

What Works Clearinghouse



Sound Partners

Program Description¹ *Sound Partners* (Vadasy et al., 2004) is a phonics-based tutoring program that provides supplemental reading instruction to elementary school students grades K–3 with below average reading skills. The program is designed specifically for use by tutors with minimal training and experience. Instruction emphasizes letter-sound correspondences, phoneme blending, decoding and encoding phonetically regular words, and reading

irregular high-frequency words, with oral reading to practice applying phonics skills in text. The program consists of a set of scripted lessons in alphabetic and phonics skills and uses Bob Books® beginning reading series as one of the primary texts for oral reading practice. The tutoring can be provided as a pull-out or after-school program, as well as by parents who homeschool their children.

Research² Four studies of *Sound Partners* that fall within the scope of the Beginning Reading review protocol meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) evidence standards, and three studies meet WWC evidence standards with reservations. The seven studies included 442 students from kindergarten and first grade in urban schools in the Pacific Northwest and the Midwest.³

Based on these seven studies, the WWC considers the extent of evidence for *Sound Partners* on beginning readers to be medium to large for alphabetics, fluency, and comprehension and small for general reading achievement.

1. The descriptive information for this program was obtained from publicly available sources: the program's website (<http://www.wri-edu.org/partners/sound-partners.htm>, downloaded August 2010) and from the seven studies included in this review. The WWC requests developers to review the program description sections for accuracy from their perspective. Further verification of the accuracy of the descriptive information for this program is beyond the scope of this review. The literature search reflects documents publicly available by November 2008.
2. The studies in this report were reviewed using WWC Evidence Standards, Version 1.0 (see the WWC Standards), as described in protocol Version 1.0.
3. The evidence presented in this report is based on available research. Findings and conclusions may change as new research becomes available.

Effectiveness *Sound Partners* was found to have positive effects on alphabetics, fluency, and comprehension and no discernible effects on general reading achievement on beginning readers.

	Alphabetics	Fluency	Comprehension	General reading achievement
Rating of effectiveness	Positive effects	Positive effects	Positive effects	No discernible effects
Improvement index⁴	Average: +21 percentile points Range: -6 to +39 percentile points	Average: +19 percentile points Range: +6 to +33 percentile points	Average: +21 percentile points Range: +11 to +27 percentile points	+9 percentile points

Additional program information

Developer and contact

Developed by The Washington Research Institute, *Sound Partners* is distributed by Sopris West Educational Services. Address: Patricia Vadasy, Ph.D., Director and Principal Investigator, The Reading Partners Group, Washington Research Institute, 150 Nickerson Street, Suite 305, Seattle, WA 98109. Email: partners@wri-edu.org. Web: <http://www.wri-edu.org/partners/>. Telephone: (206) 285-9317 x104.

Scope of use

In the Seattle School District, 20 schools were using *Sound Partners* as a supplemental intervention as of Fall 2008.

Teaching

The *Sound Partners* program is designed to be used for 30 minute sessions of one-to-one tutoring that take place four days per week throughout one school year. Each tutoring session includes from four to eight short activities, which change over the course of the intervention. Instruction emphasizes letter-sound correspondences, phoneme blending, decoding and encoding phonetically regular words, and reading irregular high-frequency words, with oral reading to practice applying phonics skills in text. The last 15 minutes of each tutoring session is allocated for oral reading practice in designated texts.

Tutors, who can be paraeducators or other adults, are trained to choose a reading method (independent reading, partner reading, or echo reading) that matches each student’s reading skills (with assistance available through the developer). In addition, tutors are trained to direct the students to apply previously taught word-level skills in their oral text reading. The texts used in the program are drawn primarily from the Bob Books® series of beginning reading texts, which are matched to the phonics skills so that they are considered “decodable.” In later lessons, additional primary-level trade books are used for oral reading practice. Although *Sound Partners* is scripted, instruction can be adjusted to an individual student’s needs. Finally, the *Sound Partners* program includes tests that can be given every 10 lessons to gauge student mastery.

Cost⁵

The *Sound Partners* Master Set costs \$231.49 and includes the Lesson Book (three copies), Implementation Manual, Tutor Handbook (three copies), and Sound Cards. Components of the Master Set can also be purchased separately. The Lesson Book and Tutor Handbook together cost \$78.49, two sets of Sound Cards cost \$16.49, and the Implementation Manual costs \$19.49. The Decodable Readers Set includes one copy of each storybook, including the Bob Books® series, and costs \$134.95.

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

5. Costs as of August 2010.

Research Eighteen studies reviewed by the WWC investigated the effects of *Sound Partners* on beginning readers. Four studies (Mooney, 2003; Vadasy & Sanders, 2008; Vadasy et al., 1997a; Vadasy, Sanders, & Peyton, 2006) are randomized controlled trials that meet WWC evidence standards. Three studies (Jenkins et al., 2004; Vadasy, Jenkins, & Pool, 2000; Vadasy, Sanders, & Peyton, 2005) are randomized controlled trials or quasi-experimental designs that meet WWC evidence standards with reservations. The remaining 11 studies do not meet either WWC evidence standards or eligibility screens.

Meets evidence standards

Mooney (2003) used an experimental design to examine the effects of *Sound Partners* on the reading skills of first-grade students in seven public elementary schools in Lincoln, Nebraska who were at risk of emotional and behavioral disorders. After students determined to be at risk for those disorders were identified, they were randomly assigned to either a treatment group that received *Sound Partners* tutoring or a control group that received a supplemental social adjustment intervention (*First Steps to Success*). Both groups also received regular classroom reading instruction. The intervention took place over a seven-month period (September to April) and involved 47 students, 28 in the treatment group and 19 in the control group.

Vadasy et al. (1997a) conducted a randomized controlled trial of 40 first-grade students from four schools in a large urban school district in Washington state. Students prescreened for low reading achievement were randomly assigned to either a treatment group or a control group. Treatment group students received after-school tutoring for 30 minutes per day, four days per week, for up to 23 weeks. Students in the control group received typical classroom instruction only.

Vadasy and Sanders (2008) conducted a randomized controlled trial with a sample of 86 kindergarten students from 13 urban public schools. Full-day kindergarten teachers in 13 urban public elementary schools were asked to identify students who would benefit from intensive additional reading instruction. Of the

referred students whose parents consented to their participation, 99 met eligibility criteria based on scoring below cutoff scores on standardized tests. Those students were then assigned through a stratified random process to one of three groups. Students in the first group received typical reading instruction plus one-on-one *Sound Partners* tutoring; those in the second group received the same instruction, but with tutoring in pairs of students rather than one-on-one; and those in the third group received typical instruction only. Tutoring for both treatment groups occurred in 30-minute sessions, four days per week, for 18 weeks. The WWC treats the two intervention groups as a single intervention group and pools the results for this report.

Vadasy, Sanders, and Peyton (2006) conducted a randomized controlled trial to examine impacts on the reading achievement of kindergarten students with reading difficulties. To determine eligibility for the study, the authors used standardized exams to assess the reading skill level of students who were identified by their teachers as being likely to benefit from additional reading instruction. Students with scores below a cutoff were randomly assigned either to receive *Sound Partners* in addition to normal instruction or to a control group that received normal instruction only. The final sample included 36 treatment and 31 control group students in nine schools. Treatment group students received *Sound Partners* tutoring 30 minutes per day, four days per week, for 18 weeks.

Meets evidence standards with reservations

Jenkins et al. (2004) conducted a quasi-experiment involving 99 first-grade students with reading difficulties from 11 public schools. Students who had previously been identified by teachers as being at risk for reading failure were screened for eligibility using standardized exams. Students' assignment to treatment or control groups was partially random and partially based on convenience. The authors state that treatment and control group children were drawn from similar classrooms in the same school district. Students in both groups received typical classroom reading instruction, with treatment group students also receiving

Research (continued)

supplemental reading tutoring for 30 minutes per day, four days per week, for 25 weeks.

Vadasy, Jenkins, and Pool (2000) conducted a randomized controlled trial that suffered from attrition problems and non-random replacement of students in both the experimental and comparison groups. The study involved 46 first-grade students from 11 classrooms in four urban elementary schools. These students, who received low scores on reading assessments, were randomly assigned to either an experimental group that was eligible to receive supplemental *Sound Partners* tutoring for 27 weeks or a comparison group that received regular classroom instruction only.

Vadasy, Sanders, and Peyton (2005) conducted a quasi-experimental study with 57 first-grade students in a large urban school district in the northwestern United States. Low-achieving students who had not repeated first grade were assigned to treatment or control groups based primarily on school of attendance, with students from six schools in the treatment group, all students from another five schools in the control group, and those from the final school split between the two groups. The sample originally contained 99 students, but substantial attrition occurred during the study. The researchers limited the treatment group sample to students deemed to have received a sufficient quantity and quality of the intervention. Those students were

matched to a subsample of the original control group students based on pretest characteristics. Treatment students were split into two groups receiving slightly different interventions, one receiving normal *Sound Partners* tutoring for the whole of the 30-minute sessions. The second group received *Sound Partners* phonics-based instruction for 15 to 20 minutes followed by oral text reading practice in decodable texts for the remaining 10 to 15 minutes. All treatment students received tutoring four days per week from October through May. Treatment group students also received the same typical classroom instruction as control group students. The WWC treats the two intervention groups as a single intervention group and pools the results for this report.

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.⁶

The WWC considers the extent of evidence for *Sound Partners* to be medium to large for alphabetics, fluency, and comprehension, and small for general reading achievement for beginning readers.

Effectiveness Findings

The WWC review of interventions for Beginning Reading addresses student outcomes in four domains: alphabetics, fluency, comprehension, and general reading achievement.

The studies included in this report cover all four domains. The findings below present the authors' estimates and WWC-calculated estimates of the size and the statistical significance of the effects of *Sound Partners* on beginning readers.

6. 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 *Sound Partners* is in Appendix A6.

Effectiveness *(continued)*

*Alphabetics.*⁷ Five studies showed positive and statistically significant effects in the alphabetics domain, two of which had strong designs. In addition, one study that did not find a statistically significant effect had an average effect size that was large enough to be considered substantively important according to WWC criteria.

Two studies examined outcomes in the phonemic awareness construct of the alphabetics domain. Vadasy et al. (1997a) reported no statistically significant effect for the outcome in the phonemic awareness construct (using the Yopp-Singer Segmentation Task), but the effect size was positive and large enough to be considered substantively important based on WWC criteria (that is, at least 0.25). Vadasy, Jenkins, and Pool (2000) reported, and the WWC confirmed, a positive and statistically significant effect on the Yopp-Singer Segmentation Task.

Three studies examined outcomes in the phonological awareness construct of the alphabetics domain. Mooney (2003) reported positive and statistically significant effects on the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) Phoneme Segmentation subtest. This effect was not statistically significant in WWC calculations. Vadasy and Sanders (2008) reported, and the WWC confirmed, positive and statistically significant effects on the Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processes (CTOPP) Phonological Awareness subtest. Vadasy, Sanders, and Peyton (2006) reported no statistically significant effects on two measures of phonological awareness (the CTOPP Phonological Awareness composite and the DIBELS Phoneme Segmentation subtest), but the effect sizes were both positive and large enough to be considered substantively important based on WWC criteria.

Two studies examined outcomes in the letter knowledge construct of the alphabetics domain. Vadasy and Sanders (2008) and Vadasy, Sanders, and Peyton (2006) reported no statistically significant effects on the DIBELS Letter Naming Fluency subtest. The effect sizes were not large enough to be considered substantively important according to WWC criteria in either case.

All seven studies examined outcomes in the phonics construct of the alphabetics domain:

Mooney (2003) reported a statistically significant positive effect on the DIBELS Nonsense Word Fluency subtest. This effect was not statistically significant in WWC calculations, but was large enough to be considered substantively important.

Vadasy et al. (1997a) reported no statistically significant effects on the Dolch Word Recognition, Pseudoword List; Woodcock-Johnson–Revised (WJ-R) Word Attack subtest; or the Wide Range Achievement Test–Revised (WRAT-R) Word Reading subtest; and a statistically significant positive effect on the Bryant Pseudoword Test, although the WWC was unable to verify the statistical significance.⁸ Effects on three of the five (the Bryant Pseudoword Test, Pseudoword List, and WRAT-R Word Reading subtest) were large enough to be considered substantively important according to WWC criteria.

Vadasy and Sanders (2008) reported, and the WWC confirmed, positive and statistically significant effects on the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test–Revised/Normative Update (WRMT-R/NU) composite (composed of the average of the Word Attack and Word Identification subtests). They reported no statistically significant effect on the Test of Word Reading Efficiency (TOWRE), but the effect was large enough to be considered substantively important according to WWC criteria.

7. 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 an explanation, see the WWC Tutorial on Mismatch. 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. In the cases of Vadasy and Sanders (2008), Vadasy et al. (1997a), Vadasy, Sanders, and Peyton (2006), Jenkins et al. (2004), and Vadasy, Jenkins, and Pool (2000), corrections for multiple comparisons were needed in the alphabetics domain, and in the case of Vadasy, Sanders, and Peyton (2005), corrections for clustering and multiple comparisons were needed, so significance levels may differ from those reported in the original studies. Mooney (2003) did not require adjustment for clustering or multiple comparisons. However, it is a randomized controlled trial that did not adjust for pretest differences. Thus, the means, effect sizes, improvement index, and statistical significance have been adjusted for pretest values using the difference-in-differences method. For an explanation of the difference-in-differences adjustment, see the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, Appendix B.
8. On the Bryant Pseudoword Test, Vadasy et al. (1997a) reported a p -value of less than 0.05 on a t -test of means adjusted for pretest scores. The WWC was unable to replicate that finding with the means and standard deviations reported in the paper.

Effectiveness *(continued)*

Vadasy, Sanders, and Peyton (2006) reported statistically significant positive effects on the DIBELS Nonsense Word Fluency subtest, TOWRE, and WRMT-R/NU Word Reading Accuracy subtest. However, only the WRMT-R/NU Word Reading Accuracy subtest was considered statistically significant after the WWC adjusted for multiple comparisons. For all three outcomes, the effect sizes were large enough to be considered substantively important according to WWC criteria.

Jenkins et al. (2004) reported, and the WWC confirmed, statistically significant effects on the Bryant Pseudoword Test, WRAT-R Reading subtest, and WRMT-R Word Attack subtest. The authors also reported positive and statistically significant impacts on the TOWRE Sight Word Efficiency subtest and the WRMT-R Word Identification subtest, but these impacts were not statistically significant after the WWC applied a correction for multiple comparisons. Effect sizes on both measures were large enough to be considered substantively important according to WWC criteria. The authors found no statistically significant effect on the TOWRE Phonemic Decoding subtest, but the effect size was large enough to be considered substantively important according to WWC criteria.

Vadasy, Jenkins, and Pool (2000) reported, and the WWC confirmed, positive and statistically significant effects on the Bryant Pseudoword Test, Dolch Word Recognition, Woodcock-Johnson Word Attack subtest, and WRAT-R Reading subtest.

Vadasy, Sanders, and Peyton (2005) reported, and the WWC confirmed, positive and statistically significant effects on three phonics outcomes: WRAT-R Reading, WRMT-R Word Attack, and WRMT-R Word Identification subtests. The authors reported no statistically significant effects on TOWRE Phonetic Decoding or Sight Word Efficiency subtests, but the effect sizes were large enough in both cases to be considered substantively important according to WWC criteria.

*Fluency.*⁹ All seven studies examined outcomes in the fluency domain. Three studies, two of which had strong designs, found

positive and statistically significant effects. Three of the remaining studies found effects that were not statistically significant but large enough to be considered substantively important according to WWC criteria.

Mooney (2003) reported a positive and statistically significant effect on the DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency subtest. This effect was not statistically significant in WWC calculations, but was large enough to be considered substantively important.

Vadasy et al. (1997a) reported no statistically significant effect on the Analytical Reading Inventory, and the effect size was not large enough to be considered substantively important according to WWC criteria.

Vadasy and Sanders (2008) reported a positive and statistically significant effect on passage reading rate.

Vadasy, Sanders, and Peyton (2006) reported a positive and statistically significant effect on passage reading rate.

Jenkins et al. (2004) reported positive and statistically significant effects on the nonphonetically controlled passage rate, phonetically controlled passage accuracy, and the phonetically controlled passage rate, but these effects were not statistically significant after the WWC corrected for multiple comparisons. The authors reported no statistically significant effect on non-phonetically controlled passage accuracy. The effect size for all four outcomes was large enough to be considered substantively important according to WWC criteria.

Vadasy, Jenkins, and Pool (2000) reported no statistically significant effects on the Analytical Reading Inventory (ARI): Primary or ARI: First Grade. Both effect sizes were positive and large enough to be considered substantively important according to WWC criteria.

Vadasy, Sanders, and Peyton (2005) reported, and the WWC confirmed, a positive and statistically significant effect on passage reading accuracy. The authors found no statistically significant effect on passage reading rate, although the effect

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. In the cases of Mooney (2003), Vadasy and Sanders (2008), Vadasy et al. (1997a), and Vadasy, Sanders, and Peyton (2006), no corrections were necessary in the fluency domain. In the cases of Jenkins et al. (2004) and Vadasy, Jenkins, and Pool (2000), corrections for multiple comparisons were needed, and in the case of Vadasy, Sanders, and Peyton (2005), corrections for clustering and multiple comparisons were needed, so significance levels may differ from those reported in the original studies.

Effectiveness (continued)

was positive and large enough to be considered substantively important according to WWC criteria.

*Comprehension.*¹⁰ Four studies examined outcomes in the comprehension domain. Two studies found positive and statistically significant effects on comprehension, one with a strong design. The other two studies found positive effects that were not statistically significant but were large enough to be considered substantively important according to WWC criteria.

Vadasy and Sanders (2008) reported a statistically significant effect on the WRMT-R Passage Comprehension subtest. Vadasy, Sanders, and Peyton (2006) found no statistically significant effect on the WRMT-R Passage Comprehension subtest, but the effect was positive and large enough to be considered substantively important according to WWC criteria. Jenkins et al. (2004) reported a statistically significant effect on the WRMT-R Passage Comprehension subtest. Vadasy, Sanders, and Peyton (2005) found no statistically significant effect on the WRMT-R Passage Comprehension subtest, but the effect was positive and large

enough to be considered substantively important according to WWC criteria.

General reading achievement. One study examined an outcome in the general reading achievement domain. Mooney (2003) reported a positive and statistically significant effect on WRMT-R/NU Total Reading subtest. This effect was not statistically significant in WWC calculations.

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 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 WWC found *Sound Partners* to have positive effects for alphabets, fluency, and comprehension and no discernible effects for general reading achievement for beginning readers

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.

The average improvement index for alphabets is +21 percentile points across the seven studies, with a range of -6 to +39 percentile points across findings.

The average improvement index for reading fluency is +19 percentile points across the seven studies, with a range of +6 to +33 percentile points across findings.

The average improvement index for reading comprehension is +21 percentile points across four studies, with a range of +11 to +27 percentile points across findings.

The improvement index for the one study examining general reading (Mooney, 2003) is +9 percentile points.

10. 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. In the cases of Vadasy and Sanders (2008), Vadasy, Sanders, and Peyton (2006), and Jenkins et al. (2004), no corrections were necessary in the comprehension domain. In the case of Vadasy, Sanders, and Peyton (2005), a correction for clustering was needed, so significance levels may differ from those reported in the original study.

The WWC found *Sound Partners* to have positive effects for alphabets, fluency, and comprehension and no discernible effects for general reading achievement for beginning readers
(continued)

Summary

The WWC reviewed 18 studies of *Sound Partners* for beginning readers. Four of these studies meet WWC evidence standards; three studies meet WWC evidence standards with reservations; the remaining 11 studies do not meet either WWC evidence

standards or eligibility screens. Based on the seven studies, the WWC found positive effects in alphabets, fluency, and comprehension and no discernible effects in general reading achievement for beginning readers. The conclusions presented in this report may change as new research emerges.

References

Meets WWC evidence standards

Mooney, P. J. (2003). An investigation of the effects of a comprehensive reading intervention on the beginning reading skills of first graders at risk for emotional and behavioral disorders (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska–Lincoln, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(05A), 85–1599.

Vadasy, P. F., Jenkins, J. R., Antil, L. R., Wayne, S. K., & O’Connor, R. E. (1997a). The effectiveness of one-to-one tutoring by community tutors for at-risk beginning readers. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 20(1), 126–139.

Vadasy, P. F., & Sanders, E. A. (2008). Code-oriented instruction for kindergarten students at risk for reading difficulties: A replication and comparison of instructional grouping. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 21(9), 929–963.

Vadasy, P. F., Sanders, E. A., & Peyton, J. A. (2006). Code-oriented instruction for kindergarten students at risk for reading difficulties: A randomized field trial with paraeducator implementers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98(3), 508–528.

Meets WWC evidence standards with reservations

Jenkins, J. R., Peyton, J. A., Sanders, E. A., & Vadasy, P. F. (2004). Effects of reading decodable texts in supplemental first-grade tutoring. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 8(1), 53–86.

Vadasy, P. F., Jenkins, J. R., & Pool, K. (2000). Effects of tutoring in phonological and early reading skills on students at risk for reading disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 33(6), 579–590.

Vadasy, P. F., Sanders, E. A., & Peyton, J. A. (2005). Relative effectiveness of reading practice or word-level instruction in supplemental tutoring: How text matters. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 38(4), 364–380.

Studies that fall outside the Beginning Reading review protocol or do not meet WWC evidence standards

Bus, A. G., & Ijzendoorn, M. H. (1999). Phonological awareness and early reading: A meta-analysis of experimental training studies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91(3), 403–414. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.

Elbaum, B., Vaughn, S., Hughes, M. T., & Moody, S. (2000). How effective are one-to-one tutoring programs in reading for elementary students at risk for reading failure. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92, 605–619. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.

Jenkins, J. R., Vadasy, P. F., Firebaugh, M., & Profflet, C. (2000). Tutoring first-grade struggling readers in phonological reading skills. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 15(2; 2), 75–84. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.

Marchand-Martella, N. E., Martella, R. C., Nelson, J. R., Waterbury, L., Shelley, S. A., Cleanthous, C., et al. (2002). Implementation

References (continued)

- of the *Sound Partners* reading program. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 11*(2), 117–130. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Sopris West Educational Services. (2008). *Sound Partners research base*. Frederick, CO: Cambium Learning Company. Retrieved November 4, 2008, from http://store.cambiumlearning.com/Resources/Research/pdf/sw_Research_SoundPartners_RB01.pdf. The study is ineligible for review because it is not a primary analysis of the effectiveness of an intervention, such as a meta-analysis or research literature review.
- Additional source:**
- Sopris West Educational Services. (2008) *Sound Partners pilot study results*. Frederick, CO: Cambium Learning Company. Retrieved November 1, 2008, from http://store.cambiumlearning.com/Resources/Research/pdf/sw_Research_SoundPartners_01.pdf
- Vadasy, P. F. (2002). *Sustainability of promising innovations, November 1, 1998–October 31, 2002. Final report*. Seattle, WA: Washington Research Institute. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Vadasy, P. F. (2008). Effects of supplemental early reading intervention at 2-year follow up: Reading skill growth patterns and predictors. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 12*(1), 51–89. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent at baseline.
- Vadasy, P. F., Jenkins, J. R., Antil, L. R., Wayne, S. K., & O'Connor, R. E. (1997b). Community-based early reading intervention for at-risk first graders. *Learning Disabilities: Research and Practice, 12*(1), 29–39. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the estimates of effects did not account for differences in pre-intervention characteristics while using a quasi-experimental design.
- Vadasy, P. F., & Sanders, E. A. (2004). *Sound Partners: Research summary*. Seattle, WA: Washington Research Institute. The study is ineligible for review because it does not use a comparison group.
- Vadasy, P., & Sanders, E. (n.d.). *Benefits of kindergarten code-oriented intervention for English language learners*. Seattle, WA: Washington Research Institute. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because it uses a randomized controlled trial design that either did not generate groups using a random process or had nonrandom allocations after random assignment and the subsequent analytic intervention and comparison groups are not shown to be equivalent.
- Vadasy, P. F., Sanders, E. A., Peyton, J. A., & Jenkins, J. R. (2002). Timing and intensity of tutoring: A closer look at the conditions for effective early literacy tutoring. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 17*(4), 227–241. The study does not meet WWC evidence standards because the measures of effect cannot be attributed solely to the intervention—there was only one unit of analysis in one or both conditions.