

# What Works Clearinghouse



## English Language Learners

July 2010<sup>1</sup>

## Read Naturally<sup>®</sup>

### Program Description<sup>2</sup>

The *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> program is a supplemental reading program that aims to improve reading fluency, accuracy, and comprehension of students in elementary, middle, or high school or adults using a combination of texts, audio CDs, and computer software. The program uses one of four products that share a common fluency-building strategy: *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> *Masters Edition*, *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> *Encore*, *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> *Software Edition*, and *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> *Live*. The common strategy includes: modeling of story reading, repeated reading of text for developing oral reading fluency, and systematic monitoring of student progress

by teachers and the students themselves. Students work at their own reading level, progress through the program at their own rate, and work (for the most part) on an independent basis. The program can be delivered in three ways: (1) students use audio CDs with hard-copy reading materials (*Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> *Masters Edition*, *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> *Encore*), (2) students use the computer-based version (*Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> *Software Edition*) or (3) students use the web-based version (*Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> *Live*). This intervention report includes studies of *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> *Masters Edition*.

### Research<sup>3</sup>

One study of *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> that falls within the scope of the English Language Learners review protocol meets What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) evidence standards, and one study of a modified version of *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> meets WWC evidence standards with reservations. The two studies

included 99 English language learner students in second through fifth grades from eight elementary schools in two states.<sup>4</sup> In one study, the comparison group receives no treatment, and in the other the comparison group receives an alternative treatment.

1. On September 16, 2013, the WWC modified this report in response to an independent review by a quality review team. Based on the review, the WWC changed the Program Description, Additional Program Information, and Cost sections of this report. The WWC has not added studies to the evidence base, updated the literature search, changed any study ratings, or changed values presented in tables since the July 2010 report. The July 2010 report has been updated to include reviews of two studies that were not included in the earlier review of *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup>. Of these additional studies, one meets evidence standards, and one is within the scope of the protocol but does not meet evidence standards. One study that met standards with reservations in the earlier review (Denton, Anthony, Parker, & Hasbrouck, 2004) was re-reviewed and still meets standards with reservations. An additional study was located but has not been yet reviewed since it is a single case design. A complete list and disposition of all studies reviewed is provided in the references.
2. The descriptive information for this program was obtained from a publicly available source: the program's website (<http://www.readnaturally.com>, downloaded May 2013). The WWC requests distributors review the program description sections for accuracy from their perspective. The program description was provided to the distributor in September 2013, and the WWC incorporated feedback from the distributor. Further verification of the accuracy of the descriptive information for this program is beyond the scope of this review.
3. The literature search reflects documents publicly available by February 2009. The studies in this report were reviewed using WWC Evidence Standards, Version 2.0 (see the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Chapter III), as described in protocol Version 2.0.
4. The evidence presented in this report is based on available research. Findings and conclusions may change as new research becomes available.

## Research *(continued)*

Based on these two studies, the WWC considers the extent of evidence for *Read Naturally*® to be small for both reading achievement and English language development for English language learners. No studies that meet WWC evidence standards with or without reservations examined the effectiveness of *Read Naturally*® in mathematics achievement for English language learners.

## Effectiveness

*Read Naturally*® was found to have no discernible effects on reading achievement and English language development of elementary school English language learners.

	<i>Reading achievement</i>	<i>English language development</i>	<i>Mathematics achievement</i>
<b>Rating of effectiveness</b>	No discernible effects	No discernible effects	na
<b>Improvement index<sup>5</sup></b>	Average: +1 percentile point Range: -6 to +6 percentile points	Average: +9 percentile points Range: +6 to +14 percentile points	na na

na = not applicable

## Additional program information

### Background

Developed by Candyce Ihnot, the four *Read Naturally*® products are distributed by Read Naturally, Inc. Address: 2945 Lone Oak Drive, Suite #190, Saint Paul, MN 55121. Email: info@readnaturally.com. Web: <http://www.readnaturally.com>. Telephone: (651) 452-4085 or (800) 788-4085. Fax: (651) 452-9204.

### Scope of use

The program was launched in 1991. It can be used with mainstream, special education, Title I, and English language learner students of all ages throughout the United States.

### Program details

The *Read Naturally*® program can be implemented using one of four products: *Read Naturally*® *Masters Edition*, *Read Naturally*® *Encore*, *Read Naturally*® *Software Edition*, and *Read Naturally*® *Live*. These products share a common fluency-building strategy and are designed to supplement a school's core language arts instruction. The program aims to improve fluency, accuracy, and comprehension by increasing the time students spend reading and can be used during class time as a pull-out intervention

during the school day or as part of an after-school program. The core strategy in all *Read Naturally*® products includes:

- (I) *Modeling of story reading*. Students listen to, and read along with, a recording of a fluent reader reading a story to help students model correct pronunciation, rate, and expression.
- (II) *Repeated reading of text to develop oral reading fluency*. Students engage in 1-minute practice readings to build their mastery of the passage. Once students feel they can achieve their reading speed goal, they alert the teacher. The teacher then conducts a "pass timing" during which students are evaluated against four criteria: (1) student reaches goal rate, (2) student makes three or fewer errors, (3) passage is read with appropriate phrasing, and (4) comprehension questions are answered correctly. If students don't meet these criteria, they spend additional time practicing the reading of the passage, and then the teacher conducts the "pass timing" again.
- (III) *Progress monitoring*. Students graph their scores to track their progress from the initial reading to the final reading of each story. The graphs also show students' progress over successive stories. These tools aim to ensure teacher and student awareness of each student's progress.

5. These numbers show the average and range of student-level improvement indices for all findings across the studies.

The four *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> products differ in (1) their delivery mode, (2) the specific sequenced texts used, and (3) whether phonics instruction is included. *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> *Masters Edition* and *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> *Encore* use audio CDs in conjunction with hard-copy reading materials. *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> *Software Edition* and *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> *Live* are computer- or web-based, respectively. The particular texts vary by product, but all include a series of sequenced texts. *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> *Software Edition*, *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> *Encore*, and *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> *Live* also include instruction in phonics.

Each *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> product includes a teacher's manual that includes the rationale for the program, descriptions of materials needed to implement the program, instructions for

implementing the program, and lesson plans for introducing the program to students.

### Cost<sup>6</sup>

Individual *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> materials vary in price. Products using audio CDs (*Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> *Masters Edition* or *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> *Encore*) cost \$129 per set. *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> *Software Edition* costs \$125 per reading level for one computer and \$399 per level for a school network version. *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> *Live*, the online software version, is priced per seat, ranging from \$149 for one seat to \$1,999 for 130 seats. Teacher training is available at an additional cost. Additional materials, including timers, posters, glossaries, crossword puzzles, and assessment materials, are also available.

## Research

Three studies reviewed by the WWC investigated the effects of *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> on English language learners. One study (Kemp, 2006) was a randomized controlled trial that meets WWC evidence standards. One study (Denton, Anthony, Parker, & Hasbrouck, 2004) was a quasi-experimental design that meets WWC evidence standards with reservations. The remaining study did not meet WWC evidence standards.

### Meets evidence standards

Kemp (2006) randomly assigned third-grade English language learner students from three elementary schools to either a treatment group that was exposed to *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> or to a control group that was not. During the months of October through January, 20 students in the treatment group participated in the *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> program for four weekly sessions of 20 minutes each, and 19 students in the comparison group received scaffolded sustained silent reading (SSSR) for the same amount of time.

### Meets evidence standards with reservations

Denton, Anthony, Parker, and Hasbrouck (2004) examined the effects of a modified version of *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> on the reading achievement of 60 English language learners enrolled in 17 bilingual classrooms in five elementary schools.<sup>7</sup> Although there was random assignment of students to treatment and control groups, three students assigned to the control group were reassigned to the treatment group, and three students assigned to the treatment group were reassigned to the control group, one week after the study had begun (as requested by one of the schools in the study). Therefore, the study is treated as a quasi-experimental design that meets WWC evidence standards with reservations. Thirty-two students in the *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> intervention group received English language pull-out tutoring during the school day in addition to their regular English instruction. Twenty-eight students in the comparison group received regular classroom instruction.

6. Updated cost information retrieved from <http://www.readnaturally.com> in August 2013.

7. The standard *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> program was modified for use with English language learners by adding and extending activities related to vocabulary, decoding, and comprehension, such as oral discussions of vocabulary and comprehension and preteaching important or challenging vocabulary in reading passages.

**Extent of evidence**

The WWC categorizes the extent of evidence in each domain as small or medium to large (see the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix G). The extent of evidence takes into account the number of studies and the total sample size across the studies that meet WWC evidence standards with or without reservations.<sup>8</sup>

The WWC considers the extent of evidence for *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> to be small for both reading achievement and English language development for English language learners. No studies that meet WWC evidence standards with or without reservations examined the effectiveness of *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> in mathematics achievement for English language learners.

**Effectiveness Findings**

The WWC review of interventions for English language learners addresses student outcomes in three domains: reading achievement, English language development, and mathematics achievement. The studies included in this report cover only two domains: reading achievement and English language development. The findings below present the authors' estimates and WWC-calculated estimates of the size and the statistical significance of the effects of *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> on English language learner students.<sup>9</sup>

*Reading achievement.* Kemp (2006) analyzed five reading achievement outcomes (Test of Word Reading Efficiency [TOWRE] Sight Word Efficiency and Phonetic Decoding Efficiency subtests, Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills [DIBELS] Oral Reading Fluency subtest, and the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test Comprehension and Vocabulary subtests) for third-grade students. The author reported no statistically significant effects on the five reading achievement outcomes. With adjustment for multiple comparisons, the WWC confirmed the effects were not significant. The WWC also found that the combined effect for reading achievement across all measures was not statistically significant, nor was it large enough to be considered substantively important.

Denton et al. (2004) analyzed three reading achievement outcomes (Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests–Revised [WRMTR]: Word Attack, Word Identification, and Passage Comprehension subtests) for English language learner students in second through fifth grades. The outcomes of the *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> group were compared against the comparison group. The authors reported no statistically significant effects on the three reading achievement outcomes. With adjustment for multiple comparisons, the WWC confirmed the effects were not significant. The WWC also found that the combined effect for reading achievement across all measures was not statistically significant, nor was it large enough to be considered substantively important.

*English language development.* Kemp (2006) found no statistically significant effects of *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> when compared to the comparison group on the Orthographic Choice test and the Morphological Awareness Test (both the Written and Oral/Written versions). With adjustment for multiple comparisons, the WWC confirmed the effects were not significant. The WWC also found that the combined effect for English language development across all measures was not statistically significant, nor was it large enough to be considered substantively important.

8. The extent of evidence categorization was developed to tell readers how much evidence was used to determine the intervention rating, focusing on the number and size of studies. Additional factors associated with a related concept—external validity, such as the students' demographics and the types of settings in which studies took place—are not taken into account for the categorization. Information about how the extent of evidence rating was determined for *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> is in Appendix A5.
9. The level of statistical significance was reported by the study authors or, when necessary, calculated by the WWC to correct for clustering within classrooms or schools and for multiple comparisons. For the formulas the WWC used to calculate the statistical significance, see WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix C for clustering and WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix D for multiple comparisons. For the *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> studies summarized here, no corrections for clustering were needed, but corrections for multiple comparisons were applied.

**The WWC found *Read Naturally*® to have no discernible effects for reading achievement and English language development for English language learners**

**Rating of effectiveness**

The WWC rates the effects of an intervention in a given outcome domain as positive, potentially positive, mixed, no discernible effects, potentially negative, or negative. The rating of effectiveness takes into account four factors: the quality of the

**Improvement index**

The WWC computes an improvement index for each individual finding. In addition, within each outcome domain, the WWC computes an average improvement index for each study and an average improvement index across studies (see WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix F). The improvement index represents the difference between the percentile rank of the average student in the intervention condition and the percentile rank of the average student in the comparison condition. Unlike the rating of effectiveness, the improvement index is entirely based on the size of the effect, regardless of the statistical significance of the effect, the study design, or the analysis. The improvement index can take on values between -50 and +50, with positive numbers denoting favorable results for the intervention group.

research design, the statistical significance of the findings, the size of the difference between participants in the intervention and the comparison conditions, and the consistency in findings across studies (see the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix E).

The average improvement index for reading achievement is +1 percentile point across the two studies, with a range of -6 to +6 percentile points across findings. The average improvement index for English language development is +9 percentile points across the study, with a range of +6 to +14 percentile points across findings.

**Summary**

The WWC reviewed three studies on *Read Naturally*® for English language learners.<sup>10</sup> One study meets WWC evidence standards; one study meets WWC evidence standards with reservations; the remaining study does not meet WWC evidence standards. Based on the two studies, the WWC found no discernible effects in reading achievement and English language development for English language learners. The conclusions presented in this report may change as new research emerges.

10. One single-case design study was identified but is not included in this review because the WWC does not yet have standards for reviewing single-case design studies.

## References **Meets WWC evidence standards**

Kemp, S. C. (2006). Teaching to *Read Naturally*: Examination of a fluency training program for third grade students (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Irvine and University of California, Los Angeles, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67(07A), 95-2447.

## **Meets WWC evidence standards with reservations**

Denton, C. A., Anthony, J. L., Parker, R., & Hasbrouck, J. E. (2004). Effects of two tutoring programs on the English reading development of Spanish-English bilingual students. *The Elementary School Journal*, 104(4), 289–305.

### **Additional source:**

Denton, C. A. (2000). *The efficacy of two English interventions in a bilingual education program*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, College Station.

## **Studies that fall outside the English Language Learners review protocol or do not meet WWC evidence standards**

Kamps, D., Abbott, M., Greenwood, C., Arreaga-Mayer, C., Wills, H., Longstaff, J., et al. (2007). Use of evidence-based, small-group reading instruction for English language learners in elementary grades: Secondary-tier intervention. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 30(3), 153–168. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the measures of effectiveness cannot be attributed solely to the intervention—the intervention was combined with another intervention.

## **Studies with disposition pending**

De la Colina, M. G. (1999). The effectiveness of repeated reading, teacher modeling, and self-monitoring for Spanish beginning readers (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60, 09A. The study is not included because it uses a design for which the WWC is currently developing standards.

# Appendix

## Appendix A1.1 Study characteristics: Kemp, 2006

Characteristic	Description
<b>Study citation</b>	Kemp, S. C. (2006). Teaching to <i>Read Naturally</i> : Examination of a fluency training program for third grade students (Doctorial dissertation, University of California, Irvine and University of California, Los Angeles, 2006). <i>Dissertation Abstracts International</i> , 67(07A), 95–2447.
<b>Participants</b>	A randomized controlled trial was used to examine the effects of <i>Read Naturally</i> ® on third-grade reading performance. A total of 42 English language learners, from three elementary schools across 13 classrooms, initially participated in the study. Students in each participating classroom were ranked by standardized tests of reading and then randomly assigned to either the <i>Read Naturally</i> ® intervention group or the scaffolded sustained silent reading (SSSR) comparison group. Of the 42 original students, 21 were assigned to the <i>Read Naturally</i> ® group and 21 were assigned to the SSSR group. Three students were excluded from the study because they were receiving special education services. The analysis sample consisted of 39 English language learners; 20 students in the intervention group, and 19 students in the comparison group.
<b>Setting</b>	The study was conducted in three schools in a suburban school district located in western Orange County, California. The intervention ( <i>Read Naturally</i> ®) and comparison (SSSR) conditions were implemented in each classroom.
<b>Intervention</b>	The <i>Read Naturally</i> ® <i>Masters Edition</i> program was implemented four days per week for 20 minutes a day during the months of October through January. <i>Read Naturally</i> ® consists of teaching modeling, repeated reading, and progress monitoring for the purpose of promoting fluency. Students are assigned to instructional level reading materials. When participating in the program, students (1) practice a “cold reading” of a self-selected passage from their assigned reading level, (2) practice reading the same passage three or four times with an audio recorded model, (3) practice reading independently until they reach their timed goal, and (4) meet with the classroom teacher so a timed reading sample can be documented.
<b>Comparison</b>	Students in the comparison condition participated in scaffolded sustained silent reading (SSSR), which involved teaching students to select materials at their individual reading level. Students then engaged in independent, silent reading. Teachers did not provide significant feedback; they walked around the room and monitored whether or not students were documenting the number of pages they read. As in the case of <i>Read Naturally</i> ®, use of SSSR occurred from October through January, four days a week, for 20 minutes each day.
<b>Primary outcomes and measurement<sup>1</sup></b>	Study measures in the reading achievement domain included the Test of Oral Word Reading Efficiency (TOWRE) Sight Word and Phonemic Decoding Efficiency subtests; the Dynamic Indicator of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) Oral Reading Fluency subtest; the Stanford Diagnostic Reading test, 4th Edition, Vocabulary and Comprehension subtests; the Orthographic Choice test; and the Morphological Relatedness Test (MRT), Written and Oral/Written versions. All measures were administered at pre- and post-test. (For a more detailed description of these outcome measures, see Appendices A2.1–A2.2.)
<b>Staff/teacher training</b>	Thirteen general education teachers received training on both the <i>Read Naturally</i> ® program and the use of SSSR. No additional details were provided.

1. The Bear Spelling Inventory, the Title Recognition test, and the Rosner Auditory Analysis test were also administered but not included in the review because they were not eligible outcomes as determined by the English Language Learners protocol.

## Appendix A1.2 Study characteristics: Denton, Anthony, Parker, & Hasbrouck, 2004

Characteristic	Description
<b>Study citation</b>	Denton, C. A., Anthony, J. L., Parker, R., & Hasbrouck, J. E. (2004). Effects of two tutoring programs on the English reading development of Spanish-English bilingual students. <i>The Elementary School Journal</i> , 104(4), 289–305.
<b>Participants</b>	The study included a group of 93 students between second and fifth grade who were bilingual with Spanish as their native language, were recommended by their teacher for tutoring, and had standardized assessments suggesting they had adequate oral English proficiency and basic proficiency in reading Spanish. The students were enrolled in 17 bilingual classrooms in five schools. Students' ages ranged from 7 to 12 years with a mean age of 9 years; 48 were males and 45 were females. Students were assigned to one of two reading ability groups based on their scores on the Word Attack subtest of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests–Revised (WRMT-R). Students with scores below first grade equivalency were assigned to the “emergent” decoding group ( <i>Read Well</i> ), and those with scores above first grade equivalency were in the “established” decoding group ( <i>Read Naturally</i> <sup>®</sup> ). Within each of these groups, students were matched on pretest scores and randomly assigned to either the treatment or comparison group. A total of 63 students were initially assigned in the <i>Read Naturally</i> <sup>®</sup> study (32 in the treatment group and 31 in the control group). Three students originally assigned to the control group participated in the treatment and were ultimately dropped from the study. Additionally, three students originally assigned to the treatment group were moved to the comparison group one week after the study had begun (as requested by one of the participating schools). As a result of these changes, the study was treated as a quasi-experimental design that meets WWC evidence standards with reservations. The <i>Read Naturally</i> <sup>®</sup> analysis sample consisted of 60 students (32 treatment and 28 comparison).
<b>Setting</b>	The study took place as a pull-out tutoring program in five elementary schools in a central Texas district. During the school year, the district served a population of 43.1% Hispanic students; 56.2% of children in the district were identified as economically disadvantaged; 9% had limited English proficiency; and 7.3% were served by a bilingual or ESL program.
<b>Intervention</b>	The intervention occurred during pull-out tutoring sessions during the school day when the participants were not receiving their English instruction. Students in the <i>Read Naturally</i> <sup>®</sup> <i>Masters Edition</i> group were tutored three times per week for 40-minute periods over 10 weeks. The sessions consisted of repeated oral reading of connected text, vocabulary and comprehension instruction, and systematic monitoring of progress in the program. The standard <i>Read Naturally</i> <sup>®</sup> <i>Masters Edition</i> program was modified for use with English language learners by adding and extending activities related to vocabulary, decoding, and comprehension (such as oral discussions of vocabulary and comprehension and preteaching important or challenging vocabulary in reading passages).
<b>Comparison</b>	The comparison condition received the same regular education curriculum as the treatment group but did not receive any additional tutoring beyond what would have been part of the schools' business-as-usual approach.
<b>Primary outcomes and measurement<sup>1</sup></b>	The study measures in the reading achievement domain included three subtests of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test–Revised: Word Attack, Word Identification, and Passage Comprehension. (For a more detailed description of these outcome measures, see Appendices A2.1–A2.2.)
<b>Staff/teacher training</b>	Tutors were 23 undergraduate students enrolled in a class in teaching students with difficulties. Tutors received training in the implementation of both the <i>Read Naturally</i> <sup>®</sup> and <i>Read Well</i> programs as part of their course instruction. They were supervised by a graduate student experienced in <i>Read Naturally</i> <sup>®</sup> .

1. The measures in the reading achievement domain also included a researcher-developed oral reading assessment, but it was not included in the study because of unreliable administration and missing data (Denton et al., 2004).

## Appendix A2.1 Outcome measures for the reading achievement domain

Outcome measure	Description
<b>Test of Oral Word Reading Efficiency (TOWRE) Sight Word Efficiency (SWE) subtest</b>	The TOWRE assessment is a nationally normed, age-based measure of word reading accuracy and fluency. The SWE subtest assessed the number of real printed words that could be accurately identified within 45 seconds (as cited by Kemp, 2006).
<b>Test of Oral Word Reading Efficiency (TOWRE) Phonemic Decoding Efficiency (PDE) subtest</b>	The TOWRE assessment is a nationally normed, age-based measure of word reading accuracy and fluency. The PDE subtest measured the number of pronounceable printed non-words that could be accurately decoded within 45 seconds (as cited by Kemp, 2006).
<b>Dynamic Indicator of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) Oral Reading Fluency subtest</b>	The DIBELS assessment is specifically designed to assess fluency with connected text. The Oral Reading Fluency subtest had students read an unfamiliar passage of grade-level material for one minute. Three passages were given. For each passage, the number of words read correctly in one minute was recorded. The final score was the middle score obtained from the three passages (as cited by Kemp, 2006).
<b>The Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test, 4th Edition–Comprehension subtest</b>	The Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test is a nationally norm-referenced test of reading comprehension. It provides criterion-referenced information to help teachers with instructional planning. The comprehension subtest was administered to the whole class, and raw scores and percentile scores were obtained (as cited by Kemp, 2006).
<b>The Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test, 4th Edition–Vocabulary subtest</b>	The Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test is a nationally norm-referenced test of reading comprehension. It provides criterion-referenced information to help teachers with instructional planning. The vocabulary subtest was administered to the whole class, and raw scores and percentile scores were obtained (as cited by Kemp, 2006).
<b>Woodcock Reading Mastery Test–Revised (WRMT-R) Word Attack subtest</b>	Word Attack assesses phonemic decoding and involves reading a list of nonwords (as cited by Denton, Anthony, Parker, & Hasbrouck, 2004).
<b>Woodcock Reading Mastery Test–Revised (WRMT-R) Word Identification subtest</b>	Word Identification is a measure of decoding. Students were asked to read words in a list format (as cited by Denton, Anthony, Parker, & Hasbrouck, 2004).
<b>Woodcock Reading Mastery Test–Revised (WRMT-R) Passage Comprehension subtest</b>	Passage Comprehension is a test of reading comprehension in which students are asked to read a brief passage that has a word omitted and to supply the target word or an acceptable alternative (as cited by Denton, Anthony, Parker, & Hasbrouck, 2004).

## Appendix A2.2 Outcome measures for the English language development domain

Outcome measure	Description
<b>Orthographic Choice test</b>	The Orthographic Choice test measured orthographic awareness by presenting 17 pairs of pronounceable pseudowords. One pseudoword of each pair contained a letter pair that never occurs in English in the initial or final position, and the other word contained an orthographically appropriate letter pair in the same position (e.g., filv, filk). The students were asked, “You are going to see pairs of letter strings that are not words. One of them looks more like a word than the other. I want you to circle the word that looks more like a word than the other. Which one has spelling that is more like a word?” The maximum score of this task was 17 (as cited by Kemp, 2006).
<b>The Morphological Relatedness Test (MRT)–Written version</b>	The MRT assessment consisted of 40 items divided equally between the Written and the Oral/Written versions. Students determined whether or not the second word in each pair was derived from the first word and circled either “yes” or “no” after each pair. In the Written version, students silently read the items before marking their answers. The items included in this assessment were pairs of words adopted from Mahony (1993) and some additional pairs that Mann (2000) created. Each version of the test contained 15 related pairs and five unrelated pairs or foils. The maximum score of both versions of the MRT was 20 (as cited by Kemp, 2006).
<b>The Morphological Relatedness Test (MRT)–Oral/Written version</b>	The MRT assessment consisted of 40 items divided equally between the Written and the Oral/Written versions. Students determined whether or not the second word in each pair was derived from the first word and circled either “yes” or “no” after each pair. In the Oral/Written version, the experimenter read each item aloud. The items included in this assessment were pairs of words adopted from Mahony (1993) and some additional pairs that Mann (2000) created. Each version of the test contained 15 related pairs and five unrelated pairs or foils. The maximum score of both versions of the MRT was 20 (as cited by Kemp, 2006).

## Appendix A3.1 Summary of study findings included in the rating for the reading achievement domain<sup>1</sup>

Outcome measure	Study sample	Sample size (students)	Authors' findings from the study		WWC calculations			
			Mean outcome (standard deviation) <sup>2</sup>		Mean difference <sup>4</sup> ( <i>Read Naturally</i> <sup>®</sup> – comparison)	Effect size <sup>5</sup>	Statistical significance <sup>6</sup> (at $\alpha = 0.05$ )	Improvement index <sup>7</sup>
			<i>Read Naturally</i> <sup>®</sup> group <sup>3</sup>	Comparison group				
<b>Kemp, 2006<sup>8</sup></b>								
TOWRE Sight Word subtest	3rd grade	39	57.90 (12.15)	57.74 (10.27)	0.16	0.01	ns	+1
TOWRE Phonemic Decoding Efficiency subtest	3rd grade	39	29.15 (12.97)	27.58 (9.91)	1.57	0.13	ns	+5
DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency subtest	3rd grade	39	94.08 (32.00)	89.37 (27.92)	4.71	0.15	ns	+6
Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test Comprehension subtest	3rd grade	39	30.98 (6.29)	30.37 (6.44)	0.61	0.09	ns	+4
Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test Vocabulary subtest	3rd grade	39	29.10 (6.22)	28.63 (7.58)	0.47	0.07	ns	+3
<b>Average for reading achievement (Kemp, 2006)<sup>9</sup></b>						<b>0.09</b>	<b>ns</b>	<b>+4</b>
<b>Denton, Anthony, Parker, &amp; Hasbrouck, 2004<sup>8</sup></b>								
WRMT-R Word Identification subtest	2nd–5th grade	60	95.37 (11.65)	95.94 (9.65)	–0.57	–0.05	ns	–2
WRMT-R Word Attack subtest	2nd–5th grade	60	96.74 (9.37)	98.04 (9.00)	–1.30	–0.14	ns	–6
WRMT-R Passage Comprehension subtest	2nd–5th grade	60	90.45 (7.90)	89.28 (10.26)	1.17	0.13	ns	+5
<b>Average for reading achievement (Denton, Anthony, Parker, &amp; Hasbrouck, 2004)<sup>9</sup></b>						<b>–0.02</b>	<b>ns</b>	<b>–1</b>
<b>Domain average for reading achievement across all studies<sup>9</sup></b>						<b>0.04</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>+1</b>

ns = not statistically significant

na = not applicable

TOWRE = Test of Oral Word Reading Efficiency

DIBELS = Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills

WRMT-R = Woodcock Reading Mastery Test–Revised

1. This appendix reports findings considered for the effectiveness rating and the average improvement indices for the reading achievement domain.
2. The standard deviation across all students in each group shows how dispersed the participants' outcomes are: a smaller standard deviation on a given measure would indicate that participants had more similar outcomes.

(continued)

## Appendix A3.1 Summary of study findings included in the rating for the reading achievement domain<sup>1</sup> (continued)

3. The *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> group means for each of the five reading achievement outcomes reported by Kemp (2006) represent the posttest mean of the control group plus the mean difference calculated by the WWC using the difference-in-differences approach. The *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> group means for each of the three WRMT-R outcomes reported by Denton, Anthony, Parker, & Hasbrouck (2004) represent the adjusted posttest mean calculated using analysis of covariance results obtained by personal communication with the authors. These results were not included or referenced in Denton et al. (2004); those findings are based on the assumption that there were no problems with random assignment. However, students were moved between the treatment and comparison groups after the study began, and according to WWC standards, that resulted in this study being categorized as a quasi-experimental design rather than a randomized controlled trial. Baseline differences between the treatment and comparison groups were large enough to require statistical adjustment. Thus, the analysis of covariance results obtained from the author are presented.
4. Positive differences and effect sizes favor the intervention group; negative differences and effect sizes favor the comparison group. The mean difference for each of the five reading achievement outcomes reported by Kemp (2006) reflects the mean difference between treatment and control groups calculated by the WWC using the difference-in-differences approach. The mean difference for each of the three WRMT-R outcomes reported by Denton, Anthony, Parker, & Hasbrouck (2004) reflects the adjusted mean difference between treatment and control groups obtained from analysis of covariate results provided to the WWC by personal communication with the authors.
5. For an explanation of the effect size calculation, see WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix B. Effect sizes for the Kemp (2006) study are based on the difference-in-differences approach. Effect sizes for Denton et al. (2004) are based on results from a student-level ANCOVA.
6. Statistical significance is the probability that the difference between groups is a result of chance rather than a real difference between the groups.
7. The improvement index represents the difference between the percentile rank of the average student in the intervention condition and that of the average student in the comparison condition. The improvement index can take on values between -50 and +50, with positive numbers denoting favorable results for the intervention group.
8. The level of statistical significance was reported by the study authors or, when necessary, calculated by the WWC to correct for clustering within classrooms or schools and for multiple comparisons. For the formulas the WWC used to calculate the statistical significance, see WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix C for clustering and WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix D for multiple comparisons. For the *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> studies summarized here, no corrections for clustering were needed; however, multiple comparisons corrections were needed.
9. The WWC-computed average effect sizes for each study and for the domain across studies are simple averages rounded to two decimal places. The average improvement indices are calculated from the average effect sizes.

## Appendix A3.2 Summary of study findings included in the rating for the English language development domain<sup>1</sup>

Outcome measure	Study sample	Sample size (students)	Author's findings from the study		WWC calculations			
			Mean outcome (standard deviation) <sup>2</sup>		Mean difference <sup>4</sup> ( <i>Read Naturally</i> <sup>®</sup> – comparison)	Effect size <sup>5</sup>	Statistical significance <sup>6</sup> (at $\alpha = 0.05$ )	Improvement index <sup>7</sup>
			<i>Read Naturally</i> <sup>®</sup> group <sup>3</sup>	Comparison group				
<b>Kemp, 2006<sup>8</sup></b>								
Orthographic Choice test	3rd grade	39	13.17 (2.14)	12.84 (2.39)	0.33	0.14	ns	+6
MRT–Written	3rd grade	39	13.26 (3.03)	12.21 (2.51)	1.05	0.37	ns	+14
MRT–Oral/Written	3rd grade	39	13.13 (2.03)	12.68 (2.31)	0.45	0.20	ns	+8
<b>Domain average for English language development<sup>9</sup></b>						<b>0.24</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>+9</b>

ns = not statistically significant

na = not applicable

MRT = Morphological Relatedness Test

1. This appendix reports findings considered for the effectiveness rating and the average improvement indices for the English language development domain.
2. The standard deviation across all students in each group shows how dispersed the participants' outcomes are: a smaller standard deviation on a given measure would indicate that participants had more similar outcomes.
3. The *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> group means for each of the three English language development outcomes reported by Kemp (2006) were calculated as the posttest mean of the control group plus the mean difference calculated by the WWC using the difference-in-differences approach.
4. Positive differences and effect sizes favor the intervention group; negative differences and effect sizes favor the comparison group. The mean difference for each of the three English language development outcomes reported by Kemp (2006) reflects the mean difference between treatment and control groups calculated by the WWC using the difference-in-differences approach.
5. For an explanation of the effect size calculation, see WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix B.
6. Statistical significance is the probability that the difference between groups is a result of chance rather than a real difference between the groups.
7. The improvement index represents the difference between the percentile rank of the average student in the intervention condition and that of the average student in the comparison condition. The improvement index can take on values between –50 and +50, with positive numbers denoting favorable results for the intervention group.
8. The level of statistical significance was reported by the study authors or, when necessary, calculated by the WWC to correct for clustering within classrooms or schools and for multiple comparisons. For the formulas the WWC used to calculate the statistical significance, see WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix C for clustering and WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix D for multiple comparisons. For the *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> study summarized here, no corrections for clustering were needed; however, multiple comparisons corrections were needed.
9. This row provides the study average, which in this instance is also the domain average. The WWC-computed domain average effect size is a simple average rounded to two decimal places. The domain improvement index is calculated from the average effect size.

## Appendix A4.1 *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> rating for the reading achievement domain

The WWC rates an intervention's effects in a given outcome domain as positive, potentially positive, mixed, no discernible effects, potentially negative, or negative.<sup>1</sup> For the outcome domain of reading achievement, the WWC rated *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> as having no discernible effects for English language learners.

### Rating received

**No discernible effects:** No affirmative evidence of effects.

- Criterion 1: No studies showing a statistically significant or substantively important effect, either *positive* or *negative*.

**Met.** *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> has no studies showing statistically significant or substantively important effects for reading achievement.

### Other ratings considered

**Positive effects:** Strong evidence of a positive effect with no overriding contrary evidence.

- Criterion 1: Two or more studies showing statistically significant *positive* effects, at least one of which met WWC evidence standards for a *strong* design.

**Not met.** *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> has no studies showing statistically significant positive effects in reading achievement.

### AND

- Criterion 2: No studies showing statistically significant or substantively important *negative* effects.

**Met.** *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> has no studies showing statistically significant or substantively important negative effects in reading achievement.

**Potentially positive effects:** Evidence of a positive effect with no overriding contrary evidence.

- Criterion 1: At least one study showing a statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effect.

**Not met.** *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> does not have any studies showing a statistically significant or substantively important positive effect.

### AND

- Criterion 2: No studies showing a statistically significant or substantively important *negative* effect and fewer or the same number of studies showing *indeterminate* effects than showing statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effects.

**Not met.** *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> does not have any studies showing a statistically significant or substantively important negative effect, but there are two studies showing indeterminate effects, and none showing statistically significant or substantively important positive effects.

**Mixed effects:** Evidence of inconsistent effects as demonstrated through either of the following criteria.

- Criterion 1: At least one study showing a statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effect, and at least one study showing a statistically significant or substantively important *negative* effect, but no more such studies than the number showing a statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effect.

**Not met.** No study showing a statistically significant or substantively important effect, either positive or negative.

1. For rating purposes, the WWC considers the statistical significance of individual outcomes and the domain-level effect. The WWC also considers the size of the domain-level effect for ratings of potentially positive or potentially negative effects. For a complete description, see the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix E.

(continued)

**OR**

- Criterion 2: At least one study showing a statistically significant or substantively important effect, and more studies showing an *indeterminate* effect than showing a statistically significant or substantively important effect.

**Not met.** No studies showing a statistically significant or substantively important effect.

**Potentially negative effects:** Evidence of a negative effect with no overriding contrary evidence.

- Criterion 1: One study showing a statistically significant or substantively important *negative* effect and no studies showing a statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effect.

**Not met.** No studies showing a statistically significant or substantively important negative effect in reading achievement.

**OR**

- Criterion 2: Two or more studies showing statistically significant or substantively important *negative* effects, at least one study showing a statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effect, and more studies showing statistically significant or substantively important *negative* effects than showing statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effects.

**Not met.** No studies showing a statistically significant or substantively important negative effect in reading achievement.

**Negative effects:** Strong evidence of a negative effect with no overriding contrary evidence.

- Criterion 1. Two or more studies showing statistically significant *negative* effects, at least one of which met WWC evidence standards for a *strong* design.

**Not met.** No studies showing a statistically significant negative effect in reading achievement.

**AND**

- Criterion 2: No studies showing statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effects.

**Met.** No studies showing a statistically significant or substantively important positive effect in reading achievement.

## Appendix A4.2 *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> rating for the English language development domain

The WWC rates an intervention's effects in a given outcome domain as positive, potentially positive, mixed, no discernible effects, potentially negative, or negative.<sup>1</sup> For the outcome domain of English language development, the WWC rated *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> as having no discernible effects for English language learners.

### Rating received

**No discernible effects:** No affirmative evidence of effects.

- Criterion 1: No studies showing a statistically significant or substantively important effect, either *positive* or *negative*.

**Met.** *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> has no studies showing statistically significant or substantively important effects for English language development.

### Other ratings considered

**Positive effects:** Strong evidence of a positive effect with no overriding contrary evidence.

- Criterion 1: Two or more studies showing statistically significant *positive* effects, at least one of which met WWC evidence standards for a *strong* design.

**Not met.** *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> has no studies showing statistically significant positive effects in English language development.

### AND

- Criterion 2: No studies showing statistically significant or substantively important *negative* effects.

**Met.** *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> has no studies showing statistically significant or substantively important negative effects in English language development.

**Potentially positive effects:** Evidence of a positive effect with no overriding contrary evidence.

- Criterion 1: At least one study showing a statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effect.

**Not met.** *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> does not have any studies showing a statistically significant or substantively important positive effect.

### AND

- Criterion 2: No studies showing a statistically significant or substantively important *negative* effect and fewer or the same number of studies showing *indeterminate* effects than showing statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effects.

**Not met.** *Read Naturally*<sup>®</sup> does not have any studies showing a statistically significant or substantively important negative effect, there is only one study showing indeterminate effects, and no studies show statistically significant or substantively important positive effects.

**Mixed effects:** Evidence of inconsistent effects as demonstrated through either of the following criteria.

- Criterion 1: At least one study showing a statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effect, and at least one study showing a statistically significant or substantively important *negative* effect, but no more such studies than the number showing a statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effect.

**Not met.** No study showing a statistically significant or substantively important effect, either positive or negative.

1. For rating purposes, the WWC considers the statistical significance of individual outcomes and the domain-level effect. The WWC also considers the size of the domain-level effect for ratings of potentially positive or potentially negative effects. For a complete description, see the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix E.

(continued)

**OR**

- Criterion 2: At least one study showing a statistically significant or substantively important effect, and more studies showing an *indeterminate* effect than showing a statistically significant or substantively important effect.

**Not met.** No studies showing a statistically significant or substantively important effect.

**Potentially negative effects:** Evidence of a negative effect with no overriding contrary evidence.

- Criterion 1: One study showing a statistically significant or substantively important *negative* effect and no studies showing a statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effect.

**Not met.** No studies showing a statistically significant or substantively important negative effect in English language development.

**OR**

- Criterion 2: Two or more studies showing statistically significant or substantively important *negative* effects, at least one study showing a statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effect, and more studies showing statistically significant or substantively important *negative* effects than showing statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effects.

**Not met.** No studies showing a statistically significant or substantively important negative effect in English language development.

**Negative effects:** Strong evidence of a negative effect with no overriding contrary evidence.

- Criterion 1. Two or more studies showing statistically significant *negative* effects, at least one of which met WWC evidence standards for a *strong* design.

**Not met.** No studies showing a statistically significant negative effect in English language development.

**AND**

- Criterion 2: No studies showing statistically significant or substantively important *positive* effects.

**Met.** No studies showing a statistically significant or substantively important positive effect in English language development.

## Appendix A5 Extent of evidence by domain

Outcome domain	Number of studies	Sample size		Extent of evidence <sup>1</sup>
		Schools	Students	
Reading achievement	2	8	99	Small
English language development	1	3	39	Small
Mathematics achievement	0	na	na	na

na = not applicable/not studied

1. A rating of “medium to large” requires at least two studies and two schools across studies in one domain and a total sample size across studies of at least 350 students or, assuming 25 students in a class, at least 14 classrooms across studies. Otherwise, the rating is “small.” For more details on the extent of evidence categorization, see the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix G.