

Critical Review: Do

The computerized databases PsychINFO, ProQuest Education, PubMed, ERIC, and SCOPUS were searched using the following criteria: [((shared)



indicator of reading. No statistically significant differences between outcomes were found.

Results showed negligible effect sizes for interventions when applied to ethnic minority and low-income children. There was a moderate effect size for expressive language. Home-based interventions produced the largest effect size compared with the school setting or combination of home and school.

Interestingly, only 5 of the 31 studies (16%) reported caregiver literacy ability and none of the studies had an adult literacy component in their intervention. The authors fittingly noted that potential literacy weaknesses may have impacted the caregivers' full or effective involvement in the emergent literacy intervention. Manz et al. also found that participant demographics were commonly neglected in both the description and formation of samples and in the data analysis, e.g., ethnicity and native language. As these fundamental characteristics were only reported in half of the 31 studies examined, this limits the generalization of the meta-analysis findings.

Further limitations of the studies in this meta-analysis include relatively few empirically-supported emergent literacy intervention studies for low-income, ethnic minority or linguistically-diverse families of young children. As well, emergent literacy is a multi-faceted concept, which is not captured by a full array of psychometrically-strong measures in the studies reviewed. More than half of the studies reviewed were based upon investigator-created measures or checklists in which reliability and validity information was not reported.

Strengths of the meta-analysis and literature review include a clearly defined rationale, a comprehensive search for relevant studies, and high inter-rater agreement, i.e., 93%. Manz et al. also provide guidelines for future research, including the need to enhance

56653CBK, in which effects will emerge in the later assessment at four years of age.

A limitation of this study is that parents who did not speak English were excluded, limiting generalizations to second-language learners. Although outcome measures were parent-reported, this is not a weakness since they have strong and expected associations in many published studies and are of practical merit.

Well-designed RCTs such as this one

### *Clinical Implications*

Clinicians need to be aware of potential barriers when working with families from low-income backgrounds. Research has shown that if book reading is unpleasant then the interaction will not be effective (Bus, van Ijzendoorn, & Pellegrini, 1995). Therefore, it is critical that speech-language pathologists ensure parents of low-income backgrounds have the tools needed to provide an enjoyable and effective shared book reading experience before recommending they engage in this activity to improve language and/or literacy skills. Furthermore, Manz et al. (2010) recommend that t

awareness, and oral language in preschool children. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 39(2), 87-98.

Reynolds, A. (1992). Mediated effects of preschool intervention. *Early Education and Development*, 3(2), 139-164.