N) (188) (188) (189) (144) (13) Phoneme Recognition & Location (% score) 11.55 25.90 13.36 22.50 M 1.93 1.70 6.05 2.38 4.75 6.62 12.79 7.61 12.47 5.77 SD 3.72 3.22 5.06 3.07 5.15 1.56 4.33 5.57 4.93 6.02 (N) (69) (50) (136) (18) (18) (144) (13) Stanowich Strip Initial Consonant / 10 M .50 - - 9.80 5.00 9.80 - M - - - - 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 SD - - - 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 M - - - - 9.64 16.97 7.33 4.42 SD - - -	Phoneme Record	tion (% scc									
M SD S21 17.15 9.61 13.02 (N) (18) (14) (13) Phoneme Recognition & Location (% score) (188) (188) (188) (144) (13) M - - - 94.78 81.48 93.40 83.05 SD (188) (18) (144) (13) Phoneme Deletion / 16 94.78 81.48 93.40 83.05 (N) (69) (50) (136) (16) (88) (13) (188) (18) (144) (13) Stanovich Strip Initial Consonant / 10 9.80 5.00 9.80 M - - 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 SD	M		<i>hey</i>	_	_	_	_	97.63	91 57	96 82	93 01
SD 01.1 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 1		-	-	-	-	_		8 21	17 15	9.61	13.02
Phoneme Recognition & Location (% score) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) <td>5D (1))</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>(199)</td> <td>(18)</td> <td>(144)</td> <td>(13)</td>	5D (1))							(199)	(18)	(144)	(13)
M SD 91.76 81.48 93.40 83.05 SD 11.55 25.90 13.96 22.50 M 1.93 1.70 6.05 2.38 4.75 .62 12.79 7.61 12.47 5.77 SD 3.72 3.22 5.06 3.07 5.15 1.56 4.33 5.57 4.93 6.02 (N) (69) (50) (136) (16) (88) (13) (188) (14) (13) Stanovich Strip Initial Consonant / 10 M - - 9.80 5.00 9.80 - - M - - - 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 SD - - - 9.72 4.61 9.23 4.66 N - - - 9.73 4.31 4.69 3.89 (N) Kill - - - 9.75 60.11 46.94 57.54	(N) Discussion Descent		-	-a)				(100)	(10)	(144)	(13)
M - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Phoneme Recogr	NUION & LOC	ation (% scor	e)				04 79	91 49	03 40	83.05
SD 11.33 23.50 15.90 23.50 15.90 23.50 15.90 23.50 15.90 23.50 15.90 23.50 15.90 23.50 15.90 23.50 15.90 23.50 15.90 23.50 15.90 23.50 15.90 23.50 15.90 23.50 15.90 23.50 15.90 23.50 15.90 23.50 15.90 23.50 15.90 23.50 15.90 23.50 15.90 23.50 15.90 23.50 15.90 23.50 15.90 23.50 15.90 25.77 5.77 5.77 5.00 3.57 4.93 6.02 6.00 9.80 - 5.60 - .65 - .65 - .65 - .65 - .65 - .65 - .65 - .65 - .65 - .65 - .65 - .65 .72 4.31 4.69 3.69 .73 .73 .722 4.51 9.00 .50 .72 .73 .723 .74 .72 4.31 .75 .72 .73	M	-	-	-		-	-	94.70 44 EE	25.00	12.06	22.50
(N) (16) (174) (13) M 1.93 1.70 6.05 2.38 4.75 .62 12.97 7.61 12.47 5.77 SD 3.72 3.22 5.06 3.07 5.15 1.56 4.33 5.57 4.93 6.02 (N) (69) (50) (136) (16) (88) (13) (188) (18) (144) (13) Stanowich Strip Initial Consonant / 10 - - - 9.80 5.00 9.80 - M - - - - 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 SD - - - - - 8.80 (188) (144) (13) Rosner Auditory Analysis / 40 M - - - 18.33 22.00 25.20 9.00 SD - - - 18.33 22.00 25.20 9.00 SD 2.23 2.76.51 63.08	SD							(100)	20.90	(144)	(12)
Phoneme Deletion / 16 1.93 1.70 6.05 2.38 4.75 6.2 12.79 7.61 12.47 5.77 SD 3.72 3.22 5.06 3.07 5.15 1.56 4.33 5.57 4.93 6.02 (N) (69) (50) (136) (16) (88) (13) (18) (144) (13) Stanovich Strip Initial Consonant / 10 - - - - 9.80 - - M - - - - 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 SD - - - - 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 SD - - - - 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 SD - - - - 18.33 22.00 25.20 9.00 SD - - - - 18.33 22.00 25.20 9.00 SD	(N)							(188)	(10)	(144)	(13)
M 1.93 1.70 6.05 2.38 4.75 5.02 12.79 7.61 12.47 3.77 SD 3.72 3.22 5.06 3.07 5.15 1.56 4.33 5.57 4.93 6.02 Stanovich Strip Initial Consonant / 10 M - - - - 9.80 - - 56 - 45 SD . - - - - 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 SD . - - - - 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 SD . - - - - 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 SD . . - - - 1.83 22.00 25.20 9.00 M - . - - - 1.7.76 14.59 2.41 10.84 1.89 RO 1.97 2.76.61 63.08	Phoneme Deletio	n / 16	4 70	0.05	0.00	4 75	<u></u>	40.70	7.64	10 47	E 77
SD 3.72 3.22 5.06 3.07 5.15 1.36 4.33 5.77 4.83 6.02 (N) (69) (50) (136) (16) (88) (13) (188) (144) (13) Stanowich Strip Initial Consonant / 10 M - - - 9.80 5.00 9.80 - SD - - - 9.80 5.00 9.80 - - 4.61 9.23 4.46 SD - - - - 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 SD - - - - 18.33 22.00 25.20 9.00 M 73.92 76.61 63.06 76.43 63.46 79.09 51.75 60.11 46.94 57.54 SD 22.23 27.28 16.58 41.68 17.01 17.76 14.59 22.41 10.64 18.89 (N) (68) (50) (134)	M	1.93	1.70	6.05	2.38	4.75	.62	12.79	7.61	12.47	5.77
(N) (69) (50) (136) (16) (88) (13) (185) (184) (144) (13) Stanovich Strip Initial Consonant / 10 - - - - 9.80 5.00 9.80 - SD . - - - - - 56 - 45 (N) . . - - - 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 SD . - - - 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 SD . . . - - - 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 SD <	SD	3.72	3.22	5.06	3.07	5.15	1.56	4.33	5.57	4.93	0.02
Stanowich Strip Initial Consonant / 10 - - - 9.80 5.00 9.80 - - SD 	(N)	(69)	(50)	(136)	(16)	(88)	(13)	(188)	(18)	(144)	(13)
M - - - - - - 9.80 - - 4.5 (N) Phoneme Deletion & Substitution / 18 - - - - - 4.61 9.23 4.46 SD - - - 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 SD - - - 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 SD - - - - 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 N (188) (118) (118) (1144) (113) 1188 (118) (144) (13) RAN - - - - - 18.33 22.00 25.20 9.00 SD 22.23 27.28 16.58 41.68 17.01 17.76 16.97 7.33 4.24 (N) (68) (49) (136) (17) (87) 113 1188 118.89 101 11.88 11.88 10.41 18.89 (N) (68) (50) (134) (16)	Stanovich Strip In	itial Consor	nant / 10								
SD	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.80	5.00	9.80	-
(N) (15) (1) (5) Phoneme Deletion & Substitution / 18 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 SD 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 SD 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 SD 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 N 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 N 9.23 4.46 1.10 9.61 <td>SD</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>.56</td> <td>-</td> <td>.45</td> <td></td>	SD							.56	-	.45	
Phoneme Deletion & Substitution / 18 M - - - - 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 SD . - - - - 9.73 4.61 9.23 4.46 SD 4.61 9.23 4.46 9.89 Rosner Auditory Analysis / 40 	(N)							(15)	(1)	(5)	
M - - - - 9,73 4,61 9,23 4,46 SD 4,72 4,31 4,69 3,89 3,89 3,89 3,89 3,89 3,89 3,89 3,89 3,89 3,89 3,89 3,89 3,89 3,89 3,84 3,89 3,84 4,61 9,23 4,46 3,89 3,84 3,89 3,84 4,61 1,89 (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89) (1,89)	Phoneme Deletio	n & Substite	ution / 18								
SD 4.72 4.31 4.69 3.89 Rosner Auditory Analysis / 40 M - - - 18.33 22.00 25.20 9.00 M - - - - 18.33 22.00 25.20 9.00 SD - - - - 18.33 22.00 25.20 9.00 RAN - - - - 18.33 22.00 25.20 9.00 RAN - - - - 18.33 22.00 25.20 9.00 RAN - - - - 18.33 22.00 25.20 9.00 SD 22.23 27.28 16.58 41.68 17.01 17.76 14.59 22.41 10.64 18.89 (N) (68) (50) (134) (16) (88) 11.0 1.185 1.55 1.55 1.55 1.55 1.55 1.55 1.55 1.55 1.55 1.55 1.55 1.55 1.55 1.55 1.55 1.55 1.55	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.73	4.61	9.23	4.46
(N) (188) (18) (144) (13) Rosner Auditory Analysis / 40 - - - - 18.33 22.00 25.20 9.00 SD - - - - - 18.33 22.00 25.20 9.00 SD SD - - - - 18.33 22.00 (5) (2) RAN (N) (68) (49) (136) 17.01 17.76 14.59 22.41 10.64 18.89 N) (68) (49) (136) (17) (87) (13) (188) (18) (144) (13) Buttercup Speech Rate (seconds) M 8.96 9.13 8.17 7.88 8.11 8.80 7.09 7.61 7.38 7.32 SD 1.97 2.3753 4.46 1.10 1.60 2.50 1.26 1.55 1.55 (N) (68) (50) (136) (16) (88) (13) (111.11 13.10 11.29 112 Phoneme & Syllable Identification / 16	SD							4.72	4.31	4.69	3.89
Rosner Auditory Analysis / 40 M - - - - 18.33 22.00 25.20 9.00 SD - - - - - 18.33 22.00 25.20 9.00 RAN - - - - - 18.33 (2) (2) (5) (2) RAN - - - - - - 14.59 22.41 10.64 18.89 SD 22.23 27.28 16.58 41.68 17.01 17.76 14.59 22.41 10.64 18.89 Buttercup Speech Rate (seconds) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	(N)							(188)	(18)	(144)	(13)
M - - - - - 18.33 9.54 22.00 (2) 25.20 7.33 9.00 4.24 (N) (B) 73.34 4.24 (G) (G) (Z) (S) (Z) RAN 73.92 76.61 63.08 76.43 63.46 79.09 51.75 60.11 46.94 57.54 SD 22.23 27.28 16.58 41.68 17.01 17.76 14.59 22.41 10.64 18.89 N (68) (49) (136) (17) (87) (13) (188) (18) (144) (13) Buttercup Speech Rate (seconds) M 8.96 9.13 8.17 7.88 8.11 8.80 7.09 7.61 7.38 7.32 SD 1.97 2.3753 4.46 1.10 1.60 2.50 1.26 1.56 1.55 1.55 (N) (68) (50) (136) (16) (88) (13) (118) (14) (1	Rosner Auditory /	Analysis / 4	0		•						
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	М	-	-	-	-	-	-	18.33	22.00	25.20	9.00
(N) (6) (2) (5) (2) RAN 73.92 76.61 63.08 76.43 63.46 79.09 51.75 60.11 46.94 57.54 SD 22.23 27.28 16.58 41.68 17.01 17.76 14.59 22.41 10.64 18.89 (N) (68) (49) (136) (17) (87) (13) (18) (18) (144) (13) Buttercup Speech Rate (seconds) M 8.96 9.13 8.17 7.88 8.11 8.80 7.09 7.61 7.38 7.32 SD 1.97 2.3753 4.46 1.10 1.60 2.50 1.26 1.56 1.55 1.55 Phoneme & Syllable Identification / 16 M 5.70 5.30 9.87 5.19 9.24 5.46 13.10 11.11 13.15 10.46 SD 4.59 4.95 3.84 3.76 4.14 3.15 2.51 3.50 2.31	SD							9.54	16.97	7.33	4.24
RAN M 73.92 76.61 63.08 76.43 63.46 79.09 51.75 60.11 46.94 57.54 SD 22.23 27.28 16.58 41.68 17.01 17.76 14.59 22.41 10.64 18.89 (N) (68) (49) (136) (17) (87) (13) (188) (18) (144) (13) Buttercup Speech Rate (seconds) M 8.96 9.13 8.17 7.88 8.11 8.80 7.09 7.61 7.38 7.32 SD 1.97 2.3753 4.46 1.10 1.60 2.50 1.26 1.56 1.55 1.55 (N) (68) (50) (134) (16) (88) (13) (178) (15) (129) (12) Phoneme & Syllable Identification / 16 M 5.70 5.30 9.87 5.19 9.24 5.46 13.10 11.11 13.15 2.51 3.50 2.31 2.50	(N)							(6)	(2)	(5)	(2)
M 73.92 76.61 63.08 76.43 63.46 79.09 51.75 60.11 46.94 57.54 SD 22.23 27.28 16.58 41.68 17.01 17.76 14.59 22.41 10.64 18.89 (N) (68) (49) (136) (17) (87) (13) (188) (18) (144) (13) Buttercup Speech Rate (seconds) M 8.96 9.13 8.17 7.88 8.11 8.80 7.09 7.61 7.38 7.32 SD 1.97 2.3753 4.46 1.10 1.60 2.50 1.26 1.56 1.55 1.55 (N) (68) (50) (134) (16) (88) (13) (178) (15) (129) (12) Phoneme & Syllable Identification / 16 S 9.24 5.46 13.10 11.11 13.15 10.46 SD 4.59 4.95 3.84 3.76 4.14 3.15 2.51	RAN							~ /	.,	• • •	
SD 22.23 27.28 16.58 41.68 17.01 17.76 14.59 22.41 10.64 18.89 (N) (68) (49) (136) (17) (87) (13) (188) (18) (144) (13) Buttercup Speech Rate (seconds)	M	73 92	76 61	63.08	76.43	63.46	79.09	51.75	60.11	46.94	57.54
(N) (68) (49) (136) (17) (87) (13) (188) (18) (144) (13) Buttercup Speech Rate (seconds) M 8.96 9.13 8.17 7.88 8.11 8.80 7.09 7.61 7.38 7.32 SD 1.97 2.3753 4.46 1.10 1.60 2.50 1.26 1.56 1.55 1.55 (N) (68) (50) (134) (16) (88) (13) (17) (15) (129) (12) Phoneme & Syllable Identification / 16 M 5.70 5.30 9.87 5.19 9.24 5.46 13.10 11.11 13.15 10.46 SD 4.59 4.95 3.84 3.76 4.14 3.15 2.51 3.50 2.31 2.50 (N) (69) (50) (136) (16) (88) (13) (188) (144) (13) GFW Sound Mimcry Subtest / 55 M 58.25 54.80	SD	22 23	27.28	16.58	41 68	17.01	17.76	14.59	22.41	10.64	18.89
Buttercup Speech Rate (seconds) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (10) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) (11) <td>(N)</td> <td>(68)</td> <td>(49)</td> <td>(136)</td> <td>(17)</td> <td>(87)</td> <td>(13)</td> <td>(188)</td> <td>(18)</td> <td>(144)</td> <td>(13)</td>	(N)	(68)	(49)	(136)	(17)	(87)	(13)	(188)	(18)	(144)	(13)
M 8.96 9.13 8.17 7.88 8.11 8.80 7.09 7.61 7.38 7.32 SD 1.97 2.3753 4.46 1.10 1.60 2.50 1.26 1.56 1.55 1.55 (N) (68) (50) (134) (16) (88) (13) (178) (15) (129) (12) Phoneme & Syllable Identification / 16	Buttercup Speech	n Rate (sec	onde)	(100)	()	(0.7	(,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	(100)	()	(,	()
M 5.10 5.17 1.00 6.11 1.00 6.10 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 <t< td=""><td>M</td><td>8 96</td><td>Q 13</td><td>8 17</td><td>7 88</td><td>8 11</td><td>8 80</td><td>7 09</td><td>7 61</td><td>7 38</td><td>7 32</td></t<>	M	8 96	Q 13	8 17	7 88	8 11	8 80	7 09	7 61	7 38	7 32
SD 1.97 2.3735 4.40 1.10 1.00 2.00 1.20 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.01 1.11 1.11 1.11 1.11 1.11 1.00 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01 1.01		1.07	2 2752	4.46	1 10	1 60	2 50	1 26	1.56	1.55	1.55
(N) (30) (134) (15) (16) (13) (170) (13) (12) (12) Phoneme & Syllable Identification / 16 M 5.70 5.30 9.87 5.19 9.24 5.46 13.10 11.11 13.15 10.46 SD 4.59 4.95 3.84 3.76 4.14 3.15 2.51 3.50 2.31 2.50 (N) (69) (50) (136) (16) (88) (13) (188) (18) (144) (13) GFW Sound Mimicry Subtest / 55 M 38.45 36.88 45.34 36.38 44.23 36.85 49.22 44.00 48.64 43.92 SD 10.21 11.55 7.74 11.79 6.24 14.76 5.38 10.40 5.98 5.12 (N) (69) (50) (136) (16) (88) (13) (188) (18) (144) (13) GFW Sound Mimery Subtest (%ile score) M 58.25 54.80 66.34 38.63 62.94 45.62 71.46 50.83 70.29 <td>3D (N)</td> <td>(69)</td> <td>2.5755</td> <td>(124)</td> <td>(16)</td> <td>(99)</td> <td>(13)</td> <td>(178)</td> <td>(15)</td> <td>(120)</td> <td>(12)</td>	3D (N)	(69)	2.5755	(124)	(16)	(99)	(13)	(178)	(15)	(120)	(12)
M 5.70 5.30 9.87 5.19 9.24 5.46 13.10 11.11 13.15 10.46 SD 4.59 4.95 3.84 3.76 4.14 3.15 2.51 3.50 2.31 2.50 (N) (69) (50) (136) (16) (88) (13) (188) (18) (144) (13) GFW Sound Mimicry Subtest / 55 M 38.45 36.88 45.34 36.38 44.23 36.85 49.22 44.00 48.64 43.92 SD 10.21 11.55 7.74 11.79 6.24 14.76 5.38 10.40 5.98 5.12 (N) (69) (50) (136) (16) (88) (13) (188) (18) (144) (13) GFW Sound Mimery Subtest (%ile score) M 58.25 54.80 66.34 38.63 62.94 45.62 71.46 50.83 70.29 40.46 SD 27.54 30.16 25.04 23.44 23.34 31.80 24.33 32.10 23.44 25.38	(IN) Dhanana 9 Oulle	(00) bla Idantifia	(00) Intian (16	(134)	(10)	(00)	(13)	(170)	(13)	(123)	(12)
M 5.70 5.30 9.87 5.19 9.24 5.46 13.10 11.11 15.15 10.46 SD 4.59 4.95 3.84 3.76 4.14 3.15 2.51 3.50 2.31 2.50 (N) (69) (50) (136) (16) (88) (13) (188) (18) (144) (13) GFW Sound Mimicry Subtest / 55 M 38.45 36.88 45.34 36.38 44.23 36.85 49.22 44.00 48.64 43.92 SD 10.21 11.55 7.74 11.79 6.24 14.76 5.38 10.40 5.98 5.12 (N) (69) (50) (136) (16) (88) (13) (188) (18) (144) (13) GFW Sound Mimery Subtest (%ile score) M 58.25 54.80 66.34 38.63 62.94 45.62 71.46 50.83 70.29 40.46 SD 27.54 30.16 25.04 23.44 23.34 31.80 24.33 32.10 23.44 25.88 <	Phoneme & Sylla			0.07	F 10	0.24	E 46	12 10	44 44	12 15	10.46
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	M	5.70	5.30	9.07	5.19	9.24	0.40	13.10	2.50	2 24	2.50
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	SD	4.59	4.95	3.84	3.76	4.14	3.15	2.31	3.30	2.31	2.50
GFW Sound Mimicry Subtest / 55 M 38.45 36.88 45.34 36.38 44.23 36.85 49.22 44.00 48.64 43.92 SD 10.21 11.55 7.74 11.79 6.24 14.76 5.38 10.40 5.98 5.12 (N) (69) (50) (136) (16) (88) (13) (188) (18) (144) (13) GFW Sound Mimory Subtest (%ile score) M 58.25 54.80 66.34 38.63 62.94 45.62 71.46 50.83 70.29 40.46 SD 27.54 30.16 25.04 23.44 23.34 31.80 24.33 32.10 23.44 25.38 (N) (69) (50) (136) (16) (87) (13) (188) (18) (144) (13) Pseudowrd Reading / 15 The second	(N)	(69)	(50)	(136)	(16)	(88)	(13)	(188)	(18)	(144)	(13)
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	GFW Sound Mim	icry Subtes	t/55					40.00		40.04	40.00
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	M	38.45	36.88	45.34	36.38	44.23	36.85	49.22	44.00	48.64	43.92
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	SD	10.21	11.55	7.74	11.79	6.24	14.76	5.38	10.40	5.98	5.12
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(N)	(69)	(50)	(136)	(16)	(88)	(13)	(188)	(18)	(144)	(13)
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	GFW Sound Mim	cry Subtest	t (%ile score)								
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	М	58.25	54.80	66.34	38.63	62.94	45.62	71.46	50.83	70.29	40.46
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	SD	27.54	30.16	25.04	23.44	23.34	31.80	24.33	32.10	23.44	25.38
Pseudowrd Reading / 15 M 7.07 3.22 6.70 1.69 SD - - - - 3.99 3.46 3.94 2.36 (N) - - - - - 3.99 3.46 3.94 2.36 (N) - - - - - - 3.99 3.46 3.94 2.36 (N) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	(N)	(69)	(50)	(136)	(16)	(87)	(13)	(188)	(18)	(144)	(13)
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Pseudowrd Read	ling / 15		• •							
SD - - - - - 3.99 3.46 3.94 2.36 (N)	М	-						7.07	3.22	6.70	1.69
(N) (188) (18) (144) (13) Rhyme Production M 2.61 2.32 5.57 2.25 4.70 1.77 9.78 5.83 9.19 6.23 SD 3.08 3.50 4.03 2.86 4.42 3.39 5.37 3.97 5.08 5.23 (N) (69) (50) (136) (16) (88) (13) (188) (144) (13)	SD	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.99	3.46	3.94	2.36
Rhyme Production M 2.61 2.32 5.57 2.25 4.70 1.77 9.78 5.83 9.19 6.23 SD 3.08 3.50 4.03 2.86 4.42 3.39 5.37 3.97 5.08 5.23 (N) (69) (50) (136) (16) (88) (13) (188) (14) (13)	(N)							(188)	(18)	(144)	(13)
M 2.61 2.32 5.57 2.25 4.70 1.77 9.78 5.83 9.19 6.23 SD 3.08 3.50 4.03 2.86 4.42 3.39 5.37 3.97 5.08 5.23 (N) (69) (50) (136) (16) (88) (13) (188) (14) (13)	Rhyme Productio	n						()	(/	、 · · /	· ·/
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	M	2 61	2 32	5 57	2 25	4 70	1 77	9 78	5 83	9.19	6:23
(N) (69) (50) (136) (16) (88) (13) (188) (18) (144) (13)	SD	3.08	3 50	4.03	2.20	4 42	3 30	5.37	3.97	5.08	5 23
	(N)	(60)	(50)	(136)	(16)	(88)	(13)	(188)	(18)	(144)	(13)

······································	JI	<		S	K			(G1	
	L1	ESL	1	_1	E	SL		L1	E	ESL
Measure			NA	RD	NA	RD	NA	RD	NA	RD
Rhyme Detection	/10		<u> </u>							
M	4 57	3.52	6.51	4.59	4.83	3.08	8.81	6.06	7.90	6.46
SD.	3 13	2.95	2.85	3 20	3 29	2.33	2.05	3.83	2.54	2.96
(N)	(60)	(50)	(136)	(17)	(88)	(13)	(188)	(18)	(144)	(13)
(IN) De altread Oa altrea	(09)	(50)	(150)	(17)	(00)	(10)	(100)	(10)	(111)	(10)
Realword Spelling	/20						0.00	2.07	0.44	2.25
М							8.62	2.07	9.44	2.20
SD	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.10	1.87	5.41	1.98
(N)							(150)	(15)	(101)	(8)
Pseudowrd Spellir	ng /10									
M		-	-	-	-	-	3.27	1.27	3.09	1.29
SD							2.26	1.53	2.17	1.38
(N)							(143)	(15)	(94)	(7)
Letter Identification	n								()	. ,
M	11 04	11 20	20 94	5 44	21 74	6 85	25 22	21 78	25 45	25.00
	7 77	P 04	5.01	4 07	3.76	5.52	88	5.65	83	91
30	1.11	0.94	(405)	4.31	(00)	(12)	(100)	(19)	(144)	(13)
(N)	(69)	(50)	(135)	(10)	(66)	(13)	(100)	(10)	(144)	(13)
WORKING MEMO	DRY									
Stanford Sentence	e Repetition	(Raw scor	re) / 42							
M	13.83	10.48	15.73	11.94	12.74	11.08	-	-	-	-
SD	4.04	3.90	3.95	4.44	3.81	3.84				
(N)	(69)	(50)	(136)	(17)	(88)	(13)				
Working Memory	Words / 12	(00)	(100)	(,	()	(-)				
M	-	_	-	_	-	-	2 23	1 44	2.03	1 46
	-	-	_				1 57	1 76	1 30	1 71
50							/100\	(19)	(142)	(13)
(N)							(100)	(10)	(142)	(13)
SYNTAX										
Syntactic Error Ju	dgement (%	score)								
M	42.61	34.46	46.57	35.80	37.89	35.93	65.60	57.46	61.01	60.71
SD	18.46	22.51	18.18	19.39	14.51	16.90	15.46	14.95	13.71	9.06
(N)	(69)	(49)	(136)	(17)	(88)	(13)	(188)	(18)	(144)	(13)
READÍNG	• •	ζ, γ	· ·	. ,		• •	. ,	• •		
Wrat-3 Raw										
/67	8 83	8 34	15 34	4 82	15 59	6 54	23.88	15.00	23.65	17 62
757 M	5.05	5.67	2 11	3 47	2 78	3.62	A AA	A 27	4 22	1 45
	(70)	5.07	(126)	(17)	2.70	(12)	(100)	(19)	(144)	(13)
SD	(70)	(50)	(130)	(17)	(00)	(13)	(100)	(10)	(144)	(13)
(N)										
Wrat-3 (%ile Sco	re)									
M	50.53	48.06	64.76	10.12	70.22	12.31	70.51	15.33	72.53	21.23
SD	31.15	33.02	17.06	8.62	16.97	7.55	22.00	8.21	20.00	3.63
(N)	(70)	(50)	(136)	(17)	(88)	(13)	(188)	(18)	(144)	(13)
Wrat-3	(/	()	()		· · ·	()	· · ·	. ,	· · ·	
standard	100 75	98 55	2	2	2	2	111 53	83.33	111.58	88.00
M	14.27	15 54	·	·	•	·	13.67	6.82	11 60	2 00
	(00)	(40)					(100)	(10)	(144)	(12)
50	(69)	(49)					(100)	(10)	(144)	(13)
(N)										
Bridge Words /69										
M	-	-	-	-	-	-	47.91	17.39	48.21	20.25
SD							17.12	13.84	17.92	10.39
(N)							(188)	(18)	(144)	(12)
Ozone Vocabular	v / 76						(,	()	()	()
M	y //0					-	55 30	28.25	53 13	30.60
	-	-	-	-	-	-	47.25	20.20	16 70	7.00
SD							17.35	0.29	10.70	7.09
(N)							(53)	(4)	(47)	(5)
Linda Experiment	al Words / 4	0								
M										
SD										
(N)										
British Ability Scal	les / 90									
M				8 335						
			264	0.00	2 05	20	22 74	0.20	30 00	10 21
5U (1))			3.04	02	3.90	.20	40.00	9.09 E 00	10.09	10.31
.(N)			7.61	.29	0.80	.45	18.88	08.C	18.06	5.54
			(106)	(12)	(55)	(5)	(188)	(18)	(144)	(13)

Grades G2, G3 and G4

		G	2			G	3			0	64	·
	L	1	ES	SL	L	1	E	SL PD	L	.1	E	SL
Measure	NA DDOOEC	RD		RD	NA	RD	NA	RD	NA	RD	INA	<u>RD</u>
PHONOLOGICAL	PROCES	SING SK	ILLS									
Phoneme Recogn	11101 (% SC	ore)	00 56	00 51	100.0	100.0	00.92	09.33			_	_
M SD	99.00	3 60	2 24	2 02	00.0	00.0	99.03	3 73	-	-	-	-
50 N	(120)	(26)	(QA)	(17)	(51)	(4)	(50)	(5)				
Phoneme Record	itn & Locat	(20) tion (% sc	(34) :ore)	(17)	(31)	(-)	(00)	(0)				
M	00 03	Q7 22	98 64	98 69	99 78	97 222	99 67	92 22	-	-	-	-
SD	3 50	8 20	57	4 18	1.09	5.56	1.33	17.39				
(N)	(120)	(26)	(95)	(17)	(51)	(4)	(50)	(5)				
Phoneme Deletion	n / 16	()	()		. ,	()						
M	15.51	13.29	15.45	12.18	15.73	14.00	15.90	14.20	-	-	-	-
SD	1.21	2.53	1.34	3.32	.92	.82	.30	2.95				
(N)	(117)	(21)	(99)	(17)	(51)	(4)	(50)	(5)				
Stanovich Strip	. ,											
Initial Consonant												
/10	9.96	10.00	9.88	7.67	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
M	.20	.00	.33	2.52								
SD	(24)	(7)	(17)	(3)								
(N)												
Phoneme	12.66	9 50	12 00	0 47	15 47	10 75	15.04	11.00				
Substitute	3 33	0.09	3 35	0.47 3 QA	2.82	2 22	2.46	4.36	_	-	-	-
M	(117)	(27)	(103)	(17)	(51)	(4)	(50)	(5)				
SD	(117)	(27)	(100)	(17)	(01)	(1)	(00)	(0)				
(N)												
Rosner Auditory												
Analysis	23.84	14.20	26.72	12.53	29.07	14.00	30.49	18.40	30.64	18.00	32.52	24.00
M	9.14	5.68	8.52	6.64	9.10	7.68	7.04	7.35	8.33	5.90	6.40	4.36
SD	(112)	(20)	(93)	(17)	(103)	(11)	(67)	(10)	(44)	(8)	(21)	(3)
(N)				,								
RAN			~~ ~~				05 40					
M	43.93	50.58	39.45	49.46	38.95	42.39	35.16	41.17		-	-	-
SD	10.28	14.73	8.09	12.84	(.92	10.34	(50)	8.90				
(N) Buttoroup	(142)	(28)	(117)	(20)	(51)	(4)	(50)	(5)				
Speech Pate												
(seconds)												
M	6 47	6 98	6 79	7 15	5 80	5 32	5 99	6.02	-	-	-	-
SD	1.06	.97	1.16	.66	.88	.29	1.11	.68				
(N)	(114)	(19)	(91)	(16)	(51)	(4)	(50)	(5)				
Phoneme &		· -/	. ,	. ,	. ,	. /	. ,	. /				
Syllable												
Identificatn	14.18	13.14	14.14	13.18	14.31	14.50	14.44	13.60	-	-	-	-
М	1.76	2.65	1.87	2.38	1.85	1.29	1.91	1.82				
SD	(117)	(21)	(99)	(17)	(51)	(4)	(50)	(5)				
(N)												
GFW Sound												
Mimicry Subtest	F4 70	40.40	50 54	47.00	50.00	54.50	E4 00	50.00				
M	51.76	48.43	50.54	47.59	52.00	51.50	51.80	50.20 2.47	-	-	-	-
5D (N)	2.70	3.90	2.01	4.91	(51)	2.32	2.00	2.17				
	(117)	(21)	(99)	(17)	(51)	(4)	(50)	(3)				
Sound Mimory												
Subtest %ile												
M	78.15	52.71	69.75	46.06	75.37	73.75	74.18	58.80	-	-	-	-
SD	18.95	26.44	20.72	26.50	20.39	22.08	22.16	17.43				
(N)	(116)	(21)	(99)	(17)	(51)	(4)	(50)	(5)				
Pseudowrd	/			. /	. /	. /	. ,	. /				
Repetition	28.04	21.29	27.59	25.00	29.96	27.29	28.00	27.40	30.02	28.63	29.43	27.67
Μ	4.20	9.16	3.74	4.36	1.80	3.40	3.44	4.39	2.13	3.93	2.04	3.21
SD	(24)	(7)	(17)	(3)	(52)	(7)	(16)	(5)	(43)	(8)	(21)	(3)
(N)												

	G2				G3				G4			
	1	1	FS	SL.	Ľ	1	ES	SL	Ľ	1	ES	SL
Measure	NA	RD	NA	RD	NA	RD	NA	RD	NA	RD	NA	RD
Woodcock Wrd					27.10	14.00	27.04	12 40	21 69	11 12	22.14	23.00
Attack	-	-	-	-	7.91	4.32	27.94 7.39	3.29	6.52	4.64	4.91	3.61
SD					(52)	(7)	(16)	(5)	(44)	(8)	(21)	(3)
(N)												
VV00dC0CKVVrd				_								
% ile score	-	-	-		48.42	10.71	49.94	9.00	56.50	3.25	62.14	22.33
M					28.08	7.27	24.49	6.00	25.94	1.75	20.76	9.29
SD (N)					(52)	(7)	(16)	(5)	(44)	(0)	(21)	(3)
Woodcock												
Wrd Attack												
M	-	-	-	-	99.08	79.29	99.44	79.00	103.11	67.88	105.19	88.00
SD					12.74	7.59	11.73	5.39	11.87	12.67	9.08	5.29
(N) Resudowrd					(52)	(7)	(16)	(5)	(44)	(8)	(21)	(3)
Reading	10.83	5.67	10.23	5.60	11.90	5.25	12.04	6.60	-	-	-	-
M	3.13	2.86	3.29	2.48	2.96	3.86	2.70	3.78				
SD (N)	(142)	(27)	(116)	(20)	(51)	(4)	(50)	(5)				
Coltheart												
Nonword					20.05	10.57	27 65	22.00	20.22	17 75	28.20	26.00
M	-	-	-	-	20.05	6.40	27.65	9.14	20.23	7.63	20.29	20.00
SD					(52)	(7)	(17)	(5)	(44)	(8)	(21)	(3)
(N) Bhumo												
Production	13.14	10.57	12.67	9.82	16.82	12.25	15.78	13.00	-	-	-	-
M	5.43	3.59	4.46	5.59	5.39	1.71	5.04	7.58				
SD (N)	(117)	(21)	(99)	(17)	(51)	(4)	(50)	(5)				
Rhyme Detection												
/10	9.73 71	8.62	9.63	8.41	9.88 38	10.00	9.96 20	9.20	-	-	-	-
SD	(117)	(21)	(99)	(17)	(51)	.00	(50)	(5)				
(N)	. ,		. ,	• •								
Orthog. Choice	-	_	_	-	13 78	11 57	14 47	12.20	14.52	12.43	14.67	13.00
SD					2.54	3.64	2.18	2.95	2.39	3.64	1.59	1.00
(N) Dechward					(49)	(7)	(17)	(5)	(42)	(7)	(21)	(3)
Spelling/20	16.91	9.75	16.87	10.30	18.80	13.50	18.82	14.40	-	-	-	-
M	2.98	3.49	2.87	3.44	1.76	5.80	1.95	4.28				
SD (N)	(141)	(28)	(116)	(20)	(51)	(4)	(50)	(5)				
Pseudowrd												
Spelling/10	E 00	2.04	4 49	2 20	C 4E	2 00	6 05	1 50				
SD	5.38 2.35	2.04	4.43	2.39	2.18	2.00	2.09	2.12	-	-	-	-
(N)	(133)	(28)	(110)	(18)	(33)	(1)	(19)	(2)				
Word Spelling/21												
(99 g3&4) M	-	-	. _	-	12.04	4.14	12.53	5.60	14.33	5.29	13.48	11.33
SD					3.49	2.12	2.55	2.61	3.20	5.25	2.99	6.35
(N) Non word					(49)	(7)	(17)	(5)	(42)	(7)	(21)	(3)
Spelling/15												
('99 g3&4)	-	-	-	-	8.16	3.14	8.71	6.00	7.88	3.86	8.30	6.67
IVI SD					2.73 (49)	∠.54 (7)	3.41 (17)	৩.৬7 (5)	3.11 (42)	1.57 (7)	∠.98 (20)	5.03 (3)
(N)					()		()	~~/	()		()	(-)
WRAT-3												
('99 g3&4) RAW												
M	-	-	-	-	28.98	23.29	30.18	24.20	30.60	23.43	30.76	25.67
5D (N)					3.49 (49)	(7)	∠.80 (17)	(5)	5.98 (42)	1.99 (7)	4.41 (21)	3.21 (3)

	G2				G3				G4			
		.1	ES		L1		ESI	_ PN	L1	PD		חא
Measure	NA	RD		RD	IN/A	RU		KD				
Spelling ('99												
Standard	-	•	-	-	107.63 11 54	89.00 5.57	111.59 9.31	92.00 5.34	105.93 13 28	83.14 4.81	105.90 13.62	89.33 7.37
SD					(49)	(7)	(17)	(5)	(42)	(7)	(21)	(3)
WRAT-3 Spelling ('99 g3&4)												
%ile M SD (N)	-	-	-	-	66.10 23.85 (49)	24.29 11.79 (7)	74.35 18.13 (17)	30.60 10.64 (5)	60.64 26.38 (42)	14.00 7.16 (7)	59.62 24.33 (21)	25.67 14.01 (3)
Letter identificatn	25.88	25.52	25.78	25.35	25.78	25.25	25.64	25.40	-	-	-	-
M	.38	.60	1.23	.93	.42	1.50	1.72	.89 (5)				
(N) WORKING MEMO	RY	(21)	(33)	(17)	(01)	(-)	(00)	(0)				
Working Memory:												
Words M	3.76 1.49	2.54 1.48	3.44 1.43	2.70 1.42	5.07 1.62	4.18 1.72	4.77 1.66	4.40 2.67	5.61 4.29	5.13 1.55	5.29 1.59	3.33 .58
SD (N)	(141)	(28)	(116)	(20)	(103)	(11)	(66)	(10)	(44)	(8)	(21)	(3)
SYNTAX Syntax Error												
Judgement% score	79.33	69.64	75.60	68.75	81.03	68.70	81.76	70.79	76.56	71.43	77.55	64.76
M SD (N)	11.56 (141)	12.47 (28)	12.58 (116)	9.58 (20)	9.07 (103)	10.63 (11)	10.85 (67)	14.41 (10)	7.93 (44)	9.16 (8)	9.27 (21)	14.38 (3)
Oral Cloze	9 50	6 96	7 35	6.67	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	_
SD (N)	2.06 (24)	2.79 (7)	2.32 (17)	2.52	-	-	-	-	-			
Syntactic Error	(= .)	(.,	()	(-)	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SD (N) READING					(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Wrat-3 Raw /57	20.46	22.00	20.19	22.45	22.24	25.64	22.10	24 00	37 11	26.00	35 76	20.00
SD	3.37	22.00	29.18 3.54 (117)	1.82	4.64	25.04	3.93	3.07	4.77	3.96	2.81	1.00
Wrat-3	(142)	(20)	(117)	(20)	(104)	(11)	(07)	(10)	(44)	(0)	(21)	(3)
%ile Score M	66.52	16.00	63.32	15.15	64.98	16.73	63.94	15.20	68.55	12.11	63.48	19.67
SD (N)	19.69 (142)	7.54 (28)	18.68 (117)	6.07 (20)	21.43 (104)	5.87 (11)	20.84 (67)	8.07 (10)	22.73 (44)	9.05 (8)	16.83 (21)	2.89 (3)
Wrat-3 standard	107.81	83.89	106.09	83.95	108.03	85.09	106 99	82 80	110 16	78 88	105.81	87.00
SD (N)	9.92 (142)	6.36 (28)	8.57 (117)	4.32 (20)	12.44 (104)	4.23 (11)	10.97 (67)	8.39 (10)	12.97 (44)	10.80 (8)	7.30 (21)	1.73 (3)
/69	66.83	50.61	66.73	51.95	68.29	60.50	68.96	60.00	-	-	-	-
M SD (N)	4.07 (142)	12.51 (28)	4.05 (117)	12.22 (20)	2.63 (51)	12.40 (4)	.20 (50)	14.68 (5)				
Linda Experimental												
Words	36.88	25.86	36.45	27.95	38.65	31.75	39.18	28.80	-	-	-	-
SD (N)	4.30 (141)	9.12 (28)	5.03 (116)	(20)	(51)	(4)	.90 (50)	(5)				

_

	···	(32		<u> </u>	G	3		G4			
	Ĺ	_1	Ē	SL	L	1	ES	SL.	L1		ESI	_
Measure	NA	RD	NA	RD	NA	RD	NA	RD	NA	RD	NA	<u>RD</u>
British Ability												
Scales	63.38	28.57	61.93	29.88	73.69	48.25	74.74	41.40	-	-	-	-
M	14 72	10.03	14.52	9.12	12.27	18.03	8.61	15.34				
90	(117)	(21)	(99)	(17)	(51)	(4)	(50)	(5)				
(N)	(11)	(21)	(00)	()	(01)	(9)	(00)	(•)				
(IN) Moodeook Mord												
Woodcock Word												
Ident. Raw					~~ ~~	45 40	CE 40	E4 00	72 70	47.25	71 22	55 67
M	-	-	-	-	62.89	45.43	05.12	51.00	13.19	47.20	11.55	33.07
SD					12.07	5.00	8.69	0.75	10.43	10.30	11.50	4.10
(N)					(52)	(7)	(16)	(5)	(43)	(8)	(21)	(3)
Woodcock Word												
ldent.												
%ile Score												
М	-	-	-	-	59.75	11.71	63.06	26.20	59.67	7.00	52.71	12.67
SD					25.70	8.73	23.63	22.04	25.97	8.07	28.01	6.11
(N)					(52)	(7)	(16)	(5)	(43)	(8)	(21)	(3)
Woodcock Word					· · ·	.,	. ,	. ,	、 ,		. ,	
Ident Standard												
M	_	-	-	-	104 52	80 29	106 44	88 80	105.40	73.38	102.62	82.33
50					12 27	7.09	11 59	11 12	13.25	11 20	13 60	4 73
					(52)	(7)	(16)	(5)	(43)	(8)	(21)	(3)
(IN) Colthoort Mordo					(32)	(\prime)	(10)	(3)	(43)	(0)	(21)	(0)
					25 49	22.14	26 10	24.90	20 50	21.00	20.05	32.00
	-	-	-	-	33.40	22.14	30.19	24.00	39.39	21.00	39.00	2 46
SD					7.51	5.52	4.34	0.98	4.09	9.97	3.71	3.40
(N)					(52)	(7)	(16)	(5)	(44)	(7)	(21)	(3)
Standford												
Reading Comp.												
Raw	-	-	-	-	37.71	24.57	40.12	29.40	37.76	19.71	39.10	32.00
M					9.60	13.13	4.33	11.76	9.03	8.42	7.11	12.17
SD					(49)	(7)	(17)	(5)	(42)	(7)	(21)	(3)
(N)												
Stanford												
Reading Comp.												
%ile	-	-	-	-	53.76	20.86	54.88	28.20	44.00	5.00	46.10	24.33
M					28.02	19.12	21.77	23.95	27.47	4.28	29.19	19.66
SD					(49)	(7)	(16)	(5)	(42)	(7)	(21)	(3)
(N)					(10)	(.)	()	(-)	(/	(.,	(= ·)	(-)
One Minute Rdg												
MPAT Top												
WrvAl-Idii					20.00	25 57	21 44	25 60	25 57	25 62	25.91	29.67
	-	-	-	-	30.88	25.57	31.44	25.60	35.57	25.03	50.01	20.07
SD					3.66	1.40	4.11	1.52	4.81	3.00	5.21	2.52
(N)					(52)	(7)	(16)	(5)	(44)	(8)	(21)	(3)
MATH												
WRAT-3 Math												
Raw												
M	-	-	-	-	26.90	26.71	29.94	28.00	29.95	28.14	30.90	27.00
SD					2.43	1.60	2.14	2.55	3.54	3.34	2.77	5.00
(N)					(49)	(7)	(17)	(5)	(42)	(7)	(21)	(3)
WRAT-3 Math					()	(.)	()	(0)	()	(.)	(= .)	(•)
Standard												
M					102.00	101 06	114 71	106 20	102 57	05.14	106 20	00.00
NI SD	-	-	-	-	0 70	101.00	0 64	0 50	12.00	10 20	0.07	17.00
50					9.72	4.14	0.04	9.50	13.00	12.38	9.07	17.00
(N)					(49)	(7)	(17)	(5)	(42)	(7)	(21)	(3)
WRAT-3 Math												
%ile												
М	-	-	-	-	54.94	54.71	80.53	64.40	55.60	40.86	64.38	32.33
SD					22.96	10.86	12.52	22.45	27.01	26.98	20.65	32.62
(N)					(49)	(7)	(17)	(5)	(42)	(7)	(21)	(3)

>

Table 9 JK Correlations between 1996 Phonological Processing (PP) Skill Measures and Wrat-3 Reading by Year and Language Status (L1, ESL)

	96		97	7	98		99)
PHONOLOGICAL								
PROCESSING	L1	ESL	L1	ESL	L1	ESL	L1	ESL
SKILL			······································					••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••
Phoneme Deletion								
R2	.420**	.428**	.331*	.247	.483**	.378*	.125	.341
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.002	.014	.110	.001	.021	.611	.153
• N	69	50	55	43	42	37	19	19
RAN								
R2	450**	341*	307**	421**	409**	287	231	179
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.016	.024	.005	.007	.085	.342	.465
N	68	49	54	43	42	37	19	19
SR Buttercup								
R2	090	093	065	184	058	205	.063	099
Sig. (2-tailed)	.466	.518	.643	.238	.718	.223	.799	.687
N	68	50	54	43	41	37	19	19
Phoneme & Syllable								
Identification					• • • •		•••	0.40
R2	.248*	.438**	.146	.339*	.213	.326*	.094	.216
Sig. (2-tailed)	.040	.001	.289	.026	.176	.049	.701	.373
N	69	50	55	43	42	37	19	19
GFW Sound Mimcry			· - -		4.00		100±	0.4.4
R2	.291*	.398**	.178	.589**	.189	.397*	.466*	.341
Sig. (2-tailed)	.015	.004	.192	.000	.230	.015	.045	.154
N	69	50	55	43	42	37	19	19
Rhyme Production						664		005
R2	.358**	.177	.461**	.281	.508**	.231	.429	085
Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.218	.000	.068	.001	.169	.067	.730
N	69	50	55	43	42	37	19	19
Rhyme Detection			40044		<u> </u>	075-	0.40	400
R2	.403**	.227	.420**	.311*	.285	.375*	.242	.129
Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.113	.001	.043	.068	.022	.319	.599
N	69	50	55	43	42	37	19	19
Letter Identification							0- -	40.4
R2	.725**	.902**	.491**	.631**	.572**	.589**	.374	.431
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.115	.065
<u> </u>	<u>69</u>	50	55	43	42	37	19	19

Table 10 SK Correlations between Phonological Processing (PP) Skill Measures and WRAT-3 Reading by Year and Language Status (L1, ESL)

	96	6	9	7	98	3	9	9
PHONOLOGICAL								
PROCESSING SKILL	L1	ESL	L1	ESL	L1	ESL	L1	ESL
Phoneme Deletion								
R2	.412**	.439**	.431**	.543**	.306*	.418*	.527**	.190
Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.001	.001	.000	.033	.003	.001	.283
N	67	51	57	49	49	48	36	34
RAN								•
R2	156	329*	299*	432**	327*	272	096	538**
Sig. (2-tailed)	.208	.020	.024	.002	.022	.064	.577	.001
N	67	50	57	48	49	47	36	33
SR Buttercup								
R2	047	145	202	261	140	111	.069	043
Sig. (2-tailed)	.708	.309	.131	.070	.336	.451	.689	.808
N	66	51	57	49	49	48	36	34
Phoneme & Syllable								
Identification								
R2	.562**	.459**	.478**	.380**	.153	.247	.195	.389*
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.000	.007	.293	.091	.255	.023
N	67	51	57	49	49	48	36	34
GFW Sound Mimcry								
R2	.515**	.201	.443**	.245	.517**	.282	.415**	.272
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.158	.001	.090	.000	.052	.012	.120
N	67	51	57	49	49	48	36	34
Rhyme Production								
R2	.294*	.359**	.251	.398**	.284*	.285*	.400*	.542**
Sig. (2-tailed)	.016	.010	.060	.005	.048	.050	.016	.001
N .	67	51	57	49	49	48	36	34
Rhyme Detection		1						
R2	.193	.145	.427**	.228	.350*	056	.249	.084
Sig. (2-tailed)	.118	.310	.001	.114	.014	.707	.143	.635
N	67	51	57	49	49	48	36	34
Letter Identification								
R2	.756**	.875**	.536**	.477**	.368**	.463**	.399*	.597**
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.001	.009	.001	.016	.000
Ν	67	51	57	49	49	48	36	34

Table 11 G1 Correlations between Phonological Processing (PP) Skills and WRAT-3 Reading by Year and Language Status (L1, ESL)

·····	96		97		98		99	
PHONOLOGICAL								
PROCESSING SKILL	L1	ESL	L1	ESL	L1	ESL	L1	ESL
Phoneme Recognition					000t		004	457
R2	.282*	.333*	.198	.305*	.382*	.239	.261	.157
Sig. (2-tailed)	.033	.016	.164	.049	.014	.132	.218	.490
N D III A	57	52	51	42	41	41	24	21
Phoneme Recognition &	Location	044	144	124	261*	064	015	115
RZ Siz (2 tailed)	.335"	.241	. 144	200	.301	.004	.015	619
Sig. (2-tailed)	.011	.063	.515	.399	.020	.032	.340	21
N Rhonomo Deletion	57	52	51	42			24	2,
Prioriente Deletion	569**	639**	495**	616*	477*	260	.322	.114
Sig (2-tailed)	000	000	000	.000	.002	· .100	.125	.624
N	.000	.000	.000	42	41	41	24	21
Phoneme Del. & Sub.	•							
R2	.756**	.706**	.639**	.627**	.543**	.484**	.455*	.315
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	029	.165
ŇŇŇ	57	52	51	42	41	41	24	21
RAN								
R2	343**	302*	339*	228	293	247	194	324
Sig. (2-tailed)	.009	.030	.015	.147	.063	.120	.365	.151
N	57	52	51	42	41	41	24	21
SR Buttercup								
R2	093	.016	264	045	.053	028	090	002
Sig. (2-tailed)	.495	.909	.061	.779	.742	.862	.676	.992
N	56	52	51	42	41	41	24	21
Phoneme & Syllable Ide	ntification	057++	000*	202*	100	254	262	170
RZ	.321"	.357***	.320	.303	. 190	.204	.203	.170
Sig. (2-tailed)	.015	.009	.019	.012	.233	.109	.215	0
IN GEW Sound Mimicov	57	52	51	42	-+ (27	21
B2	408*	316*	346*	396**	359*	212	- 063	347
Sig (2-tailed)	002	023	013	.000	.021	.184	.769	.123
N	.002	.020	51	42	41	41	24	21
Pseudoword Reading	0,	02	0.			•••		
R2	.701**	.681**	.604**	.658**	.419**	.505**	.658**	.130
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.006	.001	.000	.573
N	57	52	51	42	41	41	24	21
Rhyme Production								
R2	.360**	.352*	.328*	.212	.115	005	.225	.149
Sig. (2-tailed)	.006	.010	.019	.178	.474	.977	.291	.518
N	57	52	51	42	41	41	24	21
Rhyme Detection								
R2	.385**	.307*	.288*	.176	.103	.122	.258	104
Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.027	.040	.266	.524	.447	.224	.653
N	57	52	51	42	41	41	24	21
Real word Spelling						00014		
R2	.857**	.784	.621*	.961*	.943	.696**	.882**	.943
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.216	.018	.039	.057	.008	.004	.057
N	16	4	14	4	4	13	8	4
Pseudoword Spelling	E 40*	700	600**	640	770	504*	500	770
	.542*	.709	.099	.040	.//Ծ	.100.	.509	.110
Sig. (2-tailed)	.030	.231	CUU.	.352	ALL.	.040	. 190	<i>ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ</i>
IN Lotter Identification	10	4	14	4	4	15	0	4
	3/0**	_ 084	252*	059	- 051	250	476*	020
isc (2-tailed)		004 554	.552	.000	007	102	019	900
N	.000	.504	.011	42	41	41	.010	.000
	<u> </u>							- •

	96			97	98	3	99	
PHONOLOGICAL								
PROCESSING	ps	wrat	ps	wrat	ps	wrat	ps	wrat
SKILL	-							
Phoneme Deletion								
R ²		.420**		.331*	.429*	.483*		
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	.000	-	.014	.005	.001		
N		50		55	42	42		
RAN								
R^2		341*		307**	328*	409**		
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	.016	-	.024	.034	.007		
N		49		54	42	42		
SR Buttercup								
R^2								
Sig. (2-tailed)	-		-					
Ν								
Phoneme & Syllable	Identific	ation						
R^2								
Sig. (2-tailed)	-		-					
N								
GFW Sound Mimicry	<u>l</u>							40.04
R		.291*					.526*	.466*
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	.015	-				.030	.045
N		69					17	19
Rhyme Production								
R ²		.358**		.461**	.412**	.508**		
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	.003	-	.000	.007	.001		
N		69		55	42	42		
Rhyme Detection								
R ²		.403**		.420**				
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	.001		.001				
N		69	-	55				
Letter Identification								
R⁴		.725**		.491**	.365*	.572**		
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	.000	-	.000	.018	.000		
<u>N</u>		69		55	42	42		

Table 13 Significant Correlations between Phonological Processing Skills and Pseudoword reading (ps) versus Phonological Processing Skills and Word Reading (WRAT) for Native English Speaking JK Students

Note. - = no pseudoword measure was administered this year.

Table 14 Significant Correlations between Phonological Processing Skills and	Pseudoword
Reading (ps) vs Phonological Processing Skills and Word Reading (WRAT) for	Native English
Speaking SK Students	

, ,	9	6	97	,	98	3		99	·
PHONOLOGICAL		-	-						
PROCESSING	ps	wrat	ps	wrat	ps	wrat	ps	ps	wrat
SKILL	•						(cnw)	(wwa)	
Phoneme Deletion									
R^2			.434**	.431**	.384**	.306*	.410*	.365*	.527**
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	-	.001	.001	.007	.033	.013	.029	.001
Ν			55	57	48	49	36	36	36
RAN									
R^2			294*	299*	364*	327*	376*	462**	
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	-	.029	.024	.011	.022	.024	.005	
N .			55	57	48	49	36	36	
SR Buttercup									
R ²							362*		
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	-					.030		
N							36		
Phoneme & Syllable	Identifi	cation							
R ²			.381**	.478**	.306*				
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	-	.004	.000	.035				
N			55	57	48				
GFW Sound Mimicry			000+	F 4 F ++	440++	F 4 7 + +			445**
R ⁻			.320*	.515**	.443**	.51/**			.415***
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	-	.017	.000	.001	.000			.012
N			55	67	57	49			30
Rhyme Production						004*	245*	070*	400*
K [−] Oirr (O toile d)			•			.204	.345	.3/3	.400
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	-				.040	.040	.020	.010
N Devene Detection						49	30	30	30
Rhyme Delection			226*	407**	220*	250*			
R Sig (2 toiled)			.330	.427	.330	.300			
Sig. (Z-tailed)	-	-	.012	.001	وال. وار	.014			
N Letter Identification			55	57	40	49			
			200**	526**	107**	269**		170**	300*
R Sig (2 toilod)			.300	.000	. 4 27	000.		004	016
Sig. (z-tailed)	-	-	.003	.000	200. 40	600. 0k		26	36
IN			55	5/	40	49		30	

<u>Note.</u> In 1999 there were 2 measures of pseudo word reading : Coltheart nonword reading (cnw) and the Woodcock Word Attack Subtest from the Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests-Revised (1987) (wwa). - = no pseudoword measure was administered this year.

*p < .05 (2-tailed), **p < .01 (2-tailed)

Table 15 Significant Correlations between Phonological Processing Skills and Pseudoword Reading (ps) vs Phonological Processing Skills and Word Reading (WRAT) for Native English Speaking Grade 1 Students

	96	3	97	,	98	3		99	<u></u>
PHONOLOGICAL									
PROCESSING	ps	wrat	ps	wrat	ps	wrat	cnw	wwa	wrat
SKILL		· · · · · ·	· · · ·						
Phoneme Recognition	<u>/40</u>	000+				202*			
K [−] Sia (2 toilod)	.333"	.282*				.302			
Sig. (z-talleu)	.011	.033				.014 41			
Phoneme Recognition	& Locatio	on /54							
R^2	.370**	.335*				.361*			
Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.011				.020			
N DI VILLA	57	57				41			
Phoneme Deletion /16	565**	560**	138**	405**		477*		465*	
Sig (2-tailed)	.505	000	.430	.000		.002		.022	
N	57	57	51	51		41		24	
Phoneme Deletion & S	Substitutio	<u>n /18</u>							
R^2	.697**	.756**	.608**	.639**	.364*	.543**		.564**	.455*
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.021	.000		.004	.029
	57	57	51	51	40	41		24	24
$\frac{R^2}{R^2}$		- 343**		- 339*					
Sig. (2-tailed)		.009		.015					
N		57		51					
Phoneme & Syllable Ic	entification	on /16							
R ²	.336*	.321*	.367**	.326*					
Sig. (2-tailed)	.011	.015	.008	.019					
Pseudoword Readin	or /15	57	51	51					
R ²	<u>ig / 15</u>	701**	584**	.604**	.451**	.419**		.590**	.658**
Sig. (2-tailed)	NA	.000	.000	.000	.003	.006		.002	.000
NČ		57	51	51	40	41		24	24
GFW Sound Mimicr	<u>y /55</u>								
R ²	.475**	.408*	.334*	.346*		.359*			
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.002	.017	.013		.021			
N Phyme Production	57	57	51	51		41			
R ²	424**	.360**		.328*					
Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.006		.019					
N	57	57		51					
Rhyme Detection /10									
R ²	.512**	.385**		.288*					
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.003		.040					
N Real word Spelling /20))	57		51		•			
R ²	.743**	.857**	.656*	.621*	.736**		.843**	.866*	.882**
Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.011	.018	.004		.009	.005	.004
N	16	16	14	14	13		8	8	8
Pseudo word Spelling	<u>/10</u>						0001	-	
		.542*	.635*	.699**			.829*	./44*	
Sig. (2-tailed)		.030	CTU.	CUU.			ווט. פ	.034 g	
Letter Identification /26	6	10	14	1-4			0	U	
R ²	- .448**	.348**	.398**	.352*				.485*	.476*
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.008	.004	.011				.016	.019
N	57	57	51	51				24	24

Table 16 S	Significant	Correlations k	between Pho	nological	Processing	Skills and	Pseudoword
Reading (r	os) versus	Phonological	Processing	Skills and	Word Rea	ding (WRA	T) for JK ESL
Students							

	96	3	9	7	- 98	}	9	9
PHONOLOGICAL PROCESSING	wrat	ps	wrat	ps	wrat	ps	wrat	ps
SKILL		•		•				
Phoneme Deletion								
R^2					.378*	.416*		
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	-	-	-	.021	.010		
N					37	37		
$\frac{RAN}{R^2}$						220*		- 625**
K Sig (2 toilod)				_		339		025
Siy. (Z-taileu)	-	-	-	-		.040		.007
SR Buttercup						0,		••
R^2								489*
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	-	-	-				.047
Ň								17
Phoneme & Syllable	Identifica	<u>tion</u>						
R ²					.326*			
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	-	-	-	.049			
					37			
	Y				307*	512**		
R Sig (2-tailed)	_	_	_	_	.397	.012		
N	_	-	_		37	.001		
Rhyme Production					•••	•		
R^2								
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	-	-	-				
N								
Rhyme Detection								
R ²					.375*	.410*		.505*
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	-	-	-	.022	.012		.039
N					37	37		17
					590**	502*		
K Sia (2 tailed)	_	_	_	_	.009 000	.502		
Siy. (Z-tailed)	-	-	-	-	.000	.002		
N								

Note. - = no pseudoword measure was administered this year.

Table17 Significant Correlations between Phonological Processing Skills and Pseudoword	<u>d</u>
Reading (ps) versus Phonological Processing Skills and Word Reading (WRAT) for SK E	ŞL
Students	

	9	6	9	7	98	}	<u> </u>	99	
PHONOLOGICAL									
PROCESSING	wrat	ps	wrat	ps	wrat	ps	wrat	cnw	wwa
SKILL									
Phoneme Deletion									
R^2			.543**	.468**	.418*				
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	-	.000	.001	.003				
N			49	. 49	48				
RAN									400**
R ²			432**	-437**		366*	538**	464**	486**
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	-	.002	.002		.012	.001	.006	.005
N			48	48		46	33	33	32
SR Buttercup									
R		,							
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	-							
N									
Phoneme & Syllable	Identific	ation	200**	220*			200*		
			.380**	.330"			.309		
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	-	.007	.018			.023		
			49	49			54		
	L								
R Sig (2 toiled)									
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	-							
N Dhyma Braduction									
			308**		285*	402**	542**		441*
Sig (2-tailed)	_	_	.000		050	005	001		.010
N			49		48	47	34		33
Rhyme Detection							• •		
\mathbb{R}^2									
Sig (2-tailed)	-	-							
N									
Letter Identification									
\mathbb{R}^2			.477**	.307*	.463**	.428**	.597**	.519**	.510**
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	-	.001	.032	.001	.003	.000	.002	.002
N			49	49	48	47	34	34	33

<u>Note.</u> In 1999 there were 2 measures of pseudo word reading : Coltheart nonword reading (cnw) and the Woodcock Word Attack Subtest from the Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests-Revised (1987) (wwa). - = no pseudoword measure was administered this year.

<u>Table 18 Significant Correlations between Phonological Processing Skills and Pseudoword</u> <u>Reading (ps) versus Phonological Processing Skills and Word Reading (WRAT) for Grade 1</u> <u>ESL Students</u>

		<u> </u>							
	96	5	97	•	98			99	
PHONOLOGICAL									
PROCESSING	wrat	ps	wrat	ps	wrat	ps	wrat	cnw	wwa
SKILL		•							
Phoneme Recognition	/40				<u> </u>				
R^2	.333*		.305*						
Sig (2-tailed)	.016		.049						
N	52		42						
Phoneme Recognition	& Locatio	n /54							
\mathbb{R}^2		.398**							
Sig. (2-tailed)		.003							
Ň		52							
Phoneme Deletion /16	3								
\mathbb{R}^2	.639**	.663**	.616*	.583**		.480**			
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.001			
NČ	52	52	42	42		41			
Phoneme Deletion & S	Substitutio	<u>n /18</u>							
R^2	.706**	.628**	.627**	.534**	.484**	.555**		.524*	
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	.000		.015	
N	52	52	42	42	41	41		21	
RAN									
$\overline{R^2}$	302*								
Sig. (2-tailed)	.030								
N	52								
Phoneme & Syllable I	dentificatio	<u>on /16</u>							
R^2	.357**	.311*	.383*			.318*			
Sig. (2-tailed)	.009	.025	.012			.043			
N	52	52	42			41			
Pseudoword Reading	/15								
R ²	.681**		.658**	.526**	.505**	.438**			
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	NA	.000	.000	.001	.004			
N	52		42	42	41	41			
GFW Sound Mimicry	<u>/55</u>								
R²	.316*	.376**	.396**	.339*		.452**			
Sig. (2-tailed)	.023	.006	.009	.028		.003			
N	52	52	42	42		41			
Rhyme Production									
R²	.352*	.351*							
Sig. (2-tailed)	.010	.011							
N	52	52							
Rhyme Detection /10									
R ²	.307*	.341*							
Sig. (2-tailed)	.027	.013							
Ν	52	52							
Real word Spelling /2	<u>0</u>								
R			.961*		.696**				
Sig. (2-tailed)			.039		.008				
N			4		13				
Pseudo word Spelling	1/10								
R ⁴					.561*				
Sig. (2-tailed)					.046				
N					13				

<u>Note.</u> In 1999 there were 2 measures of pseudo word reading: Coltheart nonword reading (cnw) and the Woodcock Word Attack Subtest from the Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests-Revised (1987) (wwa). Nonsignificant correlations with Letter Identification and Buttercup Measures were omitted from the table.

- = no pseudoword measure was administered this year.

APPENDIX D

	L1 NA	ESL NA
96	1.93	1.7
97	6.51	5.63
98	13.67	11.19
N 96	69	50
N 97	55	43
N 98	42	37



	L1 NA	ESL NA
96	73.92	76.61
97	63.97	67.88
98	49.48	50.16
99	43.05	41.76
N 96	68	49
N 97	55	43
N 98	42	37
N 99	17	17



Jk longitudinal graph

	L1 Na	ESL Na
96	8.96	9.13
97	8.39	8.03
98	7.09	7.34
N 96	68	50
N 97	54	43
N 98	32	32



	L1 Na	ESL Na
96	5.68	5.3
97	10.2	9.07
98	13.93	13.59
N 96	69	50
N 97	55	43
N 98	42	37



100

-

Jk longitudinal graph

	L1 Na	ESL Na
96	38.45	36.88
97	47.24	43.81
98	48.6	47.7
N 96	69	50
N 97	55	43
N 98	42	37



	L1 Na	ESL Na
96	58.25	54.8
97	73.2	62.95
98	67.02	62.95
N 96	69	50
N 97	55	43
N 98	42	37



Jk longitudinal graph
	L1 Na	ESL Na
96	2.61	2.32
97	5.78	7.02
98	11.19	11.05
N 96	69	50
N 97	55	43
N 98	[.] 42	37



1	L1 Na	ESL Na
96	4.57	3.52
97	6.47	5.63
98	9.33	8.62
N 96	69	50
N 97	55	43
N 98	42	37



	L1 Na	ESL Na
96	11.94	11.2
97	19.96	20.45
98	25.36	25.3
N 96	69	50
N 97	55	42
N 98	42	37



	L1 Na	ESL Na
96	42.61	34.46
97	56.73	52.33
98	70.48	66.22
99	85	82.89
N 96	69	49
N 97	55	43
N 98	42	37
N 99	19	19



	L1 Na	ESL Na
96	8.8	8.34
97	15.11	14.72
98	23.17	22.84
99	29	27.11
N 96	70	50
N 97	55	43
N 98	42	37
N 99	19	19



	L1 Na	ESL Na
96	50.53	48.06
97	62.74	62.86
98	59.43	63.9
99	53.58	43.89
N 96	70	50
N 97	55	43
N 98	42	37
N 99	19	19



	L1 Na	ESL Na	L1 Rd	ESL Rd
96	6.17	4.16	2.67	0
97	13.08	12.88	8.57	9
98	15.62	15.61	13.5	13.57
N⊢96	58	43	9	8
N . 97	50	42	7	7
N 98	42	41	6	7



	L1 Na	ESL Na	L1 Rd	ESL Rd
97	10.1	8.76	5.71	6.14
98	13.79	14.4	10.67	11.57
N 97	48	42	7	7
N 98	43	40	6	7



	L1 Na	ESL Na	L1 Rd	ESL Rd
96	60.34	59.58	60.23	73.4
97	50.16	49.4	65.57	50.43
98	42.49	39.99	57.29	46.43
N 96	58	42	9	8
N 97	50	42	7	7
N 98	43	41	6	7



	ESL Na	L1 Rd	ESL Rd
96	7.91	7.29	8.08
97	7.08	7.58	7.18
98	6.58	6.59	6.07
N 96	43	9	8
N 97	41	7	7
N 98	33	6	5
	•		



			L1 Na	ESL Na	L1 Rd	ESL Rd
		96	9.69	9.3	5.11	6.38
		97	13.4	13.19	11	12.86
		98	14.79	14.77	14.33	14.43
N	96		58	43	9	8
N	97		50	42	7	7
N	98		42	40	. 6	7



	L1	NA	ESL NA	L1 RD	ESL RD
9	6	45.07	43.88	30.44	39.25
9	7	50.22	50.17	47.43	48.43
9	8	51.24	50.4	47.33	48.86
N 9	6	58	43	9	8
N 9	7	50	42	7	7
N 9	8	42	40	6	7
	•				



	L1 Na	ESL Na	L1 Rd	ESL RD
96	63.21	61.49	28.78	48.38
97	76.76	76.9	62.43	67.14
98	74.79	65.9	48.67	53.57
N 96	58	43	9	8
N 97	50	42	7	7
N 98	42	40	6	7



			L1 Na	ESL Na	L1 Rd	ESL	Rd
		97	7.27	6.29		5	4.43
		98	10.7	10.47	8	.2	7.71
N	97		48	42		7	7
Ν	98		43	40		5	7



	L1 NA	ESL NA	L1 RD	ESL RD
96	4.97	3.35	1.78	0.38
97	10.58	10.69	5.57	5.29
98	13.83	14.48	11	9.71
N 96	58	43	9	8
N 97	50	42	7	7
N 98	42	40	6	7



	L1 NA	ESL NA	L1 RD	ESL RD
96	6.66	4.65	4.89	2.5
97	9	7.93	5.71	4.29
98	9.64	9.88	9	8.57
N 96	58	43	9	8
N 97	50	42	7	7
N 98	42	40	6	7
	•			



	L1 NA	ESL NA	L1 RD	ESL RD
97	9	8.1	2.86	3.86
98	15.81	16.28	10.5	13.14
N 97 N 98	48 42	42 40	7 6	7 7



			L1 NA	ESL NA	L1 RD	ESL RD
		97	3.44	3.31	1.86	2.43
		98	5.26	4.83	3.8	3.17
Ν	97		48	42	7	7
Ν	98		38	35	5	6
			•			



	L1 NA	ESL NA	L1 RD	ESL RD
96	21.31	21.23	11.11	6.38
97	24.94	25.29	21.29	25.29
98	25.86	25.85	25.83	25.71
N 96	58	43	9	8
N 97	50	42	7	7
N 98	42	40	6	7



	1	L1 NA	ESL NA	L1 RD	ESL RD
	97	2.33	1.79	2.29	1.29
	98	3.83	3.65	3	3.14
	99	4.61	4.31	5.2	5
N	97	48	42	7	7
Ν	98	42	40	6	7
Ν	99	31	29	5	4
		-			



	Ľ	1 NA	ESL NA	L1 RD	ESL RD
9	6	51.33	42.19	39.05	38.57
9	7	70.9	61.43	62.86	57.14
9	8	80.71	77.63	72.5	67.14
9	9	77.33	75.05	72	62.86
N 9	6	58	43	9	8
N 9	7	50	42	7	7
N 9	8	42	40	6	7
N 9	9	31	30	5	4



	L1 NA	ESL NA	L1 RD	ESL RD
96	14.98	14.73	5.33	6.5
97	24.02	22.69	16.57	19.14
98	28.74	28.24	23	24.86
99	32.03	32.27	26.8	25.75
N 96	58	44	9	8
N 97	50	42	7	7
N 98	43	41	6	7
N 99	31	30	5	4



	L1 NA	ESL NA	L1 RD	ESL RD
96	66.41	65.64	10.78	12.62
97	73.58	70.74	35.71	44.86
98	59.88	55.8	23.5	31.43
99	57.03	57.77	23	18.25
N 96	58	44	9	8
N 97	50	42	7	7
N 98	43	41	6	7
N 99	31	30	5	4



	L1 NA	ESL NA	L1 RD	ESL RD
97	48.13	41.74	22.86	24.67
98	65.77	64.44	48	58.43
N 97	48	42	7	6
N 98	43	41	6	7



	L1	NA	ESL NA	L1 RD	ESL RD
ę	97	27.64	25.62	13.57	17.43
ę	98	36.55	35.9	24.67	31.29
N S	97	47	42	7	7
N S	98	42	40	6	7
	-				



L1 NA	ESL Na	L1 Rd	ESL Rd
33.78	28.79	12.86	12.71
59.12	57.95	30	37.57
50	42	7	7
42	40	6	7
	L1 NA 33.78 59.12 50 42	L1 NA ESL Na 33.78 28.79 59.12 57.95 50 42 42 40	L1 NA ESL Na L1 Rd 33.78 28.79 12.86 59.12 57.95 30 50 42 7 42 40 6



	L1 NA	ESL NA
96	93.85	93.26
97	96.38	98.61
98	99.54	99.7
N 96	53	47
N 97	23	16
N 98	36	37



	L1 NA	ESL NA
96	12.58	12.04
97	15.15	15.21
98	15.67	15.86
N 96	53	47
N 97	47	39
N 98	36	37



	L1 NA	ESL NA
96	10.87	9.4
97	13.32	12.73
98	15.75	16.05
N 96	53	47
N 97	34	26
N 98	36	37



	L1 NA	ESL NA
97	24.29	26.06
98	30.92	30.86
99	32.71	31.74
N 97	41	33
N 98	36	37
N 99	21	19



	L1 NA	ESL NA
96	50.43	46.87
97	42.98	40
98	38.29	36.23
· N 96	53	47
N 97	47	39
N 98	36	37



	L1 NA	ESL NA
96	6.98	7.65
97	6.41	6.89
98	5.8	5.77
N 96	52	47
N 97	47	39
N 98	36	37
	•	



		L1 NA	ESL NA
	97	13.32	13.51
	98	14.36	14.49
Ν	97	47	39
Ν	98	36	37



		L1 NA	ESL NA
	96	50.11	47.64
	97	51.91	50.49
	98	52.08	51.86
Ν	96	53	47
Ν	97	47	39
N	98	36	. 37
		1	



		L1 NA	ESL NA
ę	96	76.26	69.28
g	97	79.37	71.15
ç	98	75.67	74.97
NS	96	53	47
N 9	97	46	39
NS	98	36	37



	L1 NA	ESL NA
96	8.02	7.17
97	10.51	9.59
98	12.14	12
N 96	53	47
N 97	47	39
N 98	36	37



.

			L1 NA	ESL NA
		96	9.06	6.6
		97	11.28	11.15
		98	16.25	15.35
Ν	96		53	47
Ν	97		47	39
Ν	98		36	37
			•	



	L1 NA	ESL NA
96	8.53	7.51
97	9.55	9.44
98	9.92	9.97
N 96	53	47
N 97	47	39
N 98	36	37
	-	



1	L1 NA	ESL NA
97	16.6	16.62
98	19	18.7
N 97	47	39
N 98	36	37



	L1 NA	ESL NA
97	4.85	3.92
98	5.61	5.57
N 97	47	39
N 98	18	14



			L1 NA	ESL NA
		96	25.36	25.47
		97	25.83	25.54
		98	25.83	25.54
Ν	96		53	47
Ν	97		47	39
Ν	98		36	37
N	98		36	37



	L1 NA	ESL NA
96	2.04	1.78
97	3.53	3.26
98	5.58	4.76
99	6.81	5.68
N 96	53	46
N 97	47	39
N 98	36	37
N 99	21	19



			L1 NA	ESL NA
		96	58.06	54.16
		97	75.64	71.41
		98	84.31	85.14
_		99	77.42	77
N	96		53	47
Ν	97		47	39
Ν	98		36	37
Ν	99		21	19



			L1 NA	ESL NA
		96	25.43	24.04
		97	29.91	28.87
		98	34.68	33.11
		99	37.48	35.37
Ν	96		53	47
Ν	97		47	39
Ν	98		37	37
Ν	99		21	19



	L1 NA	ESL NA
96	75.62	72.91
97	66.15	61.47
98	71	66.03
99	71.29	61.53
N 96	53	47
N 97	47	39
N 98	37	37
N 99	21	19



	L1 NA	ESL NA
96	115.34	112.23
97	108.45	105.36
98	111.65	108.43
99	111.48	105.21
N 96	53	47
N 97	47	39
N 98	37	37
N 99	21	19



	L1 NA	ESL NA
G1 96	54.23	50.4
G2 97	66.26	66.15
G3 98	68.86	68.86
N 96	53	47
N 97	47	39
N 98	36	37



	L1 NA	ESL NA
G1 96	29.02	26.77
G2 97	35.81	34.72
G3 98	39.14	39.03
N 96	53	47
N 97	47	39
N 98	36	37
	•	



	L1 NA	ESL NA	
G1 96	41.3	34.68	
G2 97	65.26	59.72	
G3 98	77.11	74.68	
N 96	53	47	~
N 97	47	39	
N 98	36	37	



	Na&Rd	N
L1	1.93	63
ESL	1.7	50



	Na & Rd	N
L1	73.92	68
ESL	76.61	49



	Na & Rd	Ν
L1	38.45	68
ESL	36.88	50



	Na & Rd	N
L1	58.25	69
ESL	54.8	50



	Na&Rd	N
L1	2.61	69
ESL	2.32	50



	Na&Rd	N
L1	4.57	69
ESL	3.52	50



	Na & Rd	N
L1	13.83	69
ESL	10.48	50



	Na & Rd	N
L1	42.61	69
ESL	34.46	49



	Na & Rd	N
L1	8.83	70
ESL	8.34	50



	Na & Rd	N
L1	50.53	70
ESL	48.06	50

JK WRAT-3 Reading Subtest Mean %ile Scores					
55]
50	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	50.53			
45			48.06		
%ile score					
35	1				
-30					
25					ļ
Na & Rd					

. •

-.

	Rd & Na	N
L1	5.7	69
ESL	5.3	50



	Na & Rd	Ν
L1	11.94	69
ESL	11.2	50



•___

	NA	RD	Ν	Ν
L1	6.05	2.38	136	16
ESL	4.75	0.62	88	13



	NA	RD	N	Ν
L1	63.08	76.43	136	17
ESL	63.46	79.09	87	13



	NA	RD	Ν	Ν
L1	9.87	5.19	136	16
ESL	9.24	5.46	88	13



	NA	RD	N	Ν
L1	20.94	5.44	135	16
ESL	21.74	6.85	88	13



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	45.34	36.38	136	13
ESL	44.23	36.85	88	13



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	66.34	38.63	136	16
ESL	62.94	45.62	87	13



	NA	RD	N	Ν
L1	5.57	2.25	136	16
ESL	4.7	1.77	88	13



	NA	RD	N	Ν
L1	6.51	4.59	136	17
ESL	4.83	3.08	88	13



	NA	RD	N	Ν
L1	15.73	11.94	136	77
ESL	12.74	11.08	88	13



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	46.57	35.8	136	17
ESL	37.89	35.93	88	13


	NA	RD	N	Ν
L1	15.34	4.82	136	17
ESL	15.59	6.54	88	13



	NA	RD	N	Ν
L1	64.76	10.12	136	17
ESL	70.22	12.31	88	13



	NA	RD	N	Ν
L1	97.63	91.57	188	18
RD	96.82	93.01	144	13



	NA	RD	N	Ν
L1	94.78	81.48	188	18
RD	93.4	83.05	144	13



	NA	RD	N	Ν
L1	12.79	7.61	188	18
ESL	12.47	5.77	144	13



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	9.73	4.61	188	18
ESL	9.23	4.46	144	13



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	51.75	60.11	188	18
ESL	46.94	57.54	144	13



1	NA	RD	N	Ν
L1	13.1	11.11	188	18
ESL	13.15	10.46	144	13



G1 Bar Graph

	NA	RD	N	N
L1	49.22	44.64	188	18
ESL	48.64	43.92	144	13



	NA	RD	N	Ν
L1	71.46	50.83	188	18
ESL	70.29	40.46	144	13



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	111.53	83.33	188	18
ESL	111.58	88	144	13



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	33.74	9.39	188	18
ESL	32.89	10.31	144	13



G1 Bar Graph

	NA	RD	Ν	Ν
L1	23.88	15	188	18
ESL	23.65	17.62	144	13



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	70.51	15.33	188	18
ESL	72.53	21.23	144	13



.

	NA	RD	N	N
L1	2.23	1.44	188	18
ESL	2.03	1.46	142	13



	NA	RD	N	Ν
L1	65.6	57.46	188	18
ESL	61.01	60.71	144	13



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	8.62	2.07	150	15
ESL	9.44	2.25	101	8



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	3.27	1.27	143	15
ESL	3.09	1.29	94	7



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	9.78	5.83	188	18
ESL	9.19	6.23	144	13



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	8.81	6.06	188	18
ESL	7.9	6.46	144	13



	NA	RD	Ν	N
L1	7.07	3.22	188	18
ESL	6.7	1.69	144	13



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	47.91	17.39	188	18
ESL	48.21	20.25	144	12



G1 Bar Graph

	NA	RD	N	Ν
L1	15.51	13.29	117	21
ESL	15.45	12.18	99	17



	NA	RD	N	Ν
L1	13.66	8.59	117	27
ESL	13.88	8.47	103	17



	NA	RD	Ν	N
L1	23.84	14.2	112	20
ESL	26.72	12.53	93	17



	NA	RD	Ν	N
L1	43.93	50.58	142	28
ESL	39.45	49.46	117	20

•



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	14.18	13.14	. 117	21
ESL	14.14	13.18	99	17



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	10.83	5.67	142	27
ESL	10.23	5.6	116	20



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	51.76	48.43	117	21
ESL	50.54	47.59	99	17



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	78.15	52.71	116	21
ESL	69.75	46.06	99	17



	NA	RD	N	Ν
L1	13.14	10.57	117	21
ESL	12.67	9.82	99	17



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	9.73	8.62	117	21
ESL	9.63	8.41	99	17



	NA	RD	Ν	Ν
L1	16.91	9.75	141	28
ESL	16.87	10.3	116	20



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	5.38	2.04	133	28
ESL	4.43	2.39	110	18



	NA	RD	Ν	N
L1	3.76	2.54	141	28
ESL	3.44	2.7	116	20



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	79.33	69.64	141	28
ESL	75.6	68.75	116	20



	NA	RD	N	Ν
L1	30.16	22	142	28
ESL	29.18	22.45	117	20



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	66.52	16	142	28
ESL	63.32	15.15	117	20



	NA	RD	N	Ν
L1	107.81	83.89	142	28
ESL	106.09	83.95	117	20



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	66.83	50.61	142	28
ESL	66.73	51.95	117	20



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	36.88	25.86	141	28
ESL	36.45	27.95	116	20



	NA	RD	N	N
[L1	63.38	28.57	117	21
ESL	61.93	29.88	99	17



	NA	N	
L1	15.47		51
ESL	15.9		50



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	29.07	14	103	11
ESL	30.49	18.4	67	10



	NA	N	
L1	38.95	51	
ESL	35.16	50	



	NA	Ν
L1	14.31	51
ESL	14.44	50



	NA	Ν
L1	27.19	52
ESL	27.94	16



	NA	N
L1	48.42	52
ESL	49.94	16



	NA	Ν
L1	11.9	51
ESL	12.04	50



	NA	N
L1	26.65	52
ESL	27.65	17



	NA	N	
L1	16.8	32	51
ESL	15.7	78	50



	NA	N
L1	13.78	51
ESL	14.47	17



	NA	N
L1	18.8	51
ESL	18.82	50



	NA	N
L1	6.15	33
ESL	6.05	19



	NA	N
L1	73.69	51
ESL	74.74	50



	NA	Ν
L1	35.48	52
ESL	36.19	16



	NA	N
L1	62.89	52
ESL	65.12	16



	NA	N
L1	59.75	52
ESL	63.06	16



	NA	N
L1	12.04	49
ESL	12.53	17



	NA	N	
L1		8.16	49
ESL		8.71	17



	NA	N
L1	28.98	49
ESL	30.18	17



	NA	N
L1	66.1	49
ESL	74.35	17

.



	NA	RD	N	Ν
L1	33.34	25.64	104	11
ESL	33.18	24.9	67	10



	NA	RD	Ν	N
L1	64.98	16.73	104	11
ESL	63.94	15.2	67	10



	NA	RD	Ν	N
L1	5.07	4.18	103	11
ESL	4.77	4.4	66	10



	NA	RD	N	N
L1	81.03	68.7	103	11
ESL	81.76	70.79	67	10



	NA	N
L1	26.9	49
ESL	29.94	17



	NA	N	
L1	30.88		52
ESL	31.44		16



	NA	N
L1	37.71	49
ESL	40.12	17



	NA	N
L1	53.76	49
ESL	54.88	16



	NA	N
L1	30.64	44
ESL	32.52	21



.

	NA	N
L1	14.52	42
ESL	14.67	21


	NA	N
L1	31.68	44
ESL	33.14	21



	NA	Ν
L1	56.5	44
ESL	62.14	21



	NA	n	
L1	14.33		42
ESL	13.48	3	21



	NA	n
L1	7.88	42
ESL	8.3	20



175

	NA	n
L1	30.6	42
ESL	30.76	21



	NA	n
L1	60.64	42
ESL	59.62	21



	NA	Ν
L1	5.61	44
ESL	5.29	21



	NA	N
L1	76.56	44
ESL	77.55	21



	NA	N
L1	37.11	44
ESL	35.76	21



	NA	Ν
L1	68.55	44
ESL	63.48	21



	NA	N
L1	73.79	43
ESL	71.33	21



	NA	Ν
L1	59.67	43
ESL	52.71	21



	NA	n
L1	39.59	44
ESL	39.05	21



	NA	n
L1	35.57	44
ESL	35.81	21



	NA	N
L1	37.76	42
ESL	39.1	21



	NA	N	
L1	4	14	42
ESL	46	.1	21



	NA	N
L1	29.95	42
ESL	30.9	21



	NA	N
L1	55.6	42
ESL	64.38	32.33

