

Table 1

Early Literacy Intervention Studies

Authors	Intervention	Implementer	Participants	Setting	Findings in Content	Strength/Weakness
Arnold, Zeljo, & Doctoroff (2008)	Developmentally appropriate curriculum	Teachers	N=163 Ages 3.4-5.4	Community Center Based	Higher parent involvement results in higher pre-literacy	Study weakness: Depression as a variable Teacher report of parent involvement
Brown	Model Early Learning Standards	Teachers	Steering Committee			
Campbell, et al (2002)	Developmentally appropriate curriculum with social services	Teachers	N=57 Age 2-3	Community Center Based	Significantly higher test scores as adults Attained more years of education	Study strength: Longitudinal Study

Gettinger & Stoiber (2007)	Early Reading First EMERGE program	Trainers Teachers	N=300 Ages 3-5	Head Start	EMERGE children outperformed control group	Study strength: Three tiered response to intervention Study weakness: Movement subjective
Bernhard, et al (2008)	Early Authors Program	Trainers Teachers Families	N=367 Ages 3-5	Community Center-based	Improvement compared to national norm	Study Strength: Global intervention Study Weakness: Missing data
Elliott & Ollif (2008)	Early Literacy and Learning Model	Teachers Families	N=20 Ages 2-5	Community Center-based	Most demonstrated gains	Study weakness: Lack of treatment fidelity Intervention not described
Hawken, Johnston,	Head Start Child Outcomes	Teachers	N=273	Head Start	Focus on emerging skills	Study weakness: Self reported survey

McDonnell	Framework					
Justice et al (2009)	Print-referencing	Teachers	N=142 Ages 4-5	At-Risk Public Pre-K	Gains in print/alphabet/name writing knowledge	Study strength: Random control group Study weakness: Lack of treatment fidelity
Landry et al (2006)	Professional Development Model	Trainers Teachers Coaches	N=250 Teachers	Head Start	Increased treatment fidelity	Study strength: Follow up implemented to determine sustainability
Nancollis, Lawrie, & Dodd (2005)	Phonological Awareness	Teachers	N=99 Ages 4.7	At-Risk Public Pre-K	Mixed results in on- rhyme and segmentation tasks	Study weakness: Intervention results had little later effect
Perkins & Cooter (2005)	LEAP	Trainers Teachers	N=90 Ages 4	Head Start	Performance comparable to higher income peers	Study strength: Comprehensive curriculum, staff training

VanDerHeyden, Snyder, Broussard, & Ramsdell (2007)	Response to Intervention	Teachers	N=35	Head Start	Gains made by initial low performers	Study Strength: Intervention assessment using three tier framework
Wasik & Bond (2006)	Coaching model	Trainers Teachers	N=16 Teachers	Head Start	Significant vocabulary gain/implementation of intervention	Study weakness: Difficult to determine cause due to multiple variables
Winsler, et al (2008)	Developmentally appropriate curriculum	Teachers Parents	N=1478 Ages 2-5	At-Risk Public Pre-K & Community Center based	Slight gain in language and cognition	Study strength: Applied community project
