

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

The Story So Far: A Systematic Review of the Dialogic Reading Literature

This table presents the findings of a systematic review which aims to explore, synthesise and critically evaluate the extant dialogic reading literature.

Findings are organised according to sample and population, country of origin and setting, programme duration, language and literacy outcomes, social-emotional and other cognitive outcomes, impact and effect sizes to provide overview and insight into where and with whom DR is most effective.

Reference:

Pillinger, C., & Vardy, E. (in press). The Story So Far: A Systematic Review of the Dialogic Reading Literature. *Journal of Research in Reading*.

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

Authors / Country (MMAT* rating)	Pp/Sample/ Recruitment strategy.	Setting/ Duration	Aim & Methodology	Outcome measures	Findings relevant to study aim.
Arnold et al. (1994) USA (2*)	64 children (31 males and 33 females) & their mothers. Children aged 2 - 2,5 years. The children were from middle- to upper-SES families, above average language skills Recruited through advertisements in local newspapers.	Home – Mother +child 4 weeks Frequency & Duration of reading not stated	To develop and evaluate an inexpensive videotape training package for teaching DR techniques. Modified random assignment to either control condition, direct training condition & video training condition.	<u>Pre-test</u> Reynell PPVT-R <u>Post-test</u> EOWPVT ITPA-VE ITPA-GC PPVT-R (Form M) <u>Intervention Fidelity</u> : no	Videotape training provides a cost-effective means of implementing the DR intervention. Video-trained group outperformed control group on measures of expressive language. The video group scored 5.1 months ahead on the EOWPVT, 3.9 months ahead on the ITPA-VE and 3.3 months ahead on PPVT-R, although the difference was not significant. The video group outperformed the direct training group on the EOWPVT, PPVT-R, but no significant difference on the ITPA-VE. Direct training group outperformed the control group on the ITPA-VE only.

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

<p>Beschorner & Hutchison (2016)</p> <p>USA (2*)</p>	<p>2 groups: 17 face-to face 15 online</p> <p>Children 3-5 years.</p> <p>Program coordinator, recruited participants through the parent education organization's website, e-mails, and flyers.</p>	<p>Church, University Parent + child 9 weeks Frequency & Duration of reading not stated</p>	<p>Comparing face-to-face and online delivery methods for DR training.</p> <p>How does parent education in online and face-to-face settings influence shared storybook reading behaviors? What are the contextual factors that influence the experiences of participants in a parent education program on shared storybook reading in online and face-to-face settings?</p> <p>No control group</p>	<p>Video recording Interview, direct observation Adult Child Interactive Reading Inventory (ACIRI) <u>Intervention Fidelity</u>: no</p>	<p><u>Online group</u> There were statistically significant differences in parents' pre- and post-use of DR behaviors. The program increased the frequency of DR behaviors, the subtest scores for interactive reading strategies and literacy strategies increased significantly.</p> <p>There were statistically significant differences in children's pre- and post-intervention use of dialogue. Significant increase in children's use of interactive reading strategies and literacy strategies.</p> <p><u>Face to face group</u> There were statistically significant differences in parents' pre- and post-use of DR behaviors. The program increased the frequency of DR behaviors. The use of interactive reading strategies and literacy strategies also increased significantly.</p>
<p>Blomm-Hoffman et al. (2008)</p>	<p>18 carer-child dyads, 89% mothers</p> <p>11 White</p>	<p>Home - Health care centre</p>	<p>Examined the effect of the RTTT video on caregivers' use of DR behaviors when</p>	<p>Intervention Rating Profile</p>	<p><u>Parent verbalizations</u>: At 6 weeks there was a large effect (ES = 2.26) for intervention group and parent facilitating verbalizations. RTTT group revealed a 2-fold increase from pre-treatment compared with a small decrease in the control group.</p>

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

<p>USA (3*)</p>	<p>6 black 1 Asian/Pacific Islander</p> <p>RTTT group (10) Mean age = 3.7 years.</p> <p>Control Group (8) Mean Age = 3.1 years.</p> <p>Families were recruited for the study via targeted mailings, phone calls, and through fliers posted on the walls of the community medical centre.</p>	<p>Parents 12 weeks.</p> <p>Frequenc y & Duration of reading not stated</p>	<p>reading with their children.</p> <p>Randomized, control group, repeated measures design.</p>	<p>Video- observations, week 1, 6, 12 coded for on- and off-task verbalization s.</p> <p>On-task verbalization s = child comments about something related to the book</p> <p>Coded by 3 people till 90% agreement reached</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity: no</u></p>	<p>After 12 weeks large effect remained (ES = 1.36). RTTT group parents maintained high levels of facilitating verbalizations compared with low and stable verbalizations for control group parents.</p> <p><u>DR Strategies</u> RTTT parents used more page prompts (e.g., wh-type questions) than control parents. RTTT parents showed a greater use of evaluation prompts compared with control parents.</p> <p><u>Child Verbalizations</u> At 6-weeks, there was a large effect for intervention group (ES = .78) RTTT group children's on-task verbalizations increased, control group children's remained at a level similar to the first visit. At 12-weeks a very large effect as a result of the intervention was noted (ES = 1.26). RTTT children showed a twofold increase relative to pre-treatment in their levels of on-task verbalizations compared with control group children. Levels of off-task verbalizations were low in both groups (e.g., 3-15%).</p>
---------------------	--	---	---	---	--

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

<p>Chow & McBride (2003) Hong Kong (3*)</p>	<p>86 children (aged 4.83 - 5.92 years) Randomly selected children of normal intelligence attending 3rd year kindergarten in 2 Hong Kong kindergartens</p>	<p>Home 8 weeks hDR parents read twice a week for 15 minutes</p>	<p>To test experimentally the hypothesis that the DR intervention could produce greater gains in language and literacy skills of children compared with those engaged in typical parent-child reading. Randomly allocated within schools to 1 of 3 conditions, dialogic reading, typical reading and control.</p>	<p>Preschool and Primary Chinese Literacy Scale (PPCLS) Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test - Third Edition (PPVT-III), Raven's Coloured Progressive Matrices (RCPM) Hong Kong Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children Vocabulary subtest (HK-WISC)</p>	<p><u>PPCLS (character identification – visual/auditory discrimination)</u> Significant improvement for the DR condition only. Differences for the typical reading and the control conditions were not significant. <u>PPVT-III</u> Significant improvement for the DR condition, and the typical reading condition but not significant for the control. Medium Effect size for the PPCLS Character Identification, Visual and Auditory Discrimination Scales (ES = .47) <u>RCPM & HK-WISC</u> No significant difference between groups <u>Child's interest in reading (DR group parents)</u> After 8 weeks, 75.9% parents thought that it increased interest in reading, whereas 20.7% parents thought that it remained the same and 3.4% parents thought that it decreased.</p>
---	---	--	--	---	---

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

				<u>Intervention Fidelity:</u> no	
Chow et al. (2008) Hong Kong (3*)	148 Cantonese speaking children Aged 4.8 -5.9 years. 91 males: 57 females Children of normal intelligence attending 3rd year kindergarten were recruited	Home 12 weeks x2 20 min per week	To investigate the effects of parent-child shared book reading and metalinguistic training on the language and literacy skills of kindergartners Children were assigned randomly to one of the four conditions, the DR _ MT, DR, TR, and control conditions.	<u>Character Recognition</u> adapted from the Hong Kong Test of Specific Learning Difficulties in Reading and Writing (HKT-SpLD) <u>Vocabulary.</u> The Cantonese receptive vocabulary test.	After 12 weeks, the DR group attained higher vocabulary knowledge than the TR and control group. The DR + MT group improved significantly more in Chinese character recognition. Significant differences between the DR + MT and the TR conditions for morpheme identification and medium effect size for DR+MT Improvements in reading interest were found for DR and DR +MT compared to the control group. No significant differences between DR and TR. Medium ES for DR and DR+TR on reading interest

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

				<p><u>Morphologic al awareness.</u> morpheme identification task and morphologica l construction task</p> <p><u>Nonverbal IQ.</u> RCPM</p> <p><u>Reading interest</u> Questionnair e</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity:</u> no</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

<p>Chow et al. (2010) Hong Kong (3*)</p>	<p>51 Hong Kong kindergarteners 22 males and 29 females 4.8 - 5.9 years. Above average income Children of normal intelligence in 3rd year kindergarten were recruited from 3 Hong Kong Kindergartens</p>	<p>Home 12 weeks x2 20 min per week</p>	<p>To investigate the effects of dialogic parent-child reading in English on 51 Hong Kong kindergarteners learning English as a second language Children were randomly assigned to one of the three conditions: the DR, the TR and the control.</p>	<p><u>English word reading</u> PPVT-III <u>English Phonological Awareness</u> English syllable deletion and phoneme onset deletion tasks <u>Chinese character recognition</u> <u>Chinese receptive vocabulary</u> Hong Kong Cantonese Receptive Vocabulary Test and 30 items translated and adapted from PPVT <u>Chinese phonological awareness</u> -</p>	<p>The DR group showed significant gains on English Word Reading, English Phonological Awareness, Chinese Character Recognition, Chinese Receptive Vocabulary and Chinese Phonological Awareness. Effect sizes for DR= English word reading (.29), English PA (.36) and Chinese PA (.28) Effect sizes for TR = English word reading (.71) English PA (.04) and Chinese PA (.06). 93% of the parents reported that they liked DR while no parents disliked it. Reading interest not reported.</p>
--	--	---	--	---	---

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

				Chinese syllable deletion and phoneme onset deletion tasks <u>Reading interest.</u> Questionnaire <u>Intervention Fidelity:</u> Storybook identification	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

<p>Cohen & Kramer-Vida (2012) USA (3*)</p>	<p>3 teachers, 3 teaching assistants and 72 children, low SES, Aged 3.8-5.3 months. (27 females: 45 males) Included monolingual English (EO) speakers, bilingual speakers (DLL), and Spanish-dominant (DLL) No control group</p>	<p>Teachers 8 weeks Frequency & duration of reading not stated</p>	<p>To assess the effects of dialogic reading (DR) on child outcomes related to vocabulary development in English and Spanish Children enrolled in a state-funded public universal prekindergarten program, linked with higher education institution were recruited. Teachers trained to use RTTT Teachers implemented 1 or 2 days of whole-class DR instruction and 3 or 4 days of small-group learning based on the book of the week that had been introduced or repeatedly read</p>	<p>PPVT-4 Pre-Idea Proficiency Test (3rd edition) - Spanish Oral Free Recall Target Word test <u>Intervention fidelity:</u> no</p>	<p><u>Free Recall Target Word Test-</u> DR children recalled more words. All participants demonstrated increases in vocabulary over time, the EO (English only) revealed the greatest improvements. Children's vocabulary still improved even where the language of instruction did not match the child's dominant language.</p>
--	---	--	--	---	--

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

			through the DR method		
--	--	--	-----------------------	--	--

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

<p>Dale (1996) USA (4*)</p>	<p>33 children aged 3-6 years. 24 males; 9 females Mild to moderate language delays</p>	<p>6-8 weeks Home Mothers Frequency & Duration of reading not stated</p>	<p>How does DR program compare with CLTP (program focusing on conversation during play) in changing parents' language use and in increasing children's expressive language skills? Recruited from students enrolled in programs at the Experimental Education Unit, University of Washington. Randomly assigned to condition</p>	<p>Videotape recording analysed using CLAN <u>Intervention fidelity:</u> Reading logbook</p>	<p>A significant effect of program for number of different words used in the DR group. No significant effect for MLU, MLU increased in both groups from pre-test to post-test. There was a significant effect of episode (play vs book) for number of different words used (greater increase in play) and verbal questions about story/topic (decrease in play but not in book reading). There were two significant interactions between program and episode. Total number of utterances increased during the book-reading episode for the DR group, but decreased for the CLTP group. Modest increase for both groups in the play episode. For number of different words used, the episode effect was largely due to the DR group. <u>Intervention fidelity</u> Poor quality (missing data/inconsistency) of fidelity data prevented analysis</p>
<p>Elmonayer (2013) Egypt (2*)</p>	<p>67, 5-6 year olds Children were enrolled</p>	<p>School Group-based 8 weeks</p>	<p>Examined the effect of DR on the promotion of Arabic phonological awareness skills</p>	<p>Kindergarten inventory of phonological awareness</p>	<p>Children in the experimental group had higher phonological awareness levels than the control group.</p>

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

	<p>in the second level of kindergarten (KG2), in two private elementary schools.</p> <p>Control group= 1 school (<i>N</i>= 32 <i>Mean Age</i>= 65.34 months)</p> <p>DR group= 1 School (<i>N</i>= 35, <i>M Age</i> = 65.86 months)</p>	<p>Frequency & duration of reading not stated</p>	<p>of Egyptian kindergarteners compared to a control group who continued with their regular classroom activities. The equivalence between the participants of the two groups, in age, level of intelligence, and socioeconomic status, was verified statistically using t-test for independent samples</p>	<p><u>Intervention fidelity</u>: no</p>	
<p>Fielding-Barnsley & Purdie (2003)</p> <p>Australia (2*)</p>	<p>49 children 26=Exp Group: 23 control group 15 females 34 males</p>	<p>Home Video-tape training 8 weeks</p>	<p>Evaluate the effects of an 8 week DR programme with at-risk children, in the year prior to formal schooling compared to a control group continued with</p>	<p>PPVT Rhyme Recognition Test Concepts of Print Recognition of Initial</p>	<p>The DR group scored significantly higher than the control group on the PPVT, initial consonant, rhyme and CAP. <u>Follow-up</u>: At the end of the school year (9 months later), the DR group maintained a significant advantage on final consonant and CAP.</p>

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

	<p>Mean Age = 5.8 years.</p> <p>Children were selected from 17 schools in the local area</p>	<p>Each book was read at least 5 times per week</p>	<p>their regular classroom activities.</p> <p>At risk = family history of reading disability</p>	<p>Consonant Sound and Alphabet (RICSAs)</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity:</u> no</p>	
<p>Fleury (2013)</p> <p>USA</p> <p>(0*)</p>	<p>3 males aged 4:4, 5:11, 3:4 years with ASD.</p> <p>Participants were recruited from a university affiliated comprehensive early childhood program.</p>	<p>School</p> <p>5 weeks</p> <p>9 sessions in total across 5 weeks.</p> <p>Duration of sessions not stated.</p>	<p>Examine the effect of a dialogic reading intervention on book reading participation for three preschool boys with ASD.</p> <p>Classroom teachers nominated students based on the following eligibility criteria: (1) clinical diagnosis of ASD; (2) able to sit and attend to activities lasting five minutes; (3) communicate verbally using phrase speech consisting of</p>	<p>On-task behaviour</p> <p>Verbal participation</p> <p>Response to prompt type</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity:</u> observation coded with inter-rater reliability</p>	<p>DR group children demonstrated increased rates of child verbal participation: participated in longer book readings while maintaining high levels of engagement.</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity</u></p> <p>Good compliance</p>

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

			at least 2–3 words or better. No Control group		
Fung et al. (2005) Hong Kong (2*)	28 deaf and hard-of-hearing children in kindergarten, first, or second grade. 5:2 to 9:1 years.	8 weeks Mothers Home Read total of 8 storybook, twice each, 15-30min each time.	Investigate whether the DR intervention program was effective in improving the receptive vocabulary skills of deaf and hard-of-hearing children in HK 17 children were recruited from one local school for the deaf (The Hong Kong School for the Deaf) while the remaining 11 were recruited from 5 different mainstreamed schools through the Special Education Resource Center of the Education Department	Raven's Coloured Progressive Matrices Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test–Third Edition (PPVT–III) <u>Intervention fidelity: no</u>	The DR group produced the largest improvements in receptive vocabulary learning, controlling for age and degree of hearing loss.

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

			with random allocation to condition: DR, typical reading or control group.		
Ganotice et al. (2017) Hong Kong (0*)	48 Cantonese speaking parents and their children Children aged 3-12 years. 38 mothers; 9 fathers; 1 not indicated. Children were enrolled in 6 primary schools in HK. Identified as having relational problems with parents.	Home 12 weeks Read 2 books per week, 20 min each time	Investigate the potential affective/psychosocial efficacy of collaborative DR for parents who demonstrated relational concerns with their primary school children. No control group. Group 1 - Parents of children in Primary 1&2 Group 2- Parents of children in Primary 3-6 Training x3, 2 hour sessions	Parent-Child Relationship Inventory <u>Intervention fidelity:</u> Reading log	Parents with younger children gave better appraisal of the parent-child relationship after the intervention (higher satisfaction with parenting and communication). Parents with older children reported improved satisfaction with parenting and communication but the differences were not statistically significant. Significant improvement was reported in the autonomy given to their children. Both groups demonstrated improvement in social desirability after the intervention: ES ranged from .39 to .44. No significant differences were found for group on role orientation, limit setting, involvement, and parental support. <u>Intervention fidelity</u> Intervention fidelity according to reading logs was good

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

<p>Grygas-Coogle et al. (2018)</p> <p>USA</p> <p>(3*)</p>	<p>4 males with ASD aged 3.5 -4.5 years, attending an inclusive preschool. All White, non-Hispanic</p>	<p>School Graduate Assistant</p> <p>1-4 per week for 6 months</p>	<p>Examine the effects of DR delivered using traditional paperback books and technology enhanced books on the vocabulary acquisition of 4 pre-schoolers with ASD. For each book, 30 words were randomly assigned to conditions (10 to traditional DR, 10 to DR + technology, 10 to control)</p>	<p>PPVT-R EVT-2</p> <p>Researcher-developed target vocabulary-naming assessment plus measure of definition knowledge</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity:</u> All DR sessions recorded using a video camera</p>	<p>DR is an effective method to enhance the vocabulary outcomes of children identified with ASD. Children with ASD increased vocabulary knowledge during DR sessions as evidenced by vocabulary naming, whether taught using the traditional paperback book or using a Surface tablet.</p> <p>Definitional knowledge: variability across participants, books and intervention conditions.</p> <p>Sam made no definitional gains, suggesting neither condition was effective in enhancing his definitional knowledge.</p> <p>Carter made equal definitional gains in both conditions, which indicates both conditions were equally effective in definitional gains.</p> <p>Gregory made definitional gains in both conditions, but he made greater gains in the DR condition, suggesting the DR condition was more effective in enhancing his definitional knowledge.</p> <p>Although made greater definitional gains in the DR + T condition,</p> <p>High level of procedural <u>fidelity</u> (2 independent observers average 90-100% agreement across conditions)</p>
<p>Grygas-Coogle et al. (2020)</p> <p>USA</p> <p>(3*)</p>	<p>1 male, White non-Hispanic aged 4 years boy with ASD attending public preschool.</p>	<p>School – Teacher</p> <p>1:1</p> <p>1 10-15 min session per day</p>	<p>Case study to determine the effect of DR, modelling, and DR + modelling on expressive vocabulary identification</p>	<p>Author developed checklist of target vocabulary</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity:</u></p>	<p>Enhanced labelling of target vocabulary within each intervention condition for both children</p> <p>Both children demonstrated an immediate and the greatest effect on labelling of target vocabulary in the DR condition</p> <p>High level of procedural <u>fidelity</u> 96-100% agreement across conditions.</p>

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

	1 white-Hispanic female aged 5 years with ASD attending public preschool	for each condition .		observation and videotape	
Hargrave & Senechal (2000) Canada (4*)	36 children (21 females and 15 males) between the ages of 3- 5 years. Children were recruited from two day-care centres catering for low-income families.	Daycare & Home Teachers Group based 4 weeks Frequency & duration of reading sessions not stated	Examined the effects of regular storybook reading and DR on the acquisition of vocabulary of 36 preschool children who had poor expressive vocabulary skills, Averaging 13 months behind chronological age. One day care centre = DR, One day care centre= RR	PPVT-R EOWPVT-R <u>Intervention fidelity:</u> 2 classroom observations Parental book checklist	DR group - significantly larger gains in vocabulary introduced in the books and standardised expressive vocabulary test than RR children. <u>Intervention fidelity</u> Teachers and parents demonstrated good compliance to the intervention

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

	<p>98% eligible for government funded day care</p> <p>Parental education below the national average</p>		<p>Not stated if random allocation</p>		
<p>Huebner (2000a)</p> <p>USA</p> <p>(2*)</p>	<p>Dialogic reading condition ($n = 88$)</p> <p>Control group ($n = 41$).</p> <p>2 - 2.9 years.</p> <p>54 males: 34 females</p> <p>Announcements</p>	<p>Library & Home Children's librarians teach parents DR</p> <p>6 weeks</p> <p>5-10 min per day for 6 weeks</p>	<p>Evaluated the efficacy of an adapted version of DR (modified for broad dissemination) to 4 branches of a city library</p> <p>Random allocation to DR or control group (existing library services for parent-child)</p>	<p>Adult's Reading Ability.</p> <p>Revised Denver Pre-screening Developmental Questionnaire</p> <p>Children's Reading Exposure</p>	<p>DR group parents used more DR behaviours during reading. Compared to the control group used twice as many multiword utterances, more one-word utterances, and had longer MLU-s.</p> <p>Adjusting for differences in expressive language at pre-test, the average post-test ITPA verbal expressive subtest score was 41 points for the DR group and 34 points for the control group. Differences in post-test PPVT and EOWPVT-R scores also favoured the DR group but were not statistically significant.</p> <p><u>Follow-up</u> – no intervention group effect on PPVT or EOWPVT-R scores. Differences between groups on the ITPA verbal expressive subtest were no longer statistically significant.</p> <p>Audiotapes of home reading showed DR group used techniques at home and continued to do so 3 months after intervention.</p>

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

	were posted in neighbourhood businesses, local newspapers, children's health clinics and day care, community, and activity centres within a low-income housing facility.			Parenting Stress Index PPVT-R EOWPVT-R ITPA <u>Intervention fidelity:</u> Audio recording at 4 time points during intervention	Changes in DR parent's manner of reading were associated with changes in the child's reading style; children became more involved in telling the story, spoke more often and used more multi-phrase utterances and more complex speech. PSI: Control group parents more likely to report elevated stress. 29% of control group families and 6% of DR families scored above the cut off for high stress. <u>Intervention fidelity</u> Good compliance to the intervention
Huebner (2000b) USA (1*)	61 parent-child dyads (2-3yrs) Low socio-economic status 7 children were 1-3	6 weeks Mothers home Frequency and duration not specified	Whether DR could be adapted to communities characterised by widespread poverty and low levels of adult education. Does DR change the home literacy activities of families in low SES	Parent interview to assess children interest in books and reading patterns/frequency and children's	Frequency of home reading doubled, and significantly more parents reported their children enjoyed shared reading. MLU increased from 4.1 words to 4.7. Parental reports indicated the intervention had 'dramatic effects' on increasing children's enjoyment of reading and children were read to more frequently: the number of children read to 5 or more times a week increased from 16% to 47%.

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

	<p>months below the level expected for their chronological age, 31 children were 4 or more months below the expected level and 7 were 12 or more months below expected level.</p> <p>Although the expected mean length of utterance (MLU) for a child of 26 months is 6.0 words the children in the study had an average</p>	<p>No control group</p>	<p>communities in ways that are pleasurable and desirable to parents and their pre-school children?</p> <p>Recruited through family centres, informational posters, announcements in the local newspaper, word of mouth.</p> <p>Intervention conducted at each site, no control group (no randomisation)</p>	<p>enjoyment of books</p> <p>Phrase length – parents recall longest sentence/phrase they had heard from the child. (proxy for grammatical skill)</p> <p>MacArthur Short Form Vocabulary Checklist Level 2 (parent report inventory of expressive vocab)</p> <p>Post-test Parent satisfaction survey</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity:</u></p>	<p>Although the frequency of out-of-home literacy activities changed little, parents reported the intervention boosted their child’s motivation and helped their child acquire new language skills. Parents also stated they would continue using DR having enjoyed the physical closeness and positive involvement of spending time reading with their child one-to-one</p>
--	--	-------------------------	--	--	--

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

	MLU of 4.1 words.				
Huebner & Meltzoff (2005) USA (4*)	125, 2-3 years and 125 parents. 95 Instruction group – 30 control group 65 females; 60 males Mail invitation, advertisement in paper, tv interview with PI, flyers in public locations. Research staff attending libraries, children's centres and playgroups	8 weeks Home – Parents (96% Mother) Read daily 5-10 min per day	Examined conditions under which DR could be implemented in a community setting. Comparing a) in person video-instruction in small groups b) self-instruction by video and telephone follow-up c) self-instruction by video alone. Randomly allocated to condition.	Observation and coding of parent-child reading behaviour Parent Survey on children's reading experiences (frequency/enjoyment) – Baseline only <u>Intervention fidelity</u> : no	Instruction yielded 4-fold increase in parents DR behaviours and had a significant positive effect on the number of words children used and mean length of utterance. Although shared reading was prevalent in the sample prior to instruction. DR instruction was associated with large and significant differences in reading style. All methods of training were effective in increasing DR behaviours with no significant differences between the measures.

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

	inviting parents in person to participate.				
Huebner & Payne (2010) USA (0*)	78 parents and their children; 41 had participated in the previous DR intervention and 37 parent-child dyads had no prior experience with when the children were 2-3 years for 8 weeks 40 males; 38 females	2 year follow-up after 8 week DR training 94% of mothers Home	The present study is a long-term follow-up of parents who received instruction in dialogic reading when their children were 2 or 3 years of age. The goal was to learn if parents taught the techniques of dialogic reading when their children were young continued to read this way as their children grew older	Questionnaire – literacy experiences / demographic info <i>Parent-child reading style:</i> audio recording of parent-child reading coded for DR behaviours	Controlling for maternal education, child's age, and frequency of family reading, DR parents used on average 90% more DR behaviours than non-DR parents. Use of DR behaviours was associated with more active participation of the child in the reading session

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

	Parents were invited by postcard or telephone call to participate				
Huenekens & Xu (2016) USA (2*)	15 DLL preschool children aged 4-5 years. First language was Spanish	6 weeks School Spanish version 5-10min sessions for 6 weeks	Examined the effects of DR on preschool-age dual language learners' (DLL) early literacy skills The children were enrolled in a preschool programme No control group	Get ready to read! Screening tool – revised <u>Intervention fidelity:</u> 10-item checklist which is adapted from the Adult–Child Interactive Reading Inventory	DR in young DLLs' home language (Spanish) improved their Spanish PA and AK skills. PND Effect sizes indicated 5 participants fell into the effective or very effective range; 4 into the questionable effectiveness range and 6 were rated as ineffective. Significant differences in pre-post intervention scores on tests of English language emergent literacy skills suggest the Spanish language reading experience might have increased the participants' English language emergent literacy skills No significant differences in the change for English scores compared with the change in Spanish scores on emergent literacy skills, suggesting the Spanish-version of DR increased the participants' emergent literacy skills in English and Spanish at similar rates. <u>Intervention fidelity</u> Compliance to the intervention was good
Jimenez 2006 USA (1*)	16 Spanish-speaking Latina/o caregivers	Home Spanish version	To determine whether training mostly Spanish speaking families to implement shared reading	Videotape recording of reading session and coding of	Increases in parents' strategy use and overall verbal participation. Children's productive language and relative participation increased significantly: average number of turns, word types, word tokens, and MLU increased significantly.

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

<p>and their children.</p> <p>7-8 years. 13 males and 3 females.</p> <p><i>N= 14</i> Spanish was main language</p> <p>Low SES</p> <p>Participated in previous project, stated they would like additional information about reading with children</p>	<p>5 weeks</p> <p>Caregiver</p> <p>Frequency & duration of reading sessions not stated</p>	<p>strategies in the home language will increase parents' use of these reading strategies and verbal participation. Whether such training would result in increases in quantity and variety of child language during storybook reading interactions in the home language.</p> <p>No control group</p>	<p>parent-child interactions</p> <p>Total number of different words (word types) and total number of words (word tokens) produced, which was considered an indicator of lexical development (Menyuk, 1988), was calculated using the frequency word count feature of CLAN.</p> <p>Child's MLT</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity:</u></p>	<p><u>Intervention fidelity</u> Good compliance to the intervention</p>
--	--	---	--	---

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

				Videotape observation	
Kotaman (2008) Turkey (2*)	40 parents (80% mother) and 40 children Control = 12 female; 8 male 3.2-5 years (<i>M</i> age = 3.9years) DR = 9 females; 11 males. 3.3-4.9 years (<i>M</i> Age = 3.9years) 83% middle class households Children were recruited from local	Home 7 weeks Caregiver Frequency & Duration of reading sessions not stated	Whether DR increases children's receptive vocabulary, positively impacts on children's reading attitudes and whether there a relationship between children's receptive vocabulary development and reading attitudes Pretest-posttest, control-group design with random assignment to DR or control group	Turkish version of PPVT Preschool Reading Attitudes Scale (PRAS) school reading, non-school reading and library use <u>Intervention fidelity:</u> Reading log	Pretest - Post-test mean scores on the PPVT increased for both the DR and control group but only the difference was only significant for the DR group. PPVT scores for the DR group increased significantly more than the control group. Significant increases in DR children's reading attitude scores. No significant relationship between the increase in PPVT and reading scale scores for either group <u>Intervention fidelity</u> Not reported

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

	private school.				
La Cour et al. (2013) USA (2*)	Low SES Recruited from two Head Start Centers. 4 years old Center 1: <i>n</i> = 7 Center 2: <i>n</i> = 5 students	Home 7 weeks Caregiver Frequency & duration of reading sessions not stated	Whether training parents to use DR techniques would improve (parents perceived) pre-Kindergarten children's attitude and interest in reading	Survey based on Readiness for Reading component of the BRIGANCE Diagnostic Comprehensive Inventory of Basic Skills Revised (CIBS-R). measured attitude and interest in reading <u>Intervention fidelity:</u> no	Student interest in reading improved Attitude toward reading, both for children and caregivers, improved. Confidence of caregiver improved
Lever & Senechal (2011) Canada (2*)	40 English speaking children, 5-6 years. 22 females 18 males	2x per week for 8 weeks Researchers	Whether an 8 week DR intervention enhances the fictional narrative skills of children entering formal education	Edmonton Narrative Norms Instrument (ENNI) PPVT-III	<u>Grammar units</u> DR children had significantly higher total story grammar scores than the AT group. DR children provided significantly more internal thought and feeling references in their production narratives, and in their retelling narratives than AT children.

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

	<p>Low SES</p> <p>Recruited from pre-school serving low-income families</p>	<p>Pre-school setting</p>	<p>Random assignment to DR or AT (alternative treatment group -phoneme awareness program)</p>	<p>Unique measure of Expressive vocabulary</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity:</u> session attendance</p>	<p>Using PPVT-III and pre-test scores as covariates, DR children provided significantly more structure to their production narratives, but the effect on post-test retelling was no longer significant.</p> <p><u>Language Complexity</u> The number of words in the story, the type of token ratio, and MLU were analysed as measures of language complexity with pre-test scores as covariates, there was no significant differences between groups on any of the language complexity indicators</p> <p><u>Contextual knowledge</u> During the production task, DR children provided references to persons and objects that used decontextualized language more appropriately than the AT group.</p> <p><u>Cohesion</u> No significant differences in the number of different connectives used were found between groups on post-test</p> <p><u>Expressive Vocabulary</u> DR children correctly named, on average, more than 2 / 16 words whereas the AT children provided fewer than 2 /16 words.</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity</u> Good compliance to the intervention</p>
<p>Lonigan & Whitehurst (1998)</p>	<p>91 children ranged in age</p>	<p>6 weeks Teachers</p>	<p>The present study followed the design employed by</p>	<p>PPVT-R EOWPVT ITPA-VE</p>	<p>ES for the intervention on the EOWPVT in the high compliance centres was .41.</p>

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

<p>USA (4*)</p>	<p>from 2.75 - 5 years. 49 females; 42 males 91.2% African American. Low SES</p>	<p>Parents School-Home Frequency & Duration of reading sessions not stated</p>	<p>Whitehurst, Arnold et al. (1994); however, a third intervention group that involved just parent reading was included. The effectiveness of teacher-only, combined teacher and parent, and parent-only reading was compared to a no-treatment control condition</p> <p>The children were recruited from low-income families who attended subsidized childcare</p> <p>Children were pre-tested and randomly assigned to 1 of 4 conditions: (a) no treatment control, (b) a school condition in which children were read to by their teachers in small</p>	<p><u>Post test</u> EOWPVT-R</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity:</u> Reading logbooks and session observation</p>	<p>ES for individual intervention groups on the EOWPVT in the high compliance centres ranged from .30 for the school group to .74 for the school+home group. On the ITPA-VE, the overall ES= .44 and ranged from .18 in the school group to 1.19 in the home group.</p> <p>Effects of the intervention also were found on more naturalistic measures of children's expressive language during shared reading. In the high compliance centres, ES for the intervention groups on the unfamiliar book ranged from .63 for MLU to 1.03 for total words produced.</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity</u> 60% return of reading logs. There was no evidence of systematic differences in frequency of parent reading across centres or the two groups involving home reading ($p > .47$), and whether or not parents returned their reading logs was not associated with centre compliance with the intervention ($t_9 > .25$). There was no significant relation between parents' reports of reading frequency and children's scores on the outcome measures.</p>
---------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

			groups, (c) a home condition in which children were read to by their parents, and (d) a combined school plus home condition. Parents and teachers were trained in a specific form of interactive reading via an instructional videotape. In-school reading was conducted in small groups of 5 children.		
Lonigan et al. (1999) USA (2*)	95 children from low-income families. 2 - 5.3 years. 44 females; 54 males 77% African Americans	6 weeks. Daily for 10-15 min The study was conducted in two waves across 2	The present study was designed to examine the differential efficacy of center-based dialogic reading and typical shared-reading with children from low-income families. Randomly assigned to 1 of 3 conditions: (a) no-treatment control, (b) typical shared-	<u>Oral Language Measures</u> PPVT-R EOWPT-R ITPA-VE Listening Comprehension subtest, Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Battery (WJ-LC	Changes in ITPA-VE scores were greater for the TR and DR groups than the no-treatment group. No significant differences between the TR and DR groups. The DR group showed greater improvements on the ITPA-VE standard scores for DR group children was 4.97 (SD = 6.63), compared to 2.69 (SD = 8.83) for the TR group children and -0.44 (SD = 7.26) for no treatment group children. The DR group children experienced 5.4 months more development in descriptive language than the no-treatment group. The TR group children experienced 2.5 months more development in this area than the no-treatment group.

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

	Children recruited were from low-income families attending one of five subsidized childcare centers in the area	school years. For both intervention groups an undergraduate volunteer read to children in small groups.	reading condition, and (c) dialogic (interactive) shared-reading condition	<u>Phonological Sensitivity Measures</u> Rhyme Oddity Detection Alliteration Oddity Detection Sound Blending Sound Elision <u>Intervention fidelity:</u> reading logs	<p>Changes in WJ-LC scores across time were greater for the DR and TR groups than the no treatment group and did not differ significantly between the TR and DR groups.</p> <p>Changes in WJ-LC scores were greater for the TR than the no-treatment group, however, no differences were found for changes in WJ-LC scores between the DR and no-treatment group.</p> <p>The TR group outperformed the DR and no treatment groups on measures of listening comprehension and alliteration detection.</p> <p>Overall intervention ES = .77 for DR group and .51 for TR group. For the ITPA-VE, DR = .51 and TR = .77 For the WJ-LC, DR = .36 and TR = .70.</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity</u> Good compliance with the intervention</p>
Lonigan et al. (2013) USA (2*)	324 children Mean age = 4.5 years. 149 females, 175 males.	School Project staff 10 – 15 min per	To evaluate the efficacy of interventions designed to promote the development of emergent literacy skills, and to examine	PPVT-R EOWPVT-R CELF-P:BC Word Identification subtest of the WRMT-R	<p>DR children scored significantly higher than children in the contrast comparison groups on the Vocabulary composite, the EOWPVT-R, and the Basic Concepts subtest of the CELF-P.</p> <p>DR groups children also scored significantly higher than children in the contrast comparison groups on the Blending composite.</p>

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

<p>82% African American, 14% White, and 4% other</p> <p>Children were recruited for this study across 2 years from 13 Head Start centres and Title I preschools</p>	<p>day, 5 days a week for the school year</p>	<p>experimentally the specific and synergistic effects of the different interventions.</p> <p>Randomized to DR+PA DR+LK DR+PA+LK Standard SR+PA+LK Control Group</p>	<p><u>Phonological awareness</u></p> <p>*Rhyme Oddity *Rhyme Matching *Blending words *Blending syllables and phonemes task *Blending multiple choice task *Elision words task *Elision syllables and phonemes task *Elision multiple choice task <u>Print knowledge measures</u> *Letter name knowledge task</p>	
---	---	---	--	--

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

				<p>*Letter sound knowledge task</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity:</u> no</p>	
<p>Maul et al. (2014)</p> <p>USA (2*)</p>	<p>3 children aged 5.7-6:8 years scoring below the 7th percentile on the expressive language portion of the CELF</p> <p>2 females; 1 male</p> <p>Recruited from local university clinic, children's hospital</p>	<p>6 weeks</p> <p>4 times a week, 40 min each session</p> <p>All sessions conducted by graduate student</p>	<p>The purpose of this study was to investigate the efficacy of embedding language therapy in dialogic storybook reading as a method that speech-language pathologists (SLPs) can use to teach morphologic structures to children with language disorders, while exposing them to literacy materials</p> <p>Are DR techniques embedded in language therapy during shared storybook reading</p>	<p>Percentages of correct responses during treatment were calculated for each session based only on evoked responses.</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity:</u> 25% of sessions observed</p>	<p>Although each of the participants made good progress, they did not make equal progress.</p> <p>Participant A performed well during treatment, with accuracy levels of 80% or above for 10 of her 17 treatment sessions, but her correct response rate dropped during generalization probes, to a level of 40% during conversational speech probe.</p> <p>Participant B made the most progress. She also progressed most rapidly, requiring only seven sessions to reach a criterion level of 90% accuracy across three consecutive treatment sessions and maintaining that level of accuracy across all three probe procedures.</p> <p>Participant C had the most variable performance during treatment, but he achieved an accuracy of 70% during the conversational speech probe. Although Participants A and C performed less well than Participant B, there was considerable growth from the baseline condition, which was uniformly 0% for all three participants.</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity</u> Good compliance with the intervention</p>

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

			between SLPs and children effective in teaching bound morphemes to children diagnosed with language disorders?		
Opel et al. (2009) Bangladesh (2*)	75 = intervention group (49 male; 26 female) 78 = control group (40 male; 38 female) Low SES 5 preschools were randomly selected to be intervention schools and 5 to be controls	4 weeks Read 1 book in 3 days, 30-40min each day. Whole class group (20-25 children) Teacher	The purpose of the study was to examine the efficacy of a 4-week dialogic reading intervention with rural Bangladeshi pre-schoolers with the intention of increasing their expressive vocabulary Intervention conducted in Bangla Random allocation	<u>New vocabulary test</u> assessed children expressive vocabulary in terms of definitions of 170 challenging words before and after the program and compared with that of control children who participated in the regular language program.	Brief DR intervention resulted in increases in children's expressive vocabulary. DR group rose from a mean of 26% to 54%, whereas control children did not improve. <u>Intervention fidelity</u> Good fidelity to the intervention

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

				<u>Intervention fidelity:</u> Daily visits to observe sessions	
Pfeiffer-Flores et al. (2014) Brazil (1*)	2 males (8 years) 1 female (7years) Recruited from the public and private elementary school	3 weeks 20-30 min, 4 afternoons a week. School library & Psychological care centre of the university Researcher conducted the sessions	Investigated the effects of dialogic reading on textual comprehension of a children's novel, with three Brazilian children aged 7-8 years. Case Study No control	(a) <u>Free Retelling</u> (general instructions to retell the story), (b) <u>Directed Retelling</u> (fixed questions about the setting, characters and parts of the story), and (c) <u>Sentence Game</u> (judgment of sentences as true or false in relation to the story).	Both P1 and P2 included more events and more narrative functions in the retelling tasks when exposed to DR and P2 also showed improved performance in the Sentence Game (P1 did not participate in this task). Performance on comprehension tasks was higher with DR. <u>Intervention fidelity</u> Good compliance to the intervention

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

				<u>Intervention fidelity:</u> Session's video-recorded	
Pillinger & Wood (2013) UK (4*)	18 males and male reading partner 5.2 and 8.4 years (Mean 6.3 years) Low SES	6 weeks 15-20 min per day Home Father – male caregiver	Examine whether regular DR with an adult male has a greater impact on young boys' receptive vocabulary, reading attainment and reading fluency than traditional styles of shared book reading. Opt-in procedure from one school in Coventry, UK. Randomly allocated to either the DR condition or regular shared reading (SR) condition. Adults were trained in the two approaches using a self-instruction training DVD.	BPVS Multi-dimensional Fluency scale NGRT <u>Intervention fidelity:</u> reading logbooks	Standardised vocabulary scores increased for all children during the 6 week intervention, but the gains were greater for DR group children than SR group children. Mean reading attainment scores as measured by the NGRT did not improve for the DR group. Although mean reading fluency scores increased for all children, gains were larger for the SR group than the DR group <u>Effect sizes</u> indicated that experience of DR accounted for 15% of the variance in receptive vocabulary growth. Exposure to SR accounted for 13% growth in reading attainment and 12% change in reading fluency over the course of the intervention. <u>Intervention fidelity</u> Cannot be determined – poor response rate / incomplete data

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

<p>Pillinger & Wood (2014)</p> <p>UK</p> <p>(4*)</p>	<p>4 children (all girls)</p> <p>4.1 to 4.7years</p> <p>Low SES</p>	<p>Home</p> <p>6 Weeks</p> <p>10min, 6 days a week</p> <p>Mothers</p>	<p>This exploratory study compared the relative impact of parental DR and shared reading interventions on 4-year-old children's early literacy skills and parental attitudes to reading prior to and following school entry.</p> <p>Recruited from a single pre-school unit in Coventry, UK.</p> <p>Parents were trained using a self-instruction training DVD.</p>	<p>Concepts about print and writing vocabulary (CAP- Clay, 2002), rhyme awareness (Frederickson et al., 1997) and word reading (British Ability Scales II; Elliott et al. 1996)</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity:</u> reading logbooks</p>	<p>Findings indicated that DR had a positive impact on children's enjoyment of reading, CAP parent-child reading behaviours and parental attitudes to joint storybook reading. The children who experienced SR also demonstrated improvements in word reading. There were no changes in rhyme awareness or writing vocabulary for either group.</p> <p><u>Follow-up</u> (3 months): Changes in print concept awareness were not maintained, but improvements in writing vocabulary and word reading scores were noted.</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity</u> Compliance with the intervention was good</p>
<p>Rahn et al. (2016)</p> <p>USA</p> <p>(3*)</p>	<p>2 females (3 and 4 years)</p> <p>1 male (4 years)</p> <p>All children received</p>	<p>2 weeks</p> <p>Two 5 min sessions each day, 5 days a</p>	<p>Compare the expressive use of thematic vocabulary by three preschool children with developmental delays during Dialogic Reading, a shared</p>	<p>PPVT-4 EVT-2</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity:</u> Videotape recording of sessions –</p>	<p>DR, SR and ABI methods increased children's use of target vocabulary and were similarly effective for increasing expressive use of thematic vocabulary by pre-schoolers with disabilities.</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity</u> Good compliance to the intervention</p>

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

	special education services and were eligible for free or reduced lunch.	week for 2 weeks. School - delivered by graduate student	book reading intervention, and Activity Based Intervention, a naturalistic play-based teaching method. Children attending pre-kindergarten in two public schools in a small Mid-Atlantic city were recruited Research Question 1: Are there differences in rate of use of thematic vocabulary during DR and ABI conditions? Research Question 2: Are there differences in maintenance in each condition? Research Question 3: Are there differences in generalization in each condition?	checklist for coding	
--	---	---	--	----------------------	--

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

<p>Reese et al. (2010) USA (1*)</p>	<p>33 low-income parents and their children attending Head Start. Control ($n = 11$) DR ($n = 10$) 10 boys; 23 girls Elaborative Reminiscing (N=12) 8 non-Hispanic 12 Hispanic 13 non-Hispanic black. 48% bi-lingual</p>	<p>1 year Daily Home Parent+child</p>	<p>This study compared the unique effects of training low-income mothers in dialogic reading versus elaborative reminiscing on children's oral language and emergent literacy Our aim in this study was to compare the effects of training low-income mothers in dialogic reading versus elaborative reminiscing on the oral language and emergent literacy skills of Head Start children. Randomly assigned to either dialogic reading, elaborative reminiscing, or a control condition</p>	<p>PPVT-III EVT Story comprehension task, researchers read a storybook to children and then asked six comprehension questions to test recall of characters' names, key plot events, simple inferences about character motivation and main idea. Story retell – coded for recall and quality</p>	<p>Elaborative reminiscing resulted in marginal increases in children's story comprehension compared to a control condition. However, children whose mothers were trained in elaborative reminiscing did not have better expressive vocabulary skills or tell longer stories than children in the other conditions Training low-income mothers in DR did not result in increases in children's narrative or expressive vocabulary skills. Children in the DR condition may actually have decreased their narrative quality scores over time, whereas the children in the elaborative reminiscing and control group showed increases from pre-test to post-test. <u>Intervention fidelity</u> Could not be determined due to incomplete data</p>
---	--	--	--	--	---

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

				<p>The Concepts About Print test (Clay,1979)</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity:</u> home visit-observation</p>	
<p>Sim et al. (2013)</p> <p>Australia (4*)</p>	<p>80 children</p> <p>42 males 38 females</p> <p>4.92 to 6.25 years ($M = 5.53, SD = 0.33$).</p> <p>68 mothers 5 fathers 2 others</p> <p>79% Caucasian 19% Asian 3% Other 9% receive income from</p>	<p>8 weeks</p> <p>3 times per week</p> <p>Home</p> <p>Recruited from 3 catholic schools</p>	<p>To examine the effects of two home reading interventions provided to five- to six-year-old children during the year prior to formal schooling. Three intervention conditions were compared: DR alone, DR+PR, and an attention-matched control condition (control).</p> <p>RCT - Families were randomly assigned to one of three groups: dialogic reading</p>	<p>PPVT-IV Hundred Pictures Naming Test (HPNT PAT, Phonological Abilities CAP, Concepts about Print</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity:</u> Weekly phone calls & Reading logs</p>	<p>Children in the DR and DR+PR group showed greater improvement on the HPNT, PAT-Rhyme, and CAP than the control group.</p> <p>There were no differences for the PPVT, PAT-Word Completion, or PAT-Alphabet Knowledge. There were no significant differences on any of the measures between the intervention conditions of DR+PR and DR groups at post-intervention.</p> <p><u>Follow-up (3 months):</u> children in both the intervention groups, DR+PR and DR, had maintained the effects of the shared reading intervention compared with the children in the control group for concepts about print only.</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity</u> Cold not be determined due to incomplete data</p>

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

	government welfare benefits 21% dual language		(DR), dialogic reading with the addition of print referencing (DR + PR), or an attention-matched control group.		
Simsek & Erdogan (2015) Turkey (2*)	46 children aged 4-5 years. Low SES Recruited from public kindergarten 20 females 26 males	4 weeks 20 min, twice a week. School Teacher delivered in small groups (7-9 children)	To examine the efficacy of a 4-week dialogic reading intervention on the receptive and expressive language skills of 4-5 year old children from low-income families. Random allocation to DR or traditional reading group – regular language activities (TR)	Test of Early Language Development Third Edition” (TELD-3 <u>Intervention fidelity</u> : no	No significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test receptive language scores for children in the TR group. There was a significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test receptive scores of the children in the DR group. The expressive language scores of children in the TR group were not statistically significant at post-test. The expressive language scores of children in the DR group significantly increased post-test. The TR group total language scores indicated that the means of pre- and post-test scores were non-significant. The DR group’s total language scores indicated that pre- and post-test scores produces a statistically significant difference.
Towsen & Gallagher (2014)	Participants in the study were 3-year old children	Home 5 weeks	Do 3 year old children in a Head Start program who participate in shared	PPVT4; (TVIP; EOWPVT-4; GRTR-R	Comparison of pre and post-test means suggested modest changes in children’s vocabulary scores as well as in the parents’ frequency, duration, and quality of reading for DR group.

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

<p>USA (3*)</p>	<p>(<i>n</i> = 25) and their parents enrolled in one of three Head Start centers in the southeastern United States. Primary language English or Spanish</p> <p>12 males 13 females</p>	<p>3 times weekly (10-15 min each time)</p> <p>Parents+ child. Trained using RTTT video</p>	<p>dialogic reading with their parents show significantly greater oral vocabulary and expressive language skills growth than children who do not?</p> <p>2) Do 3 year old children in a Head Start program who participate in shared dialogic reading with their parents show significantly greater growth on basic print knowledge than children who do not?</p> <p>3) Does training parents of 3 year old children in Head Start classrooms in shared dialogic reading strategies change parent's report of the frequency, duration, and/or their quality of reading with their children?</p>	<p><u>Intervention fidelity:</u> reading logs</p>	<p>Following a 5 week intervention, there were no significant results in children's receptive and expressive vocabulary or pre-literacy skills,</p> <p>While the DR group appeared to make greater gains on the measures of receptive and expressive vocabulary, these changes were not statistically significant. Changes on the pre literacy measure were minimal in both groups.</p> <p>Results of the parent survey indicated no statistically significant changes, however, the control group generally self-reported higher in the areas of frequency and quality of reading, with the treatment group being relatively equal to the control group in the duration of reads.</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity</u> Could not be determined due to poor response rate / incomplete data</p>
---------------------	--	---	---	---	--

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

			<p>Parent-child dyads were randomly assigned to intervention and control conditions in alternating order of recruitment. 13 dyads were assigned to the dialogic shared book reading intervention, with the remaining 12 dyads participating in the control condition.</p>		
<p>Towsen & Gallagher (2016)</p> <p>USA</p> <p>(2*)</p>	<p>42 children, aged 3-5 years.</p> <p>33 males 9 females</p> <p>31 Caucasian 3 African American 7 Latino/Hispanic</p>	<p>6 weeks</p> <p>Home – Parents</p> <p>Frequency & Duration of reading sessions not stated</p>	<p>Effects of DR, with the incorporation of pause time, on the oral vocabulary, expressive language skills, print knowledge of children with disabilities (e.g., SDD, autism, Speech Impairment).</p>	<p>Get Ready to Read!– Revised (GRTR-R)</p> <p>PPVT- 4</p> <p>WODB subtest of the myIGDIs-EL</p>	<p>The DR group performed significantly better than control group on measures of both receptive and expressive near-transfer vocabulary. While the DR group appeared to make greater gains on the measures of receptive and expressive vocabulary, these changes were not statistically significant.</p> <p>Results of the parent survey indicated no statistically significant changes, however, the control group generally self-reported higher in the areas of frequency and quality of reading, with the treatment group being relatively equal to the control group in the duration of reads.</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity</u></p>

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

	<p>Primary language Spanish and have a disability (SDD, autism, Speech Impairment)</p>		<p>Does DR strategies change parent's report of the frequency, duration, and/or their quality of reading with their children?</p> <p>Enrolled in Head Start centers.</p> <p>Pre-test-post-test quasi-experimental group design with one intervention group (21 students) and one control group (21 students)</p> <p>Intervention delivered to groups pf 3-5 children</p> <p>Parent-child dyads were randomly assigned to intervention and control conditions in alternating order of recruitment.</p>	<p>Picture Naming subtest of the myIGDIs-EL</p> <p>Receptive Near transfer vocabulary task</p> <p>Expressive Near Transfer Vocabulary Task</p> <p>EOWPVT-4</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity:</u> Session observation</p>	<p>Compliance with the intervention was good</p>
--	--	--	---	---	--

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

<p>Tysbina & Eriks Brophy (2010)</p> <p>Canada</p> <p>(2*)</p>	<p>Intervention group: $n = 12$ 1.8 - 3.5years. 2 females+10 males</p> <p>Delayed treatment control group: 2 - 3.1 years.</p>	<p>6 weeks</p> <p>Home</p> <p>5 x15 min sessions per week.</p>	<p>This study examined the feasibility of using a dialogic book-reading intervention for bilingual preschool children with expressive vocabulary delays.</p> <p>The intervention was provided in English (by PI) and Spanish (by mother) concurrently to an experimental group of six children, while six other children were in a delayed treatment control group.</p>	<p>Target vocabulary verification (book & play)</p> <p>Target vocabulary probing MBCDI MIDHC Mothers' satisfaction</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity</u>: no</p>	<p>DR group learned significantly more target words in English and Spanish than the control group. Spanish-DR resulted in smaller gains in the children's learning of Spanish target words than English words. The gains in the overall vocabulary of the two groups of children did not differ significantly.</p> <p>The children's mothers expressed satisfaction with the program, and confirmed the benefits of DR for their children's learning of target words.</p>
<p>Valdez-Menchaca & Whitehurst (1992)</p> <p>Mexico</p> <p>(2*)</p>	<p>20 Mexican 2-year-olds from low-income backgrounds</p> <p>12 females: 8 males Children ranged in age</p>	<p>Teacher</p> <p>Day care centre</p> <p>6-7 weeks</p>	<p>Assess the impact of DR on the children's spontaneous verbalizations, expressive and receptive vocabulary of Mexican 2-year-olds from low-income backgrounds within a day care setting</p>	<p>PPVT-R EOWPVT ITPA</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity</u>: no</p>	<p>DR group children outperformed control group children on PPVT-R, EOWPVT and ITPA.</p> <p>Effect Size: $d = 1.3$ for PPVT-R, $d = 1.29$ for EOWPVT, and $d = 2.08$ for the ITPA.</p> <p>Mean ES: $d = 1.56$ across the three standardised tests indicating the picture book program produced large effects on performance.</p>

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

	from 2.25 - 2.9 years.	30, 10- to 12-min sessions	<p>Potential subjects were identified through the records of the day-care centre</p> <p>Pairs of children were matched as nearly as possible on the basis of their mean language scores, ages, family income, level of maternal education, family size, and gender. Children from each pair were then assigned randomly to the experimental and control conditions</p>		DR group children produced longer (i.e., larger MLU), and more complex sentences (i.e., number of compound sentences) than control group children.
Vally et al. (2015) South Africa (4*)	91 infant-mother dyads Children 1.2 - 1.3 years. 32 females 59 males	8 weeks Home & School 90 min supervised session	To establish the impact on child language and attention of providing training in dialogic book sharing to carers of infants in an	MacArthur-Bates Communicative Development Inventory (CDI)	<p><u>Child Language</u></p> <p>Parents reported their infant understood more words after the intervention. After controlling for baseline scores the difference was highly significant. Compared to controls, DR group parents reported their infants could both understand and vocalize a significantly greater number of words. This difference, after controlling for baseline scores, was also highly significant.</p>

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

	<p>Carers and their young infants were recruited from a peri-urban settlement on the outskirts of Cape Town</p> <p>The settlement is characterised by endemic poverty, mass unemployment, and rampant crime,</p>	<p>each week at school</p> <p>10 min a day reading at home</p> <p>Mother</p> <p>At school, groups of 4-5 children</p>	<p>impoverished South African community</p> <p>RCT with random allocation to DR group or no intervention control group</p>	<p>Measure of language comprehension was developed based on PPVT-R</p> <p>Early Childhood Vigilance Task (ECVT)</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity:</u> no</p>	<p><u>Comprehension</u> DR children identified a greater number of items, compared to control group. After controlling for the effect of baseline performance, however, the difference was not significant.</p> <p><u>Sustained attention</u> DR children showed a substantial increase, while those in the control group showed no change over the 8 week period. This difference in performance, after controlling for baseline scores, was highly significant.</p>
<p>Whitehurst et al (1988)</p> <p>USA</p> <p>(2*)</p>	<p>30 children, 1.8 - 2.9 years</p> <p>Middle class</p> <p>90% Mother</p> <p>5% father,</p> <p>3%</p>	<p>Home</p> <p>4 weeks</p> <p>3-4 times per week</p> <p>30 weeks</p>	<p>To assess whether maternal picture book reading has direct / immediate effects on rate of children's language acquisition</p>	<p>ITPA</p> <p>EOWPVT</p> <p>PPVT</p> <p>MLU</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity:</u> no</p>	<p>DR children had higher scores on Expressive Language, MLU, frequency of phrases, frequency of single words than the control group.</p> <p><u>Follow-up (9 months):</u> differences remained.</p>

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

	<p>grandparents, 2% other</p> <p>Volunteers responding to advert in newspaper.</p>		<p>Head start classrooms random allocation to experimental and control group ensuring equal number of boys and girls in each group</p> <p>Experimental group-small group DR reading in class 4:1; 3-5 times a week and 1:1 of the same book at home and phonemic awareness training</p>		
<p>Whitehurst, Arnold et al (1994)</p> <p>USA</p> <p>(2*)</p>	<p>73 Low SES, 3 year old children with language delay and Mothers attending subsidized day care centre.</p> <p>40 Males 33 Females</p>	<p>Home & School</p> <p>6 weeks 10 min daily</p> <p>Teacher & Caregive r</p>	<p>Examine the relative effects of home and school, group based DR with view to developing a practical interactive book reading intervention suitable for day-care, preschool, and Head Start settings</p> <p>Children were randomly assigned to</p>	<p><u>Pre-test</u> PPVT-R EOWPVT-R ITPA</p> <p>The Our Word (exp vocab test devised for this study)</p> <p><u>Post-test</u> PPVT-R - Form M EOWPVT</p>	<p><u>EOWPVT + ITPA</u> DR produced significant changes in expressive vocabulary (One Word and Our Word).</p> <p><u>6 month follow up:</u> differences were still present on the One Word (expressive vocab)</p> <p><u>PPVT- R</u> Mean scores increased for the school and school + home condition, but improvements were not maintained at follow-up.</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity</u> Compliance to the intervention varied between parents and teacher</p>

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

	55% Black 22% White 23% Hispanic	Video-tape training	a) school plus home condition (b) a school condition (c) a control (play) condition	The Our Word ITPA Follow-Up PPVT-R Form L EOWPVCT ITPA <u>Intervention fidelity:</u> Reading & Activity logs	
Whitehurst, Epstein et al. (1994) USA (1*)	167, 4 year olds attending classrooms in Head Start in New York 46% Caucasian 45% African American 8% Latin American 1% Asian 92 males	Home & School 1 school year 3-5 times per week	To gather stronger empirical evidence in support of the traditional model of relations between emergent literacy experience and development of literacy skills (scrutinizing the inter-relationships of several components). To develop a practical, effective emergent literacy program for Head	<u>Pre-test</u> PPVT-R WOWPVT ITPA DSC (18 subscales) – name letters, segmentation, word and number function. StonyBrook Family Reading Survey (A)	DR group outperformed control group children on writing and print concepts factors but differences between the two groups on the language and linguistic awareness factors were not significant. After controlling for additional variables (children’s pre-test skills) the ‘at-home’ component of the intervention was found to be significantly related to language outcomes. Parental compliance with home reading was significantly correlated with language outcome after controlling for other variables. Classroom-based reading did not, by itself, generate increases in the children’s language skills. Effects on language were limited to children whose parents were actively involved in the at-home reading program.

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

	<p>75 females</p> <p>DR $n = 94$</p> <p>Control $n = 73$</p>		<p>Start that could be added to existing pre-school curricula.</p> <p>Assessing the impact of Dr + adapted Sound foundations (phoneme awareness program) on 4 factors – writing, print concepts, language and Linguistic awareness</p> <p>Randomly assigned by classroom to experimental group (Head Start Curriculum +DR at home and in school) or control condition (Head start curriculum). At school, Dr was delivered in a small group (4 children) 3-5 times a week. Parents read same book at home with child (3</p>	<p>Quick Test (A)</p> <p>Post-Test Form L of the PPVT-R EOWPVT-Revised</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity:</u> Teachers: daily log. Observations by researchers every 2 weeks. Parents: completed survey of compliance (author recognition test included).</p>	<p><u>Effect Sizes:</u> Cohen d for the Writing factor = .516 and for Print Concept $d = .624$</p> <p><u>Intervention fidelity</u> data incomplete</p>
--	--	--	---	---	--

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

			times during the week).		
Zevenbergen et al. (2003) USA (0*)	123 children attending Head Start programs Intervention <i>n</i> = 71 Control <i>n</i> = 52 65 males; 58 females 41% African American 32% Caucasian 27% Latino/Latina	30 week DR (school and home) + 16 weeks phonemic awareness program – adapted from sound foundation (school) 3 times per week	Effects of a DR intervention in the inclusion of evaluative devices in narratives of children from low-income countries Classrooms randomly allocated to experimental or control groups	Adapted version of the Bus Story – story retelling task. Children narratives were scored for the inclusion of 8 evaluative devices – 1. reference to characters internal states; 2. references to internal state of storyteller; 3. qualifying comments; 4.	DR had significant effect on children’s inclusion of evaluative devices in their narratives even after controlling for differences between groups in their expressive language skill. DR children were significantly more likely to include references to internal states of characters and dialogue in their narratives at the end of the Head Start year than children who did not participate

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.

		Home and Head Start Parents and Teachers		use of dialogue; 5. reference to absent characters/objects, events; 6. causal statements; 7. wh-questions; 8. direct questions <u>Post-test</u> EOWPVT-R <u>Intervention</u> <u>fidelity</u> : no	
--	--	---	--	---	--

Dialogic Reading: The story so far.