

Supplemental Material S3. Study information.

| Group | Reference | N | Age | Lang | Outcome | Intervention | Setting (Provider) | Outcome | Design (Quality) |
|-------|--|----|------------|------------|--------------------|--|--------------------|---|------------------|
| DHH | Ertmer, Leonard, & Pachuiro (2002) | 2 | 3;0–7;6 | BiBi | SPer, SPro, RL, EL | Individualized rehabilitation plan | C (SLP) | Children require different strategies to develop their listening, speech, and language skills | COR (NA) |
| | Hnath-Chisolm (1997) | 17 | 4–8 | Mono, BiBi | SPer | Speech perception training using words vs sentences | NS (NS) | Improvements in speech perception and generalization from more to less complex stimuli | EGC (58.3) |
| | Kosky & Boothroyd (2003) | 6 | 8.1–12.4 | BiBi | SPer, SPro | /s/-/ʃ/ discrimination and production tasks | C (Re) | Improvement in target consonants and some generalization to untrained consonants | COR (NA) |
| | Lew, Purcell, Doble, & Lim (2014) | 3 | 2;6–3;1 | Mono | SPer | SPEAK-intervention | C (SLP) | Speech perception and production, and receptive and expressive vocabulary improved | SCR (81.8) |
| | Massaro & Light (2004a) | 7 | 8–13 | Mono | SPer, SPro | Baldi: Speech toolkit | E (Re) | Improvement of perception and production of targeted sounds but poor retention of gains | COR (NA) |
| | Rochette & Bigand (2009) | 6 | Mean 9 | BiBi | SPer | Sounds in hand | C (So) | Accuracy and processing time in non-linguistic tasks improved | COR (NA) |
| | Roman, Rochette, Triglia, Schon, & Bigand (2016) | 19 | 4.8–11.6 | Mono | SPer | Sounds in hand | C (So) | Significant gains in identification, discrimination, and auditory memory tasks, but not auditory scene analysis | EGC (62.5) |
| | Silva, Comerlatto Junior, Balen, & Bevilacqua (2012) | 17 | 6–12;7 | Mono | SPer | Auxiliary Software for the Rehabilitation of Hearing Disorders (SARDA) | C (So) | Improved speech perception performance in quiet and noise | COR (NA) |
| | Wu, Yang, Lin, & Fu (2007) | 10 | 5.87–10.88 | Mono | SPer | Computer-assisted speech training | H (So) | Significant improvements in subjects' vowel, consonant, and tone recognition performance | COR (NA) |
| | Bacsfalvi (2010) | 3 | 15–18 | BiBi, BiML | SPro | Ultrasound for /r/ | C/H (SLP) | All participants learned to position their tongues to produce /r/ and one was able to produce /r/ accurately | SCR (86.4) |
| | Bacsfalvi, Bernhardt, & Gick (2007) | 3 | 18 | Mono | SPro | Electropalatography and ultrasound | C/E (Re) | Changes in vowel production noted for all speakers, mostly towards the target | COR (NA) |

| Group | Reference | N | Age | Lang | Outcome | Intervention | Setting (Provider) | Outcome | Design (Quality) |
|-------|--|----|-----------|------------------|----------|---|--------------------|---|------------------|
| | Bernhardt, Gick, Bacsfalvi, & Ashdown (2003) | 4 | 16–18 | Mono, BiBi, BiML | SPro | Electropalatography and ultrasound | C (SLP) | Significant improvement in production of the target sounds | COR (NA) |
| | Cason, Hidalgo, Isoard, Roman, & Schon (2015) | 14 | Mean 8.7 | Mono | SPro | Musical rhythmic priming | C (SLP) | Rhythmic primes that matched sentence phonological structure were associated with improvements in production | COR (NA) |
| | Crawford (1995) | 2 | 10–11 | BiBi | SPro | Electropalatography | C (Re) | Improved intelligibility for the trained consonants (initial voiced velar stops) | COR (NA) |
| | Martin, Hirson, Herman, Thomas, & Pring (2007) | 1 | Mean 18;5 | BiBi | SPro | Electropalatography | C (Re) | Improved production of target sounds (/t/, /d/), generalization to non-target words, and improved intelligibility | COR (NA) |
| | Oller Darelid, Hartelius, & Lohmander (2016) | 1 | 20 | Mono | SPro | Electropalatography | H (So) | Improved production of /g/ immediately after intervention and 24 months later | SCR (81.8) |
| | Paatsch, Blamey, Sarant, and Bow (2006) | 21 | 5;9–12;2 | Mono | SPro, RL | Speech production vs vocabulary training | E (Ed) | No significant improvement in speech production from either method and only vocabulary training lead to improved vocabulary skills | CRO (79.2) |
| | Panteleimidou, Herman, & Thomas (2003) | 1 | 8;9 | BiBi | SPro | Electropalatography | C (Re) | Significant improvement in production of the target /k/ and generalization to untrained /g/ | SCR (63.6) |
| | Smith & Wang (2010) | 1 | 4 | BiBi | SPro, MA | Visual phonics and modified Fountas and Pinnell kindergarten phonics curriculum | E (Re) | Improved phonological awareness skills and consonant production accuracy | COR (NA) |
| | Spaai, Derksen, Hermes, & Kaufholz (1996) | 12 | 6;3–12;0 | Mono | SPro | Intonation meter | E (SLP) | 11-12yr old children performed best when the Intonation Meter was used. 6-7yr old children performed similarly whether the device was present or not. | SCR (77.3) |
| | Bailey & Weippert (1992) | 2 | 6;1–6;9 | BiBi | RL | PAWS, GARFIELD, PRINTSHOP | E (Ed) | Students learned new signs | COR (NA) |
| | Barker (2003) | 19 | 8–14 | Mono | RL | Baldi: Vocabulary tutor | E (So) | Immediate and longer term increases in receptive vocabulary were observed | COR (NA) |

| Group | Reference | N | Age | Lang | Outcome | Intervention | Setting (Provider) | Outcome | Design (Quality) |
|-------|--|----|-----------|------------|-----------|--|--------------------|---|------------------|
| | Cannon, Easterbrooks, Gagne, & Beal-Alvarez (2011) | 26 | 5–12 | BiBi | RL | LanguageLinks: Syntax assessment and intervention | E (So) | Improvements in comprehension of targeted morphosyntax structures | COR (NA) |
| | Douglas (2016) | 22 | 3;8–6;7 | Mono | RL, EL | Data-driven instruction | E (Ed) | Improvement in language and expressive vocabulary, but not receptive vocabulary | EGC (91.7) |
| | Fung, Chow, & McBride-Chang (2005) | 28 | 5;2–9;1 | Mono | RL | PEER sequence dialogic reading | H (Pa) | Children receiving this intervention showed the greatest gains in receptive vocabulary | EGC (79.2) |
| | Im & Kim (2014) | 5 | NS | BiBi | RL, EL | Writing associated with hands-on scientific activities | E (Ed) | Improvement in written language content and grammaticality | EGC (50.0) |
| | Ingvalson, Young, & Wong (2014) | 19 | 4–7 | Mono | RL, EL | Earobics | E (Ed) | Significant gains on expressive and composite language measures | EGC (62.5) |
| | Lund & Schuele (2014) | 5 | 3;1–5;9 | Mono, SpBi | RL, EL | Rapid word learning task | C (Re) | Receptive rapid word-learning performance improved | SCR (90.9) |
| | Massaro & Light (2004b) | 8 | 6;11–11;0 | Mono, SpBi | RL, EL | Baldi: Language wizard/player | C (Re) | Knowledge and production of trained vocabulary increased and was retained | SCR (95.5) |
| | Messier & Wood (2015) | 18 | 4–9 | Mono | RL, EL | Electronic storybooks vs traditional storybooks | H (Pa) | Receptive and expressive vocabulary gains from both treatments but immediate and delayed expressive vocabulary gains greatest for electronic storybook intervention | COR (NA) |
| | Richels, Bobzien, et al. (2016) | 3 | 3;8–4;11 | Mono | RL, EL | Strategic and Interactive Writing Instruction (SIWI) | E (Ed, Pr) | Improved accuracy in answering wh- questions | SCR (100.0) |
| | Salies & Starosky (2008) | 1 | 10 | BiBi | RL, EL | Board games | C (Ed, Ps, SLP,) | Board game playing offers an opportunity to practice a range of linguistic structures | COR (NA) |
| | Trussell & Easterbrooks (2014) | 5 | 4;6–6;6 | BiBi | RL | Enhanced storybook interaction | E (Ed) | The impact of the intervention on receptive vocabulary varied across children | SCR (100.0) |
| | van Staden (2013) | 64 | 6;3–11;8 | BiBi | RL, EL, R | Sign language and multi-sensory coding | E (Ed) | Improvements in sight word reading, word recognition, vocabulary, and reading comprehension | EGC (75.0) |

| Group | Reference | N | Age | Lang | Outcome | Intervention | Setting (Provider) | Outcome | Design (Quality) |
|-------|---|----|----------|------------------|--------------|---|--------------------|--|------------------|
| | Encinas & Plante (2016) | 3 | 4;8–5;4 | Mono, SpBi, BiML | EL | Enhanced conversational recast | C (Re) | Improved elicited and spontaneous use of targeted morphemes | SCR (86.4) |
| | Justice, Swanson, & Buehler (2008) | 3 | 5;4–8 | Mono | EL | Narrative-based language intervention | NS (Re) | Improvement in narrative quality and expressive syntax | SCR (50.0) |
| | Lederberg, Miller, Easterbrooks, & Connor (2014) | 58 | Mean 4;6 | Mono, BiBi | EL, MA, R | Foundations for literacy | E (Ed) | Gains in phonological awareness, letter–sound knowledge, and expressive vocabulary | EGC (91.7) |
| | Richels, Schwartz, Bobzien, & Raver (2016) | 3 | 3;7–4;4 | Mono | EL | Repeated reading and structured instruction | E (Ed) | Children acquired target vocabulary and morphosyntactic forms | SCR (100.0) |
| | Robertson, von Hapsburg, & Hay (2017) | 16 | 1;11–3;6 | Mono, BiBi | EL | Infant vs adult directed speech | C (NS) | Explicit instruction needed to learn novel words | CRO (66.7) |
| | White & Tripoli (1996) | 4 | 12 | BiML | EL | Compact Language Drills (CLDs) | E (Ed) | Significant improvement in children’s ability to use irregular verbs correctly | SCR (68.2) |
| | Gilliver, Cupples, Ching, Leigh, & Gunnourie (2016) | 30 | Mean 4;9 | Mono | MA | Explicit phonological awareness teaching | C (So) | Improvement in overall phonological awareness skills | EGC (75.0) |
| | Miller, Lederberg, & Easterbrooks (2013) | 5 | 3;8–5;11 | Mono, BiBi | MA | Foundations for literacy | E (Re) | Explicit instruction improved phonological awareness | SCR (90.9) |
| | Syverud, Guardino, & Selznick (2009) | 1 | 7 | Mono | MA, R | Teach your child to read in 100 easy lessons | E (Re) | Improvements in phoneme-grapheme correspondence, phonological awareness, and nonsense word reading | COR (NA) |
| | Trezek, Wang, Woods, Gampp, & Paul (2007) | 20 | 5;0–8;8 | BiBi | MA, R, W, Sp | LACES and visual phonics | E (Ed) | Improved performance on spelling, writing, and phonological awareness measures, but less progress than expected for hearing children of the same age | COR (NA) |
| | Werfel, Douglas, & Ackal (2016) | 9 | 4;11–5;8 | Mono, SpBi, BiBi | MA | Modified intensive phonological awareness program | E (Ed) | Most students performed changed from low to within or above the developmental range | COR (NA) |

| Group | Reference | N | Age | Lang | Outcome | Intervention | Setting (Provider) | Outcome | Design (Quality) |
|-------|--|----|------------|------------------|---------|--|--------------------|--|------------------|
| | Andrews, Winograd, & DeVille (1994) | 7 | 11;1–12;10 | BiBi | R | American Sign Language summary technique | E (Ed) | Technique improved the quality and quantity of retell and comprehension of morals from fables | CRO (66.7) |
| | Beal-Alvarez, Lederberg, & Easterbrooks (2012) | 1 | 4.75 | BiBi | R | Foundations for literacy and visual phonics | E (Ed) | The child learned and retained all grapheme-phoneme correspondence taught | SCR (100.0) |
| | | 3 | 4.3–4.6 | BiBi | R | Foundations for literacy and visual phonics | E (Ed) | Children learned and maintained all grapheme-phoneme correspondence that were taught | SCR (100.0) |
| | Benedict, Rivera, & Antia (2015) | 3 | 9.2–10.8 | Mono, SpBi, BiBi | R | Comprehension, check, and repair strategy | E (Ed) | Increased use of strategic reading behaviors by all students and some students showed decreased non-strategic behavior and increased reading comprehension | SCR (100.0) |
| | Bergeron, Lederberg, Easterbrooks, Miller, & Connor (2009) | 5 | 3;10–7;10 | Mono, BiBi | R | Children's early intervention | E (Ed) | All children learned and most maintained the taught phoneme-grapheme correspondences | SCR (95.5) |
| | | 5 | 3;10–4;5 | Mono | R | Children's early intervention and foundations for literacy | E (Ed) | All children learned and maintained previously unknown phoneme-grapheme correspondences | SCR (95.5) |
| | Cambra (1994) | 10 | 11–14 | Mono | R, W | Intervention for written narratives | E (SLP) | Some changes in written narrative skills observed for some participants | COR (NA) |
| | Celo & Vian (2016) | 15 | 5;8–7;0 | BiBi | R, W | Intramorphic method | E (Ed) | Gains observed in reading, but not writing, skills | EGC (62.5) |
| | Charlesworth, Charlesworth, Raban, & Rickards (2006) | 24 | 5;9–9;2 | Mono, BiBi | R, W | Reading recovery | E (Ed) | Improvements in all areas of reading and writing measures, except for letter identification | COR (NA) |
| | Gillespie & Twardosz (1997) | 18 | 4–11 | BiBi | R | Group storybook reading | E (Pe) | Children were able to read books more independently | EGC (79.2) |
| | Guardino, Syverud, Joyner, Nicols, & King (2011) | 6 | 7–12 | Mono | R | Teach your child to read in 100 easy lessons | E (Ed) | Some participants showed improvement in word decoding | SCR (72.7) |
| | Haptonstall-Nykaza & Schick (2007) | 21 | 4–14 | BiBi | R, Sp | Instruction using lexicalized fingerspelt words | NS (Re) | This method led to better recognition and writing of words | CRO (75.0) |

| Group | Reference | N | Age | Lang | Outcome | Intervention | Setting (Provider) | Outcome | Design (Quality) |
|-------|--|-----|-------------------|------------------|---------|--|--------------------|---|------------------|
| | Mich, Pianta, & Mana (2013) | NS | 8–14 | BiBi | R | Logic-based web tool for deaf children (LODE) | E (So) | Simplifying the text and providing illustrations lead to greater reading comprehension | EGC (29.2) |
| | Nakeva von Mentzer et al. (2013) | 48 | 5–7 | Mono, SpBi, BiBi | R | Graphogame (Swedish) | H (So) | Phoneme-grapheme correspondence improved with children with weaker skills improving the most | EGC (87.5) |
| | Reitsma (2009) | 11 | 6;8–9;7 | BiBi | R, Sp | Custom software for reading and spelling | E (So) | Improvements in reading word knowledge and spelling | CRO (75.0) |
| | Rudner et al. (2015) | 12 | 7;2–12;6 | BiBi | R | Omega-is-d1 | E (So) | Improved reading performance | COR (NA) |
| | Schimmel, Edwards, & Prickett (1999) | 48 | Elementary school | BiBi | R | Reading program with five elements | E (Ed) | Gains in word reading and teacher ratings of reading skills | COR (NA) |
| | Schirmer & Schaffer (2010) | 19 | 6;3–12.5 | BiBi | R | Guided reading | E (Ed) | Modest improvements in reading levels | SCR (81.8) |
| | Trezek & Hancock (2013) | 127 | 7;2–19;8 | BiBi | R | Corrective reading-decoding A and visual phonics | E (Ed) | Improvements and generalization of skills in identifying phonemes-graphemes in isolation, phoneme-grapheme blending, and word reading | COR (NA) |
| | Trezek & Malmgren (2005) | 22 | 11.1–15.4 | BiBi | R | Decoding A curriculum, visual phonics, Baldi, pictorial glossary | E (Ed) | Acquisition and generalization of the target phonic skills | COR (NA) |
| | Trezek & Wang (2006) | 13 | 5;5–7;11 | BiBi | R | Direct instruction reading mastery I and visual phonics | E (Ed) | Improvements in word reading, pseudoword decoding, and reading comprehension | COR (NA) |
| | Trussell & Easterbrooks (2015) | 3 | 9;3–10;2 | BiBi | R | Morphographic analysis instruction | E (Ed) | Improved skills in dissecting words and determining the meaning of affixes | SCR (100.0) |
| | Wang & Paul (2011) | 22 | 7–11 | Mono, BiBi | R | Cornerstones approach | E (Ed) | Mixed findings of the efficacy of the Cornerstones approach compared to typical practice | CRO (95.8) |
| | Wang, Spychala, Harris, & Oetting (2013) | 3 | 3;11–4;7 | Mono, BiBi | R | Reading mastery 1 | E (Ed) | Use of explicitly taught phonemic awareness and phonics skills and reading skills at or above age level when tested 2-3 years later | COR (NA) |

| Group | Reference | N | Age | Lang | Outcome | Intervention | Setting (Provider) | Outcome | Design (Quality) |
|-------|--|-----|---------------|------------|-----------|---|--------------------|---|------------------|
| | Berent, Kelly, Schmitz, & Kenney (2009) | 24 | Mean 20 | BiBi | W | Visual input enhancement (essay enhancement) | E (Ed) | Improvement in targeted grammatical constructions were achieved and maintained | EGC (50.0) |
| | Dostal & Wolbers (2016) | 23 | 4th–6th grade | Mono, BiBi | W | Strategic and Interactive Writing Instruction (SIWI) | E (Ed) | Students applied and generalized genre-specific knowledge | COR (NA) |
| | Mander, Wilton, Townsend, & Thomson (1995) | 14 | Mean 7.6–8.4 | Mono | W | Word process writing for written language | E (Ed) | Improved teacher rated quality of writing | COR (NA) |
| | Schirmer & Ingram (2003) | 6 | 10–12 | BiBi | W | Teacher mediated online chat | E (Ed) | Sporadic increases in the use of the target construction (conjunctions) | SCR (68.2) |
| | | 8 | High school | BiBi | W | Teacher mediated online chat | E (Ed) | Improved use of target vocabulary (descriptors) | SCR (63.6) |
| | Wolbers (2008) | 16 | 7–14 | BiBi | W | Morning message | E (Ed) | Significant gains in word identification, editing/revising skills, and use of genre-specific traits and contextual language | COR (NA) |
| | Wolbers, Dostal, & Bowers (2012) | 29 | Mean 13.2 | BiBi | W | Strategic and Interactive Writing Instruction (SIWI) | E (Ed) | Statistically significant gains in writing length, sentence complexity, and sentence awareness | COR (NA) |
| DML | Cannon, Fredrick, & Easterbrooks (2010) | 4 | 10–12 | BiML | R | Pre-teaching reading vocabulary | E (Ed) | Correct signing of target words increased with pre-teaching | SCR (90.9) |
| | Guardino, Cannon, and Eberst (2014) | 5 | 14–22 | BiML | R | Pre-teaching reading vocabulary | E (Ed) | Reading of target vocabulary words improved | SCR (95.5) |
| ML | Bekman, Aksu-Koc, & Erguvanli-Taylan (2011) | 185 | 6;0–6;11 | SpBi | RL, EL | Summer pre-school school readiness program | E (Ed) | Significant changes in expressive syntax, narrative comprehension skills, but not receptive vocabulary | EGC (87.5) |
| | Bernhard, Winsler, Bleiker, Ginieniewicz, & Madigan (2008) | 325 | 3–5 | SpBi | RL, EL | Early authors program | E (Ed) | 3-5yr old children showed greater gains in language development than controls | EGC (75.0) |
| | Caesar & Nelson (2014) | 19 | 2;8–5;2 | SpBi | RL, MA, R | Supporting the Acquisition of Language and Literacy through | E (Ed) | Significant improvements in alphabetic and print knowledge but not receptive language or phonological awareness | EGC (91.7) |

| Group | Reference | N | Age | Lang | Outcome | Intervention | Setting (Provider) | Outcome | Design (Quality) |
|-------|--|-----|----------|---------------|------------------|---|-----------------------|--|---------------------|
| | | | | | | School–Home Activities (SALSA) | | | |
| | Cohen, Kramer-Vida, & Frye (2012a) | 72 | 3–5 | Mono, SpBi | RL | Dialogic reading | E (Ed, Pe) | Children’s word knowledge increased | COR (NA) |
| | Cohen, Kramer-Vida, & Frye (2012b) | 72 | 3;4–5;4 | Mono, SpBi | RL | Dialogic reading | E (Ed, Pe) | Improvement in vocabulary knowledge | COR (NA) |
| | Gorman, Brice, & Berman (2012) | 30 | Mean 4;3 | SpBi | RL, EL, MA | Reading Acquisition Program for Spanish Speakers (RASPA) | C (SLP) | Gains in phonological awareness and receptive and expressive vocabulary | EGC (79.2) |
| | Mendez, Crais, Castro, & Kainz (2015) | 42 | Mean 4.3 | SpBi | RL | Informed vocabulary instructional strategies | E (SLP) | The bilingual approach showed greatest gains in English, Spanish vocabulary and gains in Spanish vocabulary were maintained | EGC (100.0) |
| | Motsch & Schutz (2012) | 180 | 3–6 | Mono, SpBi | RL, EL | Language route | E (Ed) | All children’s language improved with the greatest improvement for children with the weakest language skills at baseline | COR (NA) |
| | Silverman (2007) | 72 | Mean 6 | Mono, SpBi | RL, EL | Multidimensional Vocabulary Program (MVP) | E (Ed) | Increases in receptive and expressive vocabulary | COR (NA) |
| | Spycher (2009) | 39 | K | Mono, SpBi | RL, EL | Intentional vs implicit vocabulary approach | E (Ed) | The intentional vocabulary approach was associated with greater gains in receptive and expressive vocabulary | EGC (83.3) |
| | Tong, Lara-Alecio, Irby, Mathes, & Kwok (2008) | 534 | Mean 5;7 | SpBi | RL, EL | Story Telling for English Language and Literacy Acquisition (STELLA), Santillana intensive English curriculum, and academic oral language | E (Ed) | Students in intervention programs showed greater and faster gains in English expressive vocabulary and listening comprehension | EGC (95.8) |

| Group | Reference | N | Age | Lang | Outcome | Intervention | Setting (Provider) | Outcome | Design (Quality) |
|-------|--|------|-----------|------|---------------|--|--------------------|---|------------------|
| | Townsend & Collins (2009) | 37 | 11;0–15;2 | SpBi | RL, EL | Language workshop | E (Re) | Growth in knowledge of academic vocabulary | EGC (100.0) |
| | Troia (2004) | 191 | 5;11–13;3 | SpBi | RL, EL, MA, R | Fast ForWord Language | E (So) | Sight word reading improved more for intervention than control students. Examining only the students with the weakest pre-intervention language skills showed intervention-related gains in expressive language and pseudoword decoding | EGC (100.0) |
| | Vadasy & Sanders (2016) | 100 | K | SpBi | RL, R, Sp | Explicit vocabulary vs explicit vocabulary and spelling | E (Pe) | Both interventions showed gains in receptive vocabulary, word reading, and spelling | EGC (100.0) |
| | Vadasy, Nelson, & Sanders (2013) | 140 | K | SpBi | RL, R | Connections | E (Pe) | Gains in receptive vocabulary, word reading, and word comprehension were maintained six months after intervention | EGC (87.5) |
| | Cruz de Quiros, Lara-Alecio, Tong, & Irby (2012) | 72 | Mean 8.44 | SpBi | EL | Story reTelling English Language and Literacy Acquisition (STELLA) | E (Ed) | STELLA intervention showed greatest gains in use of story elements | EGC (87.5) |
| | Lesaux, Kieffer, Kelley, & Harris (2014) | 2082 | 6th grade | SpBi | EL | Academic Language Instruction for All Students (ALIAS) | E (Ed) | Students improved their vocabulary knowledge, morphological awareness, comprehension of expository texts, and standardized measures of written language. | EGC (95.8) |
| | Petersen, Thompsen, Guiberson, & Spencer (2016) | 73 | 5;11–9;8 | SpBi | EL | Story champs | E (NS) | Improved use of causal subordination and story grammar in both languages | EGC (87.5) |
| | Tsybina & Eriks-Brophy (2010) | 12 | 1;10–3;6 | SpBi | EL | Dialogic book-reading intervention | H (Pa, Re) | Production of the target words in English, Spanish following intervention and maintained 6 weeks after intervention | EGC (83.3) |
| | Al-jasser (2008) | 40 | 18–20 | SpBi | MA | Top-up listening 3 with additional emphasis on | E (Re) | Additional emphasis on English phonotactic rules was associated with significant gains in word segmentation skills | EGC (66.7) |

| Group | Reference | N | Age | Lang | Outcome | Intervention | Setting (Provider) | Outcome | Design (Quality) |
|-------|--|-----|-------------|------|---------|--|--------------------|--|------------------|
| | | | | | | English phonotactic rules | | | |
| | Armand, Sirois, & Ababou (2008) | 107 | Mean 6;5 | SpBi | MA | Cross-linguistic phonological awareness | E (Ed, Pe) | Only a significant difference for time. Intervention and maturation effects could not be separated | EGC (62.5) |
| | Lam & Sheng (2016) | 111 | 4–7 | SpBi | MA | Morphemic compounding and derivation tasks | NS (Re) | Cross-linguistic influences on morphological awareness observed | EGC (62.5) |
| | Swanson, Hodson, & Schommer-Aikins (2005) | 68 | 11;11–14;9 | SpBi | MA, R | Phonological awareness, orthographic rules, comprehension strategies | E (SLP, Pe) | Improvements in phonological awareness and word attack, word identification, word comprehension, and passage comprehension | EGC (91.7) |
| | Zhang (2016) | 109 | 4th grade | SpBi | MA | Instruction on English derivational morphemes | E (Ed) | Gains in morphological awareness in English and Malay | EGC (79.2) |
| | Amendum, Amendum, & Almond (2013) | 1 | K–1st grade | SpBi | R | ENRICH | E (Ed) | Intervention allowed the child to read at grade level | COR (NA) |
| | Baker et al. (2017) | 78 | 1st grade | SpBi | R | GraphoGame (Spanish) | E (So) | Some cross-linguistic transfer in decoding skills from Spanish to English were observed | EGC (87.5) |
| | Bui & Fagan (2013) | 49 | 5th grade | SpBi | R | Integrated Reading Comprehension Strategy (IRCS) and IRCS Plus | E (Ed) | Similar improvements in word recognition, reading comprehension, and story retell for both interventions | EGC (79.2) |
| | Calhoon, Al Otaiba, Cihak, King, & Avalos (2007) | 76 | Mean 6.5 | SpBi | R | Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS) | E (Ed) | Significant improvements in reading skills of children in a two-way immersion education program | EGC (100.0) |
| | Carlo et al. (2009) | 254 | 5th grade | SpBi | R | Word analysis and vocabulary learning strategies | E (Ed) | Improvement in word knowledge and depth of knowledge, polysemy, and reading comprehension | EGC (75.0) |
| | Cirino et al. (2009) | 111 | Mean 6.6 | SpBi | R, Sp | Proactive reading (English) | E (Ed) | Intervention effects observed for oral language, decoding, spelling, fluency, and comprehension | EGC (87.5) |
| | | 104 | Mean 6.6 | SpBi | R, Sp | Lectura proctiva (Spanish) | E (Ed) | Intervention effects observed for decoding, spelling, fluency, and comprehension | EGC (87.5) |

| Group | Reference | N | Age | Lang | Outcome | Intervention | Setting (Provider) | Outcome | Design (Quality) |
|-------|---|-----|-----------------|------------|---------|---|--------------------|---|------------------|
| | Dalton, Proctor, Uccelli, Mo, & Snow (2011) | 106 | 5th grade | Mono, SpBi | R | Improving Comprehension Online (ICON) | E (So) | Use of the vocabulary and/or comprehension modules lead to increased reading comprehension | EGC (95.8) |
| | De la Colina, Parker, Hasbrouck, & Lara-Alecio (2001) | 74 | 1st & 2nd grade | SpBi | R | Read naturally (Spanish) | E (Ed) | Improvements in oral reading fluency and reading comprehension | SCR (81.8) |
| | Denton, Anthony, Parker, & Hasbrouck (2004) | 33 | 7–12 | SpBi | R | Read well | E (Ed) | Improvement in word decoding but not comprehension | EGC (87.5) |
| | | 60 | 7–12 | SpBi | R | Read naturally | E (Ed) | No improvement in word decoding or comprehension | EGC (87.5) |
| | Eisenchlas, Schalley, & Moyes (2016) | 9 | 5–8 | SpBi | R, Sp | Play to learn | H (So) | Development of home language emergent literacy skills | COR (NA) |
| | Greenwood, Arreaga-Mayer, Utley, Gavin, & Terry (2001) | 117 | 1st–5th grade | SpBi | R, Sp | Class Wide Peer Tutoring Learning Management System (CWPT-LMS) vs enhanced CWPT-LMS | E (Ed) | Improvements in sight word reading and spelling | SCR (86.4) |
| | Gunn, Biglan, Smolkowski, & Ary (2000) | 256 | K–3rd grade | Mono, SpBi | R | Reading mastery and corrective reading | E (Ed) | Improvements in word attack, word identification, oral reading fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension | EGC (100.0) |
| | Hilton-Prillhart, Hopkins, Skinner, & McCane-Bowling (2011) | 3 | 7;7 | Mono, SpBi | R | Computer-based sight word reading intervention | E (So) | Improved sight word reading | SCR (100.0) |
| | Jaeger (2015) | 1 | 4th grade | SpBi | R | Interactive model of reading (dis)ability and the RAND model | NS (Re) | Improvement in reading and understanding narrative texts | COR (NA) |
| | Kamps et al. (2007) | 318 | 1st & 2nd grade | Mono, SpBi | R | Reading mastery, early interventions in reading, read well, read naturally | E (Ed) | Improvements in decoding and oral reading skills | EGC (79.2) |

| Group | Reference | N | Age | Lang | Outcome | Intervention | Setting (Provider) | Outcome | Design (Quality) |
|-------|--|-----|---------------|------------|----------|--|--------------------|--|------------------|
| | Kelly, Gomez-Bellenge, Chen, & Schulz (2008) | NS | 1st grade | SpBi | R, Sp | Reading recovery | E (Ed) | Over half of English language learner participants performed at grade level | COR (NA) |
| | Kitano & Lewis (2007) | 58 | 3rd–5th grade | Mono, SpBi | R | Decoding and reading comprehension strategies | E (Ed) | Improvement in reading performance | COR (NA) |
| | Kucer & Silva (1999) | 26 | 3rd grade | SpBi | R, W, Sp | Whole language curriculum | E (Ed, Re) | Improvements in reading accuracy, writing, and spelling but not number of sentences used in writing | COR (NA) |
| | Matchett & Burns (2009) | 1 | 10 | SpBi | R | Incremental rehearsal of high-frequency words | E (Re) | Intensive one-to-one intervention resulted in improved sight-word recognition | SCR (100.0) |
| | Muñiz-Swicegood (1994) | 95 | 8–9 | SpBi | R | Metacognitive reading strategies (Spanish) | E (Ed) | Increased reading accuracy in Spanish and use of metacognitive reading strategies in English and Spanish | EGC (58.3) |
| | Nag-Arulmani, Reddy, & Buckley (2003) | 118 | 7–9 | SpBi | R | Phonological instruction vs language exposure | E (Ed) | The phonological instruction intervention improved reading and spelling more than the language exposure intervention | EGC (70.8) |
| | Proctor, Dalton, & Grisham (2007) | 30 | 4th grade | SpBi | R | Universal Literacy Environment (ULE) | E (Ed) | No significant change in reading vocabulary or comprehension | COR (NA) |
| | Proctor et al. (2011) | 240 | 5th grade | Mono, SpBi | R | Improving Comprehension Online (ICON) | E (Ed) | Increases in reading vocabulary knowledge but not reading comprehension | EGC (100.0) |
| | Ruiz de Zarobe & Zenotz (2015) | 50 | 10–12 | SpBi | R | Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) | E (Re) | There were not changes in the number of type of reading strategies used | EGC (45.8) |
| | Saunders & Goldenberg (1999) | 116 | 4th–5th grade | Mono, SpBi | R | Literature logs and/or instructional conversations | E (Ed) | Significant results observed on story comprehension | EGC (66.7) |
| | Shah-Wundenberg, Wyse, & Chaplain (2013) | 241 | 6–7 | SpBi | R | Paired reading vs hearing reading | H (Pa) | Both interventions were related to similar gains in English reading skills, accuracy, and comprehension | EGC (70.8) |

| Group | Reference | N | Age | Lang | Outcome | Intervention | Setting (Provider) | Outcome | Design (Quality) |
|-------|--|-----|-------------------|------------|---------|---|--------------------|--|------------------|
| | Slavin & Madden (1999) | NS | Elementary school | SpBi | R | Success for all (Spanish: Exito para todos) | E (Ed) | Positive impact on children's reading skills in English | EGC (29.2) |
| | | NS | Elementary school | SpBi | R | English as a second language strategies | E (Ed) | Positive impact on children's reading skills in English | EGC (29.2) |
| | Soltero-González, Sparrow, Butvilofsky, Escamilla, & Hopewell (2016) | 358 | K–3rd grade | SpBi | R, W | Literacy squared vs sequential literacy instruction | E (Ed) | Literacy Squared associated with higher reading and writing scores in English, Spanish | EGC (79.2) |
| | Vadasy and Sanders (2013) | 180 | 1st grade | Mono, SpBi | R, Sp | Code-oriented intervention | E (Pe) | Word reading, spelling and reading comprehension improvements were maintained | EGC (100.0) |
| | Vaughn, Cirino, et al. (2006) | 91 | Mean 6.6 | SpBi | R | Proactive reading (English) | E (Ed) | Significant improvements in phonological awareness, word attack, word reading, and spelling. | EGC (95.8) |
| | | 80 | Mean 6.6 | SpBi | R | Lectura proctiva (Spanish) | E (Ed) | Significant improvements in phonological awareness, letter-sound and letter-word identification, verbal analogies, word reading fluency, and spelling. | EGC (95.8) |
| | Vaughn, Linan-Thompson, et al. (2006) | 64 | Mean 6.6 | SpBi | R | Lectura proctiva (Spanish) | E (Ed) | Significant gains in phonological awareness, reading comprehension, and reading fluency. | EGC (91.7) |
| | Vaughn, Mathes, et al. (2006) | 41 | Mean 6.6 | SpBi | R | Proactive reading (English) | E (Ed) | Significant gains in English measures (e.g., letter naming, phonological awareness, language skills, reading, academic achievement), but less gains on Spanish measures. | EGC (95.8) |
| | Ahn (2012) | 10 | 5th–6th grade | SpBi | W | Genre approach | E (Ed) | Anecdotal reports from researcher and educators that the intervention was effective | COR (NA) |
| | Akinwamide (2012) | 80 | Senior high | SpBi | W | Process approach and product approach | E (Re) | Significant improvements in Process Approach group but not Product Approach group | COR (NA) |
| | Kuball & Peck (1997) | 15 | Mean 5.3 | SpBi | W | Whole language instruction | E (Ed) | Improvement in compositional and grapho-phonemic skills | EGC (45.8) |

| Group | Reference | N | Age | Lang | Outcome | Intervention | Setting (Provider) | Outcome | Design (Quality) |
|-------|--|---|-----------|------|---------|---|--------------------|--|------------------|
| | Alvarado-Gomez & Belfiore (2000) | 3 | 3rd grade | SpBi | Sp | Error correction | E (Ed) | The error correction strategy was associated with more words spelt correctly than a traditional correction approach | CRO (75.0) |
| | Niolaki, Terzopoulos, & Masterson (2017) | 1 | 7.04 | SpBi | Sp | Sublexical training (phonological and letter-sound awareness) | E (Re) | Improved word and nonword spelling in Greek but not English | COR (NA) |
| | Vargas, Grskovic, Belfiore, & Halbert-Ayala (1997) | 8 | Mean 12 | SpBi | Sp | Error correction | E (Re) | Primary English speakers spelled more English words in the error correction condition than the traditional and students who were primarily Spanish speakers correctly spelled Spanish words in both conditions | CRO (54.2) |

Note. This table is ordered first by group (DHH/DML/ML), then by outcome (SPer, SPro, RL, EL, MA, R, W, Sp), then alphabetically by first author name. Abbreviations: DHH = deaf and hard of hearing; DML: multilingual DHH; ML = multilingual; K = kindergarten; Mono = monolingual; SpBi = spoken language bilingual; BiBi = bimodal bilingual; BiML = bimodal multilingual; SPer = speech perception; SPro = speech production; RL = receptive language; EL = expressive language; MA = metalinguistic; R = reading; W = writing; Sp = spelling; NS = not specified; C = clinic; E = education; H = home; Ed = educator; Pa = parent; Pe = para-educator; Pr = peer; Ps = psychologist; Re = researcher; SLP = speech-language pathologist; So = software; COR = correlational; CRO = crossover; EGC = experimental group comparison; SCR = single-case research; NA = not applicable.

References

- Ahn, H. (2012). Teaching writing skills based on a genre approach to L2 primary school students: An action research. *English Language Teaching*, 5(2), 2–16. <http://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n2p2>
- Akinwamide, T. K. (2012). The influence of Process Approach on English as second language students' performances in essay writing. *English Language Teaching*, 5(3), 16–29.
- Al-jasser, F. (2008). The effect of teaching English phonotactics on the lexical segmentation of English as a foreign language. *System: An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics*, 36(1), 94–106. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2007.12.002>
- Alvarado-Gomez, M., & Belfiore, P. J. (2000). Effects of error correction on Spanish spelling words for students whose primary language is Spanish. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, 10(4), 213–221.
- Amendum, S., Amendum, E., & Almond, P. (2013). "One dy i kud not red a book bot naw i can": One English learner's progress. *Reading Teacher*, 67(1), 59–69. <http://doi.org/10.1002/TRTR.1183>
- Andrews, J. F., Winograd, P., & DeVille, G. (1994). Deaf children reading fables: Using ASL summaries to improve reading comprehension. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 139(3), 378–386. <http://doi.org/10.1353/aad.2012.0303>
- Armand, F., Sirois, F., & Ababou, S. (2008). Writing readiness in multilingual and underprivileged contexts: Developing metaphonological capacities and raising awareness of linguistic diversity. [Entree dans l'ecrit en contexte plurilingue et defavorise: developper les capacites metaphonologiques et sensibiliser a la diversite linguistique]. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 65(1), 61–87. <http://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.65.1.61>
- Bacsfalvi, P. (2010). Attaining the lingual components of /r/ with ultrasound for three adolescents with cochlear implants. *Canadian Journal of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology*, 34(3), 206–217.
- Bacsfalvi, P., Bernhardt, B. M., & Gick, B. (2007). Electropalatography and ultrasound in vowel remediation for adolescents with hearing impairment. *Advances in Speech Language Pathology*, 9(1), 36–45. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14417040601101037>
- Bailey, J., & Weippert, H. (1992). Using computers to improve the language competence and attending behaviour of deaf aboriginal children. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 8(2), 118–127. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2729.1992.tb00395.x>
- Baker, D. L., Basaraba, D. L., Smolkowski, K., Conry, J., Hautala, J., Richardson, U., . . . Cole, R. (2017). Exploring the cross-linguistic transfer of reading skills in Spanish to English in the context of a computer adaptive reading intervention. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 40(2), 222–239. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2017.1309719>
- Barker, L. J. (2003). Computer-assisted vocabulary acquisition: The CSLU vocabulary tutor in oral-deaf education. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 8(2), 187–198. <http://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/eng002>
- Beal-Alvarez, J. S., Lederberg, A. R., & Easterbrooks, S. R. (2012). Grapheme-phoneme acquisition of deaf preschoolers. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 17(1), 39–60. <http://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enr030>
- Bekman, S., Aksu-Koc, A., & Erguvanli-Taylan, E. (2011). Effectiveness of an intervention program for six-year-olds: A summer-school model. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 19(4), 409–431. <http://doi.org/10.1080/1350293X.2011.623508>
- Benedict, K. M., Rivera, M. C., & Antia, S. D. (2015). Instruction in metacognitive strategies to increase deaf and hard-of-hearing students' reading comprehension. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 20(1), 1–15. <http://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enu026>
- Berent, G. P., Kelly, R. R., Schmitz, K. L., & Kenney, P. (2009). Visual input enhancement via essay coding results in deaf learners' long-term retention of improved English grammatical knowledge. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 14(2), 190–204. <http://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enn032>
- Bergeron, J. P., Lederberg, A. R., Easterbrooks, S. R., Miller, E. M., & Connor, C. M. (2009). Building the alphabetic principle in young children who are deaf and hard of hearing. *Volta Review*, 109(2–3), 87–119.
- Bernhard, J. K., Winsler, A., Bleiker, C., Ginieniewicz, J., & Madigan, A. L. (2008). "Read my story!" Using the early authors program to promote early literacy among diverse, urban preschool children in poverty. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 13(1), 76–105. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10824660701860458>
- Bernhardt, B., Gick, B., Bacsfalvi, P., & Ashdown, J. (2003). Speech habilitation of hard of hearing adolescents using electropalatography and ultrasound as elevated by trained listeners. *Clinical Linguistics and Phonetics*, 17(3), 199–216. <http://doi.org/10.1080/0269920031000071451>
- Bui, Y. N., & Fagan, Y. M. (2013). The effects of an integrated reading comprehension strategy: A culturally responsive teaching approach for fifth-grade students' reading comprehension. *Preventing School Failure*, 57(2), 59–69. <http://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.2012.664581>
- Caesar, L. G., & Nelson, N. W. (2014). Parental involvement in language and literacy acquisition: A bilingual journaling approach. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 30(3), 317–336. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0265659013513028>
- Calhoon, M. B., Al Otaiba, S., Cihak, D., King, A., & Avalos, A. (2007). Effects of a peer-mediated program on reading skill acquisition for two-way bilingual first-grade classrooms. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 30(3), 169–184. <http://doi.org/10.2307/30035562>

- Cambra, C. (1994). An instructional program approach to improve hearing-impaired adolescents' narratives: A pilot study. *Volta Review*, 96(3), 237–245.
- Cannon, J. E., Easterbrooks, S. R., Gagne, P., & Beal-Alvarez, J. (2011). Improving DHH students' grammar through an individualized software program. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 16(4), 437–457. <http://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enr023>
- Cannon, J. E., Fredrick, L. D., & Easterbrooks, S. R. (2010). Vocabulary instruction through books read in American Sign Language for English-language learners with hearing loss. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 31(2), 98–112. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1525740109332832>
- Carlo, M. S., August, D., McLaughlin, B., Snow, C., Dressler, C., Lippman, D., . . . White, C. E. (2009). Closing the gap: Addressing the vocabulary needs of English-language learners in bilingual and mainstream classrooms. *Journal of Education*, 189(1–2), 57–76. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022057409189001-205>
- Cason, N., Hidalgo, C., Isoard, F., Roman, S., & Schon, D. (2015). Rhythmic priming enhances speech production abilities: Evidence from prelingually deaf children. *Neuropsychology*, 29(1), 102–107. <http://doi.org/10.1037/neu0000115>
- Celo, P., & Vian, N. (2016). Teaching reading and writing with the intramorphic method to deaf children. *Rivista Di Psicologica Applicata*, 16(2), 85–99.
- Charlesworth, A., Charlesworth, R., Raban, B., & Rickards, F. (2006). Reading recovery for children with hearing loss. *Volta Review*, 106(1), 29–51.
- Cirino, P. T., Vaughn, S., Linan-Thompson, S., Cardenas-Hagan, E., Fletcher, J. M., & Francis, D. J. (2009). One-year follow-up outcomes of Spanish and English interventions for English language learners at risk for reading problems. *American Educational Research Journal*, 46(3), 744–781. <http://doi.org/10.3102/0002831208330214>
- Cohen, L. E., Kramer-Vida, L., & Frye, N. (2012a). Implementing dialogic reading with culturally, linguistically diverse preschool children. *NHSA Dialog*, 15(1), 135–141. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15240754.2011.639965>
- Cohen, L. E., Kramer-Vida, L., & Frye, N. (2012b). Using dialogic reading as professional development to improve students' English and Spanish vocabulary. *NHSA Dialog*, 15(1), 59–80.
- Crawford, R. (1995). Teaching voiced velar stops to profoundly deaf children, using EPG: Two case studies. *Clinical Linguistics and Phonetics*, 9(3), 255–269. <http://doi.org/10.3109/02699209508985336>
- Cruz de Quiros, A. M., Lara-Alecio, R., Tong, F., & Irby, B. J. (2012). The effect of a structured story reading intervention, story retelling and higher order thinking for English language and literacy acquisition. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 35(1), 87–113. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9817.2010.01472.x>
- Dalton, B., Proctor, C. P., Uccelli, P., Mo, E., & Snow, C. E. (2011). Designing for diversity: The role of reading strategies and interactive vocabulary in a digital reading environment for fifth-grade monolingual English and bilingual students. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 43(1), 68–100. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X10397872>
- De la Colina, M. G., Parker, R. I., Hasbrouck, J. E., & Lara-Alecio, R. (2001). Intensive intervention in reading fluency for at-risk beginning Spanish readers. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 25(4), 503–538. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2001.11074465>
- 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. <http://doi.org/10.1086/499754>
- Dostal, H. M., & Wolbers, K. A. (2016). Examining student writing proficiencies across genres: Results of an intervention study. *Deafness and Education International*, 18(3), 159–169. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14643154.2016.1230415>
- Douglas, M. (2016). Improving spoken language outcomes for children with hearing loss: Data-driven instruction. *Otology and Neurotology*, 37(2), e13–e19. <http://doi.org/10.1097/MAO.0000000000000902>
- Eisenclas, S. A., Schalley, A. C., & Moyes, G. (2016). Play to learn: Self-directed home language literacy acquisition through online games. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 19(2), 136–152. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1037715>
- Encinas, D., & Plante, E. (2016). Feasibility of a recasting and auditory bombardment treatment with young cochlear implant users. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 47(2), 157–170. http://doi.org/10.1044/2016_LSHSS-15-0060
- Ertmer, D. J., Leonard, J. S., & Pachuiro, M. L. (2002). Communication intervention for children with cochlear implants: Two case studies. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 33(3), 205–217. [http://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461\(2002/018\)](http://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461(2002/018))
- Fung, P.-C., Chow, B. W.-Y., & McBride-Chang, C. (2005). The impact of a dialogic reading program on deaf and hard-of-hearing kindergarten and early primary school-aged students in Hong Kong. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 10(1), 82–95. <http://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/eni005>
- Gillespie, C. W., & Twardosz, S. (1997). A group storybook-reading intervention with children at a residential school for the deaf. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 142(4), 320–332. <http://doi.org/10.1353/aad.2012.0224>

- Gilliver, M., Cupples, L., Ching, T. Y., Leigh, G., & Gunnourie, M. (2016). Developing sound skills for reading: Teaching phonological awareness to preschoolers with hearing loss. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 21(3), 268–279. <http://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enw004>
- Gorman, B. K., Brice, A. E., & Berman, S. (2012). Reading acquisition program for Spanish-speakers. *Perspectives on Communication Disorders and Sciences in Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CLD) Populations*, 19(2), 49–57. <http://doi.org/10.1044/cds19.2.49>
- Greenwood, C. R., Arreaga-Mayer, C., Utley, C. A., Gavin, K. M., & Terry, B. J. (2001). ClassWide peer tutoring learning management system: Applications with elementary-level English language learners. *Remedial and Special Education*, 22(1), 34–47. <http://doi.org/10.1177/074193250102200105>
- Guardino, C., Cannon, J. E., & Eberst, K. (2014). Building the evidence-base of effective reading strategies to use with deaf English-language learners. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 35(2), 59–73. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1525740113506932>
- Guardino, C., Syverud, S. M., Joyner, A., Nicols, H., & King, S. (2011). Further evidence of the effectiveness of phonological instruction with oral-deaf readers. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 155(5), 562–568. <http://doi.org/10.1353/aad.2011.0002>
- Gunn, B., Biglan, A., Smolkowski, K., & Ary, D. (2000). The efficacy of supplemental instruction in decoding skills for hispanic and non-hispanic students in early elementary school. *The Journal of Special Education*, 34(2), 90–103. <http://doi.org/10.1177/002246690003400204>
- Haptonstall-Nykaza, T. S., & Schick, B. (2007). The transition from fingerspelling to English print: Facilitating English decoding. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 12(2), 172–183. <http://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enm003>
- Hilton-Prillhart, A. N., Hopkins, M. B., Skinner, C. H., & McCane-Bowling, S. (2011). Enhancing sight word reading in second-grade students using a computer-based sight word reading system. *Journal of Evidence-Based Practices for Schools*, 12(2), 205–218.
- Hnath-Chisolm, T. (1997). Context effects in auditory training with children. *Scandinavian Audiology*, 47, 64–69.
- Im, S., & Kim, O.-J. (2014). An approach to teach science to students with limited language proficiency: In the case of students with hearing impairment. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 12(6), 1393–1406. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-013-9465-1>
- Ingvalson, E. M., Young, N. M., & Wong, P. C. (2014). Auditory-cognitive training improves language performance in prelingually deafened cochlear implant recipients. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, 78(10), 1624–1631. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2014.07.009>
- Jaeger, E. L. (2015). Learning to construct meaning from text: A case study of the relationship between a tutor and an English learner within a response to intervention setting. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 54(4), 285–315. <http://doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2015.1062942>
- Justice, E. C., Swanson, L. A., & Buehler, V. (2008). Use of narrative-based language intervention with children who have cochlear implants. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 28(2), 149–161. <http://doi.org/10.1097/01.TLD.0000318935.54548.36>
- Kamps, D., Abbott, M., Greenwood, C., Arreaga-Mayer, C., Wills, H., Longstaff, J., . . . Walton, C. (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. <http://doi.org/10.2307/30035561>
- Kelly, P. R., Gomez-Bellenge, F.-X., Chen, J., & Schulz, M. M. (2008). Learner outcomes for English language learner low readers in an early intervention. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42(2), 235–260. <http://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2008.tb00117.x>
- Kitano, M. K., & Lewis, R. B. (2007). Examining the relationships between reading achievement and tutoring duration and content for gifted culturally and linguistically diverse students from low-income backgrounds. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 30(3), 295–325. <http://doi.org/10.1177/016235320703000302>
- Kosky, C., & Boothroyd, A. (2003). Perception and production of sibilants by children with hearing loss: A training study. *Volta Review*, 103(2), 71–98.
- Kuball, Y. E., & Peck, S. (1997). The effect of whole language instruction on the writing development of spanish-speaking and English-speaking kindergartners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 21(2-3), 213–231. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.1997.10668661>
- Kucer, S. B., & Silva, C. (1999). The English literacy development of bilingual students within a transition whole-language curriculum. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 23(4), 345–371. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.1999.10162740>
- Lam, B. P., & Sheng, L. (2016). The development of morphological awareness in young bilinguals: Effects of age and L1 background. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 59(4), 732–744. http://doi.org/10.1044/2015_JSLHR-L-14-0171
- Lederberg, A. R., Miller, E. M., Easterbrooks, S. R., & Connor, C. M. (2014). Foundations for literacy: An early literacy intervention for deaf and hard-of-hearing children. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 19(4), 438–455. <http://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enu022>

- Lesaux, N. K., Kieffer, M. J., Kelley, J. G., & Harris, J. R. (2014). Effects of academic vocabulary instruction for linguistically diverse adolescents: Evidence from a randomized field trial. *American Educational Research Journal*, 51(6), 1159–1194. <http://doi.org/10.3102/0002831214532165>
- Lew, J., Purcell, A. A., Doble, M., & Lim, L. H. (2014). Hear here: Children with hearing loss learn words by listening. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, 78(10), 1716–1725. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2014.07.029>
- Lund, E., & Schuele, C. M. (2014). Effects of a word-learning training on children with cochlear implants. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 19(1), 68–84. <http://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/ent036>
- Mander, R., Wilton, K. M., Townsend, M. A., & Thomson, P. (1995). Personal computers and process writing: A written language intervention for deaf children. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 65, 441–453. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.1995.tb01164.x>
- Martin, K. L., Hirson, A., Herman, R., Thomas, J., & Pring, T. (2007). The efficacy of speech intervention using electropalatography with an 18-year-old deaf client: A single case study. *Advances in Speech Language Pathology*, 9(1), 46–56. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14417040601120912>
- Massaro, D. W., & Light, J. (2004a). Improving the vocabulary of children with hearing loss. *Volta Review*, 104, 141–174.
- Massaro, D. W., & Light, J. (2004b). Using visible speech to train perception and production of speech for individuals with hearing loss. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 47(2), 304–320. [http://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2004\)025](http://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2004)025)
- Matchett, D. L., & Burns, M. K. (2009). Increasing word recognition fluency with an English-language learner. *Journal of Evidence-Based Practices for Schools*, 10(2), 194–206.
- Mendez, L. I., Crais, E. R., Castro, D. C., & Kainz, K. (2015). A culturally and linguistically responsive vocabulary approach for young Latino dual language learners. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 58(1), 93–106. http://doi.org/10.1044/2014_JSLHR-L-12-0221
- Messier, J., & Wood, C. (2015). Facilitating vocabulary acquisition of children with cochlear implants using electronic storybooks. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 20(4), 356–373. <http://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/env031>
- Mich, O., Pianta, E., & Mana, N. (2013). Interactive stories and exercises with dynamic feedback for improving reading comprehension skills in deaf children. *Computers and Education*, 65, 34–44. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2013.01.016>
- Miller, E. M., Lederberg, A. R., & Easterbrooks, S. R. (2013). Phonological awareness: Explicit instruction for young deaf and hard-of-hearing children. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 18(2), 206–227. <http://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/ens067>
- Motsch, H.-J., & Schutz, D. S. (2012). Effektivität inklusiver sprachförderung ein-und mehrsprachiger vorschulkinder nach der “language route.” [Effectiveness of the inclusive language support concept “Language Route” in mono- and multilingual pre-school children]. *Vierteljahresschrift für Heilpädagogik und ihre Nachbargebiete*, 81(4), 299–311. <http://doi.org/10.2378/vhn2012.art16d>
- Muñiz-Swicegood, M. (1994). The effects of metacognitive reading strategy training on the reading performance and student reading analysis strategies of third grade bilingual students. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 18(1–2), 83–97. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.1994.10162659>
- Nag-Arulmani, S., Reddy, V., & Buckley, S. (2003). Targeting phonological representations can help in the early stages of reading in a non-dominant language. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 26(1), 49–68. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.261005>
- Nakeva von Mentzer, C., Lyxell, B., Sahlen, B., Wass, M., Lindgren, M., Ors, M., . . . Uhlen, I. (2013). Computer-assisted training of phoneme-grapheme correspondence for children who are deaf and hard of hearing: Effects on phonological processing skills. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, 77(12), 2049–2057. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2013.10.007>
- Niolaki, G. Z., Terzopoulos, A. R., & Masterson, J. (2017). A sublexical training study for spelling in a biliterate Greek- and English-speaking child. *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation*, 27(4), 540–562. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09602011.2015.1105825>
- Oller Darelid, M., Hartelius, L., & Lohmander, A. (2016). Generalised EPG treatment effect in a cochlear implant user maintained after 2 years. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 18(1), 65–76. <http://doi.org/10.3109/17549507.2015.1048827>
- Paatsch, L. E., Blamey, P. J., Sarant, J. Z., & Bow, C. P. (2006). The effects of speech production and vocabulary training on different components of spoken language performance. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 11(1), 39–55. <http://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enj008>
- Panteleimidou, V., Herman, R., & Thomas, J. (2003). Efficacy of speech intervention using electropalatography with a cochlear implant user. *Clinical Linguistics and Phonetics*, 17(4/5), 383–392. <http://doi.org/10.1080/0269920031000079958>
- Petersen, D. B., Thompson, B., Guiberson, M. M., & Spencer, T. D. (2016). Cross-linguistic interactions from second language to first language as the result of individualized narrative language intervention with children with and

- without language impairment. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 37(3), 703–724. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716415000211>
- Proctor, C. P., Dalton, B., & Grisham, D. L. (2007). Scaffolding English language learners and struggling readers in a universal literacy environment with embedded strategy instruction and vocabulary support. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 39(1), 71–93. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10862960709336758>
- Proctor, C. P., Dalton, B., Uccelli, P., Biancarosa, G., Mo, E., Snow, C., & Neugebauer, S. (2011). Improving comprehension online: Effects of deep vocabulary instruction with bilingual and monolingual fifth graders. *Reading and Writing*, 24(5), 517–544. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-009-9218-2>
- Reitsma, P. (2009). Computer-based exercises for learning to read and spell by deaf children. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 14(2), 178–189. <http://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enn031>
- Richels, C. G., Bobzien, J. L., Schwartz, K. S., Raver, S. A., Browning, E. L., & Hester, P. P. (2016). Teachers and peers as communication models to teach grammatical forms to preschoolers with hearing loss. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 37(3), 131–140. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1525740115598770>
- Richels, C. G., Schwartz, K. S., Bobzien, J. L., & Raver, S. A. (2016). Structured instruction with modified storybooks to teach morphosyntax and vocabulary to preschoolers who are deaf/hard of hearing. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 21(4), 352–361. <http://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enw049>
- Robertson, V. S., von Hapsburg, D., & Hay, J. S. (2017). The effect of hearing loss on novel word learning in infant- and adult-directed speech. *Ear and Hearing*, 38(6), 701–713. <http://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0000000000000455>
- Rochette, F., & Bigand, E. (2009). Long-term effects of auditory training in severely or profoundly deaf children. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1169, 195–198. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.04793.x>
- Roman, S., Rochette, F., Triglia, J. M., Schon, D., & Bigand, E. (2016). Auditory training improves auditory performance in cochlear implanted children. *Hearing Research*, 337, 89–95. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2016.05.003>
- Rudner, M., Andin, J., Rönnerberg, J., Heimann, M., Hermansson, A., Nelson, K., & Tjus, T. (2015). Training literacy skills through sign language. *Deafness and Education International*, 17(1), 8–18. <http://doi.org/10.1179/1557069X14Y.00000000037>
- Ruiz de Zarobe, Y., & Zenotz, V. (2015). Reading strategies and CLIL: The effect of training in formal instruction. *Language Learning Journal*, 43(3), 319–333. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2015.1053284>
- Salies, T. G., & Starosky, P. (2008). How a deaf boy gamed his way to second-language acquisition: Tales of intersubjectivity. *Simulation and Gaming*, 39(2), 209–239.
- Saunders, W. M., & Goldenberg, C. (1999). Effects of instructional conversations and literature logs on limited- and fluent-English-proficient students' story comprehension and thematic understanding. *The Elementary School Journal*, 99(4), 277–301. <http://doi.org/10.1086/461927>
- Schimmel, C. S., Edwards, S. G., & Prickett, H. T. (1999). Reading?... pah! (I got it!): Innovative reading techniques for successful deaf readers. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 144(4), 298–308. <http://doi.org/10.1353/aad.2012.0342>
- Schirmer, B. R., & Ingram, A. L. (2003). Using online chat to foster the written language development of students who are deaf. *Reading Online*, 7(1), 2–21.
- Schirmer, B. R., & Schaffer, L. (2010). Implementation of the guided reading approach with elementary school deaf students. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 155(3), 377–385.
- Shah-Wundenberg, M., Wyse, D., & Chaplain, R. (2013). Parents helping their children learn to read: The effectiveness of paired reading and hearing reading in a developing country context. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 13(4), 471–500. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1468798412438067>
- Silva, M. P., Comerlatto Junior, A. A., Balen, S. A., & Bevilacqua, M. C. (2012). O uso de um software na (re)habilitação de crianças com de ciência auditiva. [Software use in the (re)habilitation of hearing impaired children]. *Jornal da Sociedade Brasileira de Fonoaudiologia*, 24(1), 34–41.
- Silverman, R. D. (2007). Vocabulary development of English-language and English-only learners in kindergarten. *Elementary School Journal*, 107(4), 365–384. <http://doi.org/10.1086/516669>
- Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. (1999). Effects of bilingual and English as a second language adaptations of success for all on the reading achievement of students acquiring English. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 4(4), 393–416. http://doi.org/10.1207/s15327671espr0404_3
- Smith, A., & Wang, Y. (2010). The impact of Visual Phonics on the phonological awareness and speech production of a student who is deaf: A case study. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 155(2), 124–130.
- Soltero-González, L., Sparrow, W., Butvilofsky, S., Escamilla, K., & Hopewell, S. (2016). Effects of a paired literacy program on emerging bilingual children's biliteracy outcomes in third grade. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 48(1), 80–104. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X16653842>
- Spaai, G. W., Derksen, E. S., Hermes, D. J., & Kaufholz, P. A. (1996). Teaching intonation to young deaf children with the intonation meter. *Folia Phoniatrica et Logopaedica*, 48(1), 22–34. <http://doi.org/10.1159/000266379>
- Spycher, P. (2009). Learning academic language through science in two linguistically diverse kindergarten classes. *Elementary School Journal*, 109(4), 359–379. <http://doi.org/10.1086/593938>

- Swanson, T. J., Hodson, B. W., & Schommer-Aikins, M. (2005). An examination of phonological awareness treatment outcomes for seventh-grade poor readers from a bilingual community. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 36(4), 336–345. [http://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461\(2005/033\)](http://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461(2005/033))
- Syverud, S. M., Guardino, C., & Selznick, D. N. (2009). Teaching phonological skills to a deaf first grader: A promising strategy. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 154(4), 382–388.
- Tong, F., Lara-Alecio, R., Irby, B., Mathes, P., & Kwok, O.-m. (2008). Accelerating early academic oral English development in transitional bilingual and structured English immersion programs. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(4), 1011–1044. <http://doi.org/10.3102/0002831208320790>
- Townsend, D., & Collins, P. (2009). Academic vocabulary and middle school English learners: An intervention study. *Reading and Writing*, 22(9), 993–1019. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-008-9141-y>
- Trezek, B. J., & Hancock, G. R. (2013). Implementing instruction in the alphabetic principle within a sign bilingual setting. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 18(3), 391–408. <http://doi.org/deafed/ent016>
- Trezek, B. J., & Malmgren, K. W. (2005). The efficacy of utilizing a phonics treatment package with middle school deaf and hard-of-hearing students. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 10(3), 256–271. <http://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/eni028>
- Trezek, B. J., & Wang, Y. (2006). Implications of utilizing a phonics-based reading curriculum with children who are deaf or hard of hearing. *The Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 11(2), 202–213. <http://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enj031>
- Trezek, B. J., Wang, Y., Woods, D. G., Gampp, T. L., & Paul, P. V. (2007). Using visual phonics to supplement beginning reading instruction for students who are deaf or hard of hearing. *The Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 12(3), 373–384. <http://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enm014>
- Troia, G. A. (2004). Migrant students with limited English proficiency: Can Fast ForWord language make a difference in their language skills and academic achievement? *Remedial and Special Education*, 25(6), 353–366. <http://doi.org/10.1177/07419325040250060301>
- Trussell, J. W., & Easterbrooks, S. R. (2014). The effect of enhanced storybook interaction on signing deaf children's vocabulary. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 19(3), 319–332. <http://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/ent055>
- Trussell, J. W., & Easterbrooks, S. R. (2015). Effects of morphographic instruction on the morphographic analysis skills of deaf and hard-of-hearing students. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 20(3), 229–241. <http://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/env019>
- Tsybina, I., & Eriks-Brophy, A. (2010). Bilingual dialogic book-reading intervention for preschoolers with slow expressive vocabulary development. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 43(6), 538–556. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2010.05.006>
- Vadasy, P. F., Nelson, J. R., & Sanders, E. A. (2013). Longer term effects of a tier 2 kindergarten vocabulary intervention for English learners. *Remedial and Special Education*, 34(2), 91–101. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0741932511420739>
- Vadasy, P. F., & Sanders, E. A. (2013). Two-year follow-up of a code-oriented intervention for lower-skilled first-graders: The influence of language status and word reading skills on third-grade literacy outcomes. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 26(6), 821–843. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-012-9393-4>
- Vadasy, P. F., & Sanders, E. A. (2016). Attention to orthographic and phonological word forms in vocabulary instruction for kindergarten English learners. *Reading Psychology*, 37(6), 833–866. <http://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2015.1116477>
- van Staden, A. (2013). An evaluation of an intervention using sign language and multi-sensory coding to support word learning and reading comprehension of deaf signing children. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 29(3), 305–318. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0265659013479961>
- Vargas, A. U., Grskovic, J. A., Belfiore, P. J., & Halbert-Ayala, J. (1997). Improving migrant students' spelling of English and Spanish words with error correction. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, 7(1), 13–23.
- Vaughn, S., Cirino, P. T., Linan-Thompson, S., Mathes, P. G., Carlson, C. D., Hagan, E. C., . . . Francis, D. J. (2006). Effectiveness of a Spanish intervention and an English intervention for English-language learners at risk for reading problems. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(3), 449–487. <http://doi.org/10.3102/00028312043003449>
- Vaughn, S., Linan-Thompson, S., Mathes, P. G., Cirino, P. T., Carlson, C. D., Pollard-Durodola, S. D., . . . Francis, D. J. (2006). Effectiveness of Spanish intervention for first-grade English language learners at risk for reading difficulties. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 39(1), 56–73. <http://doi.org/10.1177/00222194060390010601>
- Vaughn, S., Mathes, P., Linan-Thompson, S., Cirino, P., Carlson, C., Pollard-Durodola, S., . . . Francis, D. (2006). Effectiveness of an English intervention for first-grade English language learners at risk for reading problems. *Elementary School Journal*, 107(2), 153–181. <http://doi.org/10.1086/510653>
- Wang, Y., & Paul, P. V. (2011). Integrating technology and reading instruction with children who are deaf or hard of hearing: The effectiveness of the Cornerstones project. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 156(1), 56–68. <http://doi.org/10.1353/aad.2011.0014>

- Wang, Y., Spychala, H., Harris, R. S., & Oetting, T. L. (2013). The effectiveness of a phonics-based early intervention for deaf and hard of hearing preschool children and its possible impact on reading skills in elementary school: A case study. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 158(2), 107–120. <http://doi.org/10.1353/aad.2013.0021>
- Werfel, K. L., Douglas, M., & Ackal, L. (2016). Small-group phonological awareness training for pre-kindergarten children with hearing loss who wear cochlear implants and/or hearing aids. *Deafness and Education International*, 18(3), 134–140. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14643154.2016.1190117>
- White, A. H., & Tripoli, L. J. (1996). Classroom assessment of the use of compact language drills: A technique borrowed from foreign language teaching. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 141(5), 346–351. <http://doi.org/10.1353/aad.2012.0223>
- Wolbers, K. A. (2008). Using balanced and interactive writing instruction to improve the higher order and lower order writing skills of deaf students. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 13(2), 257–277. <http://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enm052>
- Wolbers, K. A., Dostal, H. M., & Bowers, L. M. (2012). "I was born full deaf." Written language outcomes after 1 year of strategic and interactive writing instruction. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 17(1), 19–38. <http://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enr018>
- Wu, J. L., Yang, H. M., Lin, Y. H., & Fu, Q. J. (2007). Effects of computer-assisted speech training on Mandarin-speaking hearing-impaired children. *Audiology and Neuro-Otology*, 12(5), 307–312. <http://doi.org/10.1159/000103211>
- Zhang, D. (2016). Morphology in Malay–English biliteracy acquisition: An intervention study. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 19(5), 546–562. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1026873>