# Early Precursors of Literacy Development in Simultaneous Bilinguals: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Insiya Bhalloo[1,2], and Monika Molnar[1,2]

[1]Department of Speech-Language Pathology, University of Toronto

[2]Rehabilitation Sciences Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto

**Acknowledgements:**

We thank Kai Ian Leung, for her help with screening papers, along with University of Toronto librarians, Chad Crichton, Erica Nekolaichuk and Glyneva Bradley-Ridout, for helping with the database and search terms selection.

This project was supported by a Canada Graduate Scholarship – Master's (CGS-M) awarded to Insiya Bhalloo by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC: 771-2019-0057).

**Author Note:**

Correspondence regarding this article may be addressed to Insiya Bhalloo, Department of Speech-Language Pathology, Rehabilitation Sciences Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto (500 University Avenue, Toronto, ON, M5G 1V7). Phone: +1 416-946-8638. Email: insiya.bhalloo@mail.utoronto.ca

**Disclosures:**

No conflicts of interest, financial or otherwise, are declared by the authors.

**Abstract**

Several literacy precursors have been identified in monolingual English-speaking children; however, it is unclear whether the same precursors are also associated with literacy development in bilingual children. *Purpose:* We examine whether in simultaneous bilingual children: (i) code-related, oral-language, and domain-general cognitive literacy precursors have been utilized — similar to monolingual children; (ii) other types of precursors have been identified; (iii) code-related, oral-language, domain-general cognitive, or other types of literacy precursors are associated with word/non-word and/or text-level reading skills; in (a) one or (b) both spoken languages; (iv) the type of literacy outcome measure, and (v) language background measure influence performance on emergent literacy skills. *Method:* We examined reported statistical associations, between a given literacy precursor and outcome measure, and conducted a meta-analysis examining specific code-related and oral-language precursors in relation to word/non-word reading and/or text reading comprehension. *Results:* Apart from semantic awareness, all code-related, oral-language, domain-general cognitive and eight additional identified precursors were significantly associated with reading in simultaneous bilinguals. However, these precursors were predominantly assessed only in English, or English in addition to a heritage language. Phonological awareness and vocabulary emerged as commonly-assessed precursors consistently associated with reading. *Conclusions:* Particularly, these code-related and oral-language skills may be used as precursor screening tools in simultaneous bilinguals, across heritage and societal languages. Future research should develop language-specific precursor screening tools and investigate the reliability of non-linguistic precursors, to address the evident English assessment bias and support biliteracy development across spoken languages.

## Background

Globally, 56% of children do not meet age-appropriate reading levels (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 2017). It is important to identify reliable precursors of literacy to facilitate early screening of reading difficulties, thereby mitigating resulting academic and socio-economic ramifications in all children – both monolingual and bilingual (Ritchie & Bates, 2013). *Literacy precursors* are linguistic and cognitive skills, emerging during preschool age, that facilitate reading acquisition (Birgisdottir et al., 2020; Schaars et al., 2019). Most research has focused on English-speaking monolinguals; however, approximately half of children worldwide are bilingual (e.g., Grosjean, 2010; Ryan, 2013). This review problematizes such a dominant focus on English-monolingual literacy development by emphasizing assessment across home/heritage[1] and school/societal[2] languages.

Research has investigated literacy precursors via various reading models, including *Simple View of Readin*g (SVR; Castles et al., 2018), *Dual Route Model of Reading (*Ripamonti et al., 2014)*, Linguistic Interdependence Hypothesis* (LIH; Kim & Piper, 2019), and *Script Dependent Hypothesis (SDH;* Geva & Siegel, 2000). Apart from *LIH* and *SDH*, most models are based on European alphabetic languages, and primarily English monolinguals (Daniels & Share, 2018). The *LIH* and *SDH* demonstrate influences of home-language vocabulary on school-language reading, and orthographic features — whether shared or disparate — on cross-language literacy skill transfer (Bialystok et al., 2005). These bidirectional cross-language effects

[1] The main language spoken within the home, in a country where the heritage language is not an official language.
[2] The main language of education and communication outside the home, which is considered an official language in the child's country of residence.

emphasize assessing and supporting literacy development, via language-specific[3] precursor screening tools, across spoken languages (Kim & Piper, 2019).

In monolingual English-speaking children, systematic reviews and correlational meta-analyses identified nine precursors of word/non-word reading and text reading comprehension which are listed below (García & Cain, 2014; Hjetland et al., 2017; National Early Literacy Panel [NELP], 2008):

***Code-related skills*** include *phonological awareness*, *letter knowledge*, and *serial recall*. These early skills enable acquisition of systematic relationships between oral and written language, and the alphabetic principle[4]. According to the *SVR*, these skills (i.e., decoding; D) and oral language comprehension (LC) together contribute to reading comprehension (RC; Castles et al., 2018). Across orthography type, preschool and Grade 1 code-related skills are associated with early decoding (D) and later fluent word/non-word recognition which, followed by oral language (LC), contribute to Grade 2 RC (Caravolas et al., 2019; Muter et al., 2004). Phonological awareness is an important precursor (McBride-Chang et al., 2004), influenced by orthography type and the relationship between phonological grain size units[5]. As compared to the contribution of phonemic awareness to word recognition in alphabetic languages such as English (Ellis & Hooper, 2001), syllable and onset-rime awareness demonstrate strong correlations with

[3] Based on language-specific phonological/orthographic properties.
[4] Awareness of the predictable relationship between individual speech sounds (e.g., phonemes) and the corresponding code (e.g., graphemes/symbols), such as phoneme-letter associations in English.
[5] According to the *Psycholinguistic Grain Size Theory*, phonological grain sizes are the most accessible and consistently represented (onto orthographic units such as letters or characters) speech sound units, based on language-specific orthographic characteristics (Ziegler & Goswami, 2005). These speech sounds include phonemes (which are mapped onto letters in alphabetic languages such as English), syllables (mapped onto characters in morpho-syllabic/logographic and alpha-syllabic languages such as Chinese or Tamil, with larger grain sizes), or morphemes.

character recognition in morpho-syllabic/logographic languages such as Chinese (Ruan et al., 2018). As children acquire language-specific linguistic structures and sound-grapheme correspondences, word decoding becomes automatic. This enables dual sub-lexical (i.e., phonological processes for decoding unfamiliar words) and lexical (i.e., whole-word processes for recognizing high-frequency words) reading routes (see *Dual Route Model of Reading*) — with the lexical route predominantly facilitating reading in morpho-syllabic languages (Tong & McBride, 2017; Yeong et al., 2013).

***Oral language skills*** involve understanding and producing spoken language, including *vocabulary* and *grammar* (i.e., morphological and syntactic awareness). Oral language skills contribute to early decoding at Grade 1-2 levels, and later fluent word/non-word and character recognition (Foorman et al., 2015; Hulme at al., 2019). In monolingual English readers, oral language (LC) and word/non-word reading/speed (D) have been evidenced as the most significant contributors of RC (*SVR*) across elementary and secondary grades, compared to non-verbal reasoning and working memory (Tighe et al., 2015; see next section). Oral language (LC) and character recognition skills also facilitate RC in monolingual Chinese primary-level readers (Dong et al., 2020; Yan et al., 2020).

***Domain-general cognitive skills*** include *memory* and *non-verbal intelligence* which involve non-language-specific reasoning. Kindergarten domain-general cognitive skills are consistent contributors to reading and passage comprehension in English and Chinese monolinguals, across primary and secondary grade levels (Adlof et al., 2010; Yang & Qiao, 2021). Code-related and domain-general cognitive skills also typically show a correlation (Oakhill & Kyle, 2000).

**Review Objectives**

This review and meta-analysis examine literacy precursors used for assessing typically-developing and hearing simultaneous bilingual children (i.e., exposed to both languages before 3 years, prior to learning to read in kindergarten; Patterson, 2002). Because differences between monolinguals and bilinguals in oral language and domain-general cognitive skills have been observed (Blom et al., 2014; Kuo et al., 2016), it could lead to differential emergent literacy development. While there is valuable literature on sequential bilinguals and second-language learners (e.g., August & Shanahan, 2006; Lesaux & Geva, 2006), this review focuses on simultaneous bilinguals, a considerable segment of the bilingual population, without age of acquisition (AoA) influences. As this paper focuses on existing pre-literacy skills, we included *assessment* studies only. Specifically, our goals are to examine whether:

(i) Code-related, oral language, and domain-general cognitive precursors have been assessed in relation to reading in simultaneous bilingual children, similar to monolinguals.

(ii) Literacy precursors, in addition to these skills, have been identified and assessed in relation to reading in simultaneous bilinguals.

(iii) Code-related, oral language, domain-general cognitive, and additional identified literacy precursors are associated with word/non-word and/or text-level reading skills, in (a) one or (b) both spoken languages.

(iv) Type of outcome measure (e.g., word, non-word and text reading accuracy, speed and comprehension) influences precursor-outcome associations.

(v) Language background (type and frequency of language exposure) influences performance on literacy precursors and outcome measures.

## Methods

### Eligibility Criteria

The database search was based on PICO framework (Richardson et al., 1995): Population (i.e., typically-developing and hearing simultaneous bilinguals, ≤ 12 years), Intervention (i.e., literacy precursor assessed), Comparison (no specified controls), and Outcome (i.e., reading-based outcome measure assessed).

### Information Sources

After consulting linguistics and speech-language pathology librarians, we entered search terms (Table 1, Appendix A) into four databases: Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts (LLBA), Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), MLA International Bibliography and PsycINFO (ProQuest), indexing peer-reviewed literature. We conducted the most up-to-date database search on August 16th, 2021 and did not specify publication year limits. These searches included peer-reviewed and gray literature, and callouts for unpublished research.

### Search

The nine literacy precursors were individually searched with the two outcome measures, to find studies discussing at least one precursor in relation to word/non-word reading and/or text reading comprehension. A general search was conducted to identify additional precursors unique to bilingual children (see Supplemental File 1, Appendix A for database search syntax). Tables 2 and 3 indicate search strategy and terms (Appendix A). We also conducted a Google Scholar and manual reference search of included studies, and excluded non-primary and case studies, to identify additional relevant studies (Figure 1, Appendix A).

### Study Selection

Two independent reviewers screened studies based on following inclusion, exclusion and critical appraisal criteria at title/abstract and full-text levels. A third reviewer was also consulted.

***Inclusion Criteria***

1. Assessed existing precursor skills in relation to reading-based literacy outcome measures (e.g., word/text-level reading or comprehension);

2. Assessed precursors in typically-developing and hearing simultaneous bilinguals and/or multilinguals ≤ 12 years, and/or included age-matched typically-developing bilingual controls;

3. Assessed simultaneous bilinguals who: were born or immigrated prior to 3 years to a country where heritage language was not an official language and had sufficient exposure to heritage language at home and school/societal language in wider community, even if societal language was not home language; or were exposed to both as home languages. We verified full texts of abstracts on second language learners, due to interchangeable use in bilingualism literature.

***Exclusion Criteria***

1. Non-primary (e.g., reviews) and case studies;

2. Non-English studies with inaccessible translations;

3. Studies on bimodal bilingual populations (i.e., with signed-spoken language combinations);

4. Literacy precursor intervention studies, that did not also assess existing precursor skills;

5. Studies only analyzing precursors in relation to other precursors, not reading outcomes;

6. Studies only assessing non word, sentence or passage-level reading measures (e.g., letter naming, spoken word recognition, spelling and/or writing);

7. Studies not separating non-typically developing, deaf and/or sequential bilinguals[6] or second language learners[7] from typically-developing and hearing simultaneous bilinguals in analyses.

[6] Who acquired the second language (L2) at school between the age of 4-6 in an L2-majority country.

[7] Who acquired the L2 at school after the age of 6 in a non-L2 majority country.

### *Critical Appraisal of Studies*

To account for risk of bias, included studies met relevant criteria from an adapted Critical Appraisal Checklist for Quasi-Experimental Studies (Joanna Briggs Institute, 2017):

**1.** ***Clear Cause and Effect:*** Examined whether precursors were associated with outcomes;

**2.** ***Reliable Assessment and Outcome Measures:*** Described literacy assessment measures;

**3.** ***Appropriate Statistical Analyses:*** Used appropriate statistical tests;

**4.** ***Description of Follow-Up Procedures in case of Participant Attrition during Longitudinal Studies:*** Accounted for participant attrition.

***5. Additional Criteria – Sufficient Language and Socio-Economic Status (SES) Background:*** Specified adequate language and demographic background information, including AoA and/or language proficiency, and SES (see Data Items). This is because type of bilingual experience and SES influence emergent literacy skills (Meir & Armon-Lotem, 2017; Wood et al., 2018).

### *Data Items*

After study screening (see Table 4, Appendix A for included studies), data items were extracted (Table 5 and Supplemental Excel Table 1, Appendix A): *study citation information* (i.e., author names, publication year, database, in-text citation and reference), *participant demographic characteristics* (i.e., sample size, number and type of participant groups, age at evaluation, gender, place of birth or age at immigration, and language status in country of assessment), *language background* (e.g., spoken language combinations, AoA, and degree/duration of language exposure), *proficiency measures (*e.g., parent/teacher-completed questionnaires, classroom observations, child interviews, oral language comprehension/production tasks, reading assessments), *parental SES* (i.e., parental income, education, and home/school neighbourhood), *assessed literacy precursor and outcome measures*

(i.e., type, measure and language(s) of assessment, and whether assessed in one or both languages), and *statistical analyses* (i.e., tests, reported significant or non-significant associations between precursors and outcomes assessed in one or both languages). We tabulated frequency of studies relevant to extracted data categories.

For meta-analyses, we extracted *sample size*, and *correlation coefficients*, across studies. Although meta-analyses typically compare study effect sizes, only 4/33 studies reported standardized mean-difference effect sizes (Table 4, Appendix A). Following Cochrane Collaboration (2011)'s recommendations to account for violations of statistical independence, we selected a single reported correlation coefficient, based on common pre-identified criteria, for studies reporting multiple correlation coefficients across literacy precursor type.

## Results

### Database Search

The database search resulted in 3096 studies. After duplicate screening of 1732 studies, 1364 abstracts were identified for title/abstract-level screening. After full-text screening and critical appraisal of 323 abstracts, two reviewers independently identified 22 papers meeting inclusion criteria. We manually searched reference lists of these 22 papers and previously excluded non-primary studies (retrieving 22 papers at full-text screening), which resulted in 11 additional papers meeting inclusion/exclusion and critical appraisal criteria (see Figure 1, Appendix A). This review includes 43 studies across 33 papers, comprising scholarly and gray literature (Table 4, Appendix A).

**Results Overview**

The study numbers indicated in this section, Tables 1-13 (see Appendix A) and Figures 1-12 (see Appendix A) refer to the 33 papers listed in Table 4.[8] Below, we provide a synthesis of our findings in table format, in addition to meta-analyses. In total, 17/33 studies reported Pearson's correlations, while 16/33 studies reported other estimation models. We conducted random-effects correlational meta-analyses for precursors, analyzed in at least five independent studies (Jackson & Turner, 2017), to account for between-study variation in sample size and assessment measures. Similar to prior studies (e.g., Akoglu, 2018), we categorized the strength of Pearson's correlation coefficients < 0.4 as weak, between 0.4-0.6 as moderate, and between 0.7-0.9 as strong — and specified statistical significance as $p \leq 0.05$. The reported *precursor-outcome associations* do not imply a 1:1 predictive relationship. We acknowledge that primary study statistical limitations — including influences (and range) of sample sizes, confounding variables, and multiple correlational testing — extend to this review. These limitations affirm need for detailed statistical reporting and/or different approaches to examining literacy precursors in future studies.

**Participants**

As shown in Table 6 (Appendix A), the most assessed groups were Spanish-English (n=5), Heterogeneous-English (n=4) and Mandarin-English simultaneous bilinguals (n=7). The average age at assessment was 7;5 years, with 13/33 studies assessing children between 8;0-9;12 years (2, 3, 5, 7, 12, 14, 16, 19, 20, 25, 27, 28, 32). In total, 8/33 studies assessed children aged 6;0-7;12 years (1, 9, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 30), followed by 4;0-5;12 (4, 8, 11, 13, 31), 10;0-11;0 (15, 17, 26, 29, 33), and 3;0-3;12 (6, 10) years. See Table 5 (Appendix A).

[8] We assigned study numbers to reduce text in the Results section.

As Tables 6 and 8A-B (Appendix A) indicate, literacy precursors and outcome measures were predominantly assessed in English (n=22), then Spanish (n=7), Chinese (n=4), Welsh (n=3), Hebrew (n=2), French (n=2), Hindi (n=2), Dutch (n=2), Turkish (n=1), Malay (n=1), Italian (n=1), Kiswahili (n=1), Maya (n=1), German (n=1), Norwegian (n=1), and Urdu (n=1).

## Literacy Precursors

### *Code-Related, Oral Language, and Domain-General Cognitive Precursors Assessed in Relation to Word/Non-Word and Text Reading*

As indicated in Table 7 (Appendix A), this review identified 17 *literacy precursors* assessed in relation to *literacy outcome measures* in simultaneous bilingual children. Nine of these precursors have been highlighted as important emergent literacy skills in monolingual English-speaking children (García & Cain, 2014; Hjetland et al., 2017; NELP, 2008; see goal i):

*Code related skills* (phonological awareness [n=15: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, 19, 22, 23, 24, 32, 33]; letter knowledge [n=2: 4, 13]; serial recall [n=4: 4, 22, 26, 33]); *Oral language and grammar skills* (oral language comprehension [n=3: 10, 11, 16]; vocabulary [receptive: n=14, 1, 3, 8, 10, 11, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 30, 33; expressive: n=3, 6, 24, 33]; grammar [syntactic awareness: n=3, 4, 17, 33; morphological awareness: n=5,1, 3, 5, 23, 33]); *Domain-general cognitive skills* (working memory/verbal short-term memory [n=4: 4, 17, 31, 33]; non-verbal intelligence [n=4: 22, 31, 32, 33]); and *word/non-word decoding* (n=6: 21, 23, 24, 26, 30, 33).

### *Additional Identified Precursors Assessed in Relation to Word/Non-Word and Text Reading*

As Table 7 (Appendix A) demonstrates, *additional literacy precursors* identified and assessed in relation to reading include (see goal ii): semantic awareness (n=3: 7, 9, 26), spelling (n=2: 4, 17), visual attention (VA) span (15), orthographic processing skills (2), environmental

print awareness (4), name writing (13), sub-lexical/phonological speech perception (28), and sentence priming (29). Four studies assessed non-cognitive-linguistic precursors, including type of literacy measure and instruction (12, 18, 20, 27; see Table 6, Appendix A).

## Associations between Literacy Precursors and Outcome Measures

Here, we examine precursor-outcome associations between assessed code-related, oral language, domain-general cognitive, and additional literacy precursors in relation to reading — reported in one (goal iii a) or both (goal iii b) spoken languages. *Precursor-outcome associations* are reported statistically significant or non-significant relationship between a given precursor and outcome measure. We also conducted meta-analyses for specific code-related and oral-language precursors in relation to word/non-word reading and text reading comprehension (see *Correlational Meta-Analyses for Code-Related, Oral Language, and Decoding Precursors*).

### *Associations for Code-Related, Oral Language, Domain-General Cognitive, and Additional Identified Precursors in Relation to Word/Non-Word and Text Reading*

#### *Precursors and Outcome Measures Assessed in One Language.*

As Table 8A (Appendix A) demonstrates, 17/33 studies assessed precursors and outcomes in one language (English: n=9 [1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 16, 23, 31, 32]; Other language: n=8 [9, 19, 21, 24, 26, 28, 29, 30]). Out of these 17 studies, 15 studies demonstrated significant within-language precursor-outcome associations[9] (1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 16, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32), one study demonstrated significant across-language precursor-outcome associations[10] (29), and six

[9] In Tables 8A and 8B, *within-language precursor-outcome associations* refer to associations between precursors and outcomes assessed in the same language.

[10] A*cross-language precursor-outcome associations* refer to associations between measures assessed in different languages.

studies demonstrated non-significant associations (1, 4, 7, 9, 26, 31). For the 6/33 studies assessing precursors in both languages and outcomes in one language (1, 6, 8, 21, 30, 32), four studies demonstrated significant within- and across-language precursor-outcome associations (1, 8, 21, 32), and two studies demonstrated significant within-(30) and across- (6) language associations. Two studies, assessing precursors in one language and outcomes in both languages, demonstrated significant within- and across-language precursor-outcome associations (5, 22).

Literacy precursors with consistent significant within-language precursor-outcome associations, in relation to at least one assessed outcome measure across studies, were *code-related* (phonological awareness [n=10: 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 19, 23, 24, 32], letter knowledge [4]), *oral language* (oral language comprehension [16], receptive vocabulary [n=9: 1, 8, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 26, 30], expressive vocabulary [n=2: 6, 24], syntactic awareness [4]), and *additional identified* skills (spelling [4], orthographic processing skills [2], environmental print awareness [4], sub-lexical/phonological speech perception [28], and sentence priming [29]). Semantic awareness was not a significant precursor (7, 9, 26), across both assessed languages.

**Interim Discussion**

Similar to English monolinguals, *code-related*, *oral-language*, *domain-general cognitive*, and *word/non-word decoding* precursors were assessed in simultaneous bilinguals across the 33 included studies (goal i). In addition, we identified eight literacy precursors assessed in simultaneous bilingual children (goal ii). These are: *semantic awareness* (Ibrahim et al., 2007; Jasińska et al., 2018; Spatgens & Schoonen, 2018), *spelling* (Chiappe et al., 2002; D'angiulli et al., 2001), *visual attention span* (Lallier et al., 2014), *orthographic processing* (Yeong et al., 2014), *environmental print awareness* (Chiappe et al., 2002), *name writing* (Bengochea et al., 2017), *sub-lexical/phonological speech perception* (Ríos-López et al., 2017), and *sentence*

*priming* (Vital & Karniol, 2011). Significant precursor-outcome associations were evident for code-related, oral-language, and domain-general cognitive skills across heritage and societal languages (Tables 7, 8A and 8B Appendix A for studies; see goal iii); and for the eight additional identified precursors, except for *semantic awareness* (Jasińska et al., 2018; Ibrahim et al., 2007; Spatgens & Schoonen, 2018; see goal iii).

Code-related and oral-language skills (specifically, phonological awareness and vocabulary) were commonly assessed precursors consistently associated with reading in children speaking diverse language combinations, including Chinese-English, Hindi-English and Spanish-English (e.g., Gupta & Jamal, 2007; Mak, 2014; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2014; Zhang, 2016; Tables 8A-B, Appendix A). Particularly, phonological awareness and vocabulary may also be used as precursor screening tools, for early identification of potential reading difficulties in both spoken languages, of simultaneous bilinguals.

Simultaneous bilinguals demonstrated higher phonological awareness and semantic awareness scores, compared to aged-matched monolinguals (Jasińska et al., 2018). Phonological awareness and semantic awareness are metalinguistic skills and they also may reflect a metalinguistic advantage in simultaneous bilinguals (e.g., Adesope et al., 2010; Kroll et al., 2014). However, while both monolinguals and simultaneous bilinguals consistently demonstrated significant precursor-outcome associations for phonological awareness (Chiappe et al., 2002; Hsu et al., 2019; Ibrahim et al., 2007; Jasińska et al., 2018; Limbird et al., 2014; Spencer & Hanley, 2003; Yeong et al., 2014), only monolinguals and sequential bilinguals demonstrated significant associations between semantic awareness and reading (Ibrahim et al., 2007; Jasińska et al., 2018).

The additional identified precursors are also associated with reading in monolingual children (also see, Bosse & Valdois, 2009; Both-de Vries & Bus, 2010; Nation & Snowling, 1998; Vanvooren et al., 2017). However, further research evaluating their reliability in linguistically-diverse monolingual and bilingual populations is needed. For instance, orthographic processing skills could be relevant to bilinguals learning to read in languages with disparate orthographic characteristics. For Chinese-English bilinguals, cross-language transfer of lexical strategies from the syllabic script, requiring processing of whole character units, may facilitate balanced use of dual — compared to predominant sub-lexical — reading strategies in the alphabetic script (Yeong et al., 2014; Ripamonti et al., 2014).

**Correlational Meta-Analyses for Code-Related, Oral Language, and Decoding Precursors**

We conducted random-effects correlational meta-analyses for precursors reporting a minimum of five independent correlation coefficients (Jackson & Turner, 2017). To account for unit-of-analysis issues, we selected one reported coefficient for studies testing the same group across multiple timepoints, languages and measures. We selected coefficients based on common study features, including testing type (i.e., within-language testing for studies reporting both within- and across-language correlations), testing time (i.e., latest assessment timepoint), assessment language (i.e., English or alphabetic, opaque languages; where possible, we conducted separate analyses per assessment language type [English-only or other language]), precursor measure (i.e., phonemic [versus onset-rime and syllable] awareness, receptive [versus expressive] vocabulary, derivational [versus compound] awareness, and word [versus non-word] decoding), and outcome measure (i.e., word [compared to non-word] reading).

***Code-Related and Oral Language Precursors in Relation to Word/Non-Word Reading.***

As Table 9 below and Figures 2-6 (Appendix A) demonstrate, we examined specific *code-related* (phonological awareness) and *oral language/grammar* skills (receptive/expressive vocabulary, morphological awareness) in relation to word/non-word reading. We conducted separate meta-analyses, across assessment language (i.e., whether assessed in English or another language), for precursors with at least five independent studies per language type. The analyses were significant for phonological awareness (Figures 2-3), vocabulary (Figures 4-5), and morphological awareness (Figure 6), across language type (see Table 9 for r-coefficient values).

**Table 9**

*Correlational Meta-Analyses Results Across Precursor Type, in relation to Word and Non-Word Reading.* We listed correlational effect size, along with number of studies (n), 95% CI, p-values and heterogeneity values, for **phonological awareness**, **vocabulary** and **morphological awareness**, in relation to word/non-word reading. When possible, we conducted two separate analyses, based on assessment language (i.e., whether assessed in English only, or another language only).

| **Literacy Precursor** | **n (studies)** | **Effect Size (Correlation)** | **95% CI** | | **p** | **Heterogeneity** | | **Figure** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Lower | Upper | | I2 | p | |
| **Phonological Awareness** | | | | | | | | |
| *English* | 15 | 0.5068 | 0.4055 | 0.5958 | *< 0.0001 | 64.1% | 0.0004 | 2 |
| *Other Language (Non-English)* | 5 | 0.3563 | 0.1169 | 0.5565 | *0.0042 | 58.8% | 0.0455 | 3 |
| **Vocabulary**: | | | | | | | | |
| *English* | 12 | 0.4027 | 0.2862 | 0.5075 | *< 0.0001 | 60.9% | 0.0031 | 4 |
| *Other Language (Non-English)* | 5 | 0.3133 | 0.1383 | 0.4692 | *0.0006 | 53.5% | 0.0719 | 5 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Morphological Awareness** | 6 | 0.5005 | 0.1441 | 0.7420 | *0.0078 | 85.8% | < 0.0001 | 6 |

*Note* *= significant p-value <0.05. See Figures 2-6 for corresponding random-effect models.

***Oral Language Precursors and Word/Non-Word Decoding Skills in Relation to Text Reading Comprehension.***

As Table 10 below and Figures 7-8 (Appendix A) demonstrate, our analyses were significant for specific *oral language* (vocabulary; Figure 7), and *word/non-word decoding* skills (Figure 8) in relation to text reading comprehension (see Table 10 for r-coefficient values).

**Table 10**

*Correlational Meta-Analyses Results Across Precursor Type, in relation to Text Reading Comprehension.* We listed correlational effect size, along with number of studies (n), 95% CI, p-values and heterogeneity values, for **vocabulary** and **word/non-word decoding**, in relation to text comprehension.

| **Literacy Precursor** | **n (studies)** | **Effect Size (Correlation)** | **95% CI** | | **p** | **Heterogeneity** | | **Figure** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Lower | Upper | | I2 | p | |
| **Vocabulary** | 8 | 0.5706 | 0.3669 | 0.7221 | *< 0.0001 | 77.9% | < 0.0001 | 7 |
| **Word and Non-Word Decoding** | 5 | 0.6741 | 0.3705 | 0.8476 | *0.0002 | 90.3% | < 0.0001 | 8 |

*Note* *= significant p-value <0.05. See Figures 7-8 for corresponding random-effect models.

***Code-Related and Oral Language Precursors, in relation to Word/Non-Word Reading, based on Type of Testing, Writing System and Country of Assessment.***

As evident in Table 11 and Figures 9-11 (Appendix A), we conducted meta-analyses for *code-related skills* (specifically, phonological awareness) in relation to word/non-word reading -

— based on type of *testing* (i.e., whether assessed in same [within] or different [across] language), *writing system* (i.e., whether bilinguals, assessed in an alphabetic language[11], spoke syllabic-alphabetic or alphabetic-alphabetic combinations), and *assessment country* (i.e., whether Chinese-English bilinguals were assessed, on English measures, in Canada/US or Singapore).

The analysis for phonological awareness and word/non-word reading was significant only in relation to type of *writing system* (test for subgroup differences [Q]=3.97; p=0.0463, Figure 10 [syllabic-alphabetic bilinguals: r= 0.5708; 95% CI: 0.4813, 0.6485; studies = 11; n=654]; [alphabetic-alphabetic bilinguals: r= 0.3763; 95% CI: 0.1781, 0.5451; studies = 5; n= 412]). The analyses were not significant in relation to *testing* condition (Q=2.48; p=0.1154, Figure 9 [within-language: r= 0.5031; 95% CI: 0.4098, 0.5860; studies = 17; n= 1125]; [across-language: r= 0.3485; 95% CI: 0.1577, 0.5142; studies = 5; n= 231]), and *country of assessment* (Q=0.09; p=0.7610, Figure 11 [Canada/US: r = 0.5813; 95% CI: 0.4453, 0.6910; studies = 6; n= 237]; [Singapore: r = 0.5553; 95% CI: 0.4322, 0.6581; studies = 5; n= 654]).

As evident in Table 12 and Figure 12 (Appendix A), the meta-analysis for *oral language skills* (vocabulary) and word/non-word reading was significant for *testing* condition (Q=5.32; p=0.0210, Figure 12 [within-language: r= 0.4221; 95% CI: 0.28889, 0.5392; studies = 11; n= 459]; [across-language: r=0.2026; 95% CI: 0.0644, 0.3332; studies = 7; n= 870]).

**Interim Discussion**

Similar to English monolinguals, commonly-assessed *code-related* (phonological awareness: Chiappe et al., 2002; Hsu et al., 2019; Ibrahim et al., 2007; Jasińska et al., 2018; Limbird et al., 2014; Spencer & Hanley, 2003; Yeong et al., 2014) and *oral-language*

[11] Most alphabetic within-language assessments were conducted in English, except for Hebrew and French (studies 9 and 15).

(vocabulary: Hsu et al., 2019; Lervåg & Aukrust, 2009; Limbird et al., 2014; Rhys & Thomas, 2013; Spatgens & Schoonen, 2018; van den Bosch et al., 2020; also see, Hjetland et al., 2017; NELP, 2008) precursors were associated with word/non-word reading across English and heritage languages of bilinguals. Associations were also evident between morphological awareness and word/non-word reading, as well as for vocabulary and word/non-word decoding in relation to text reading comprehension (see Tables 9-10, and goal iii).

The evident differences in correlational strength for phonological awareness and vocabulary in relation to word/non-word reading, across the two languages, may be due to greater degree of English usage/exposure or language-specific linguistic differences (i.e., based on phonological and orthographic structure). Yeong et al. (2014) demonstrate influence of language exposure and assessment measure type on precursor skills. Chinese-English simultaneous bilinguals, with greater English home-language exposure, demonstrated significantly higher scores on English receptive vocabulary and specific phonological awareness measures (i.e., for phoneme and syllable blending, but not elision), compared to bilinguals with greater Chinese exposure. However, we could not examine whether language proficiency mediates this relationship, as limited studies reported language usage/exposure rates.

Similarly, correlational strength differences demonstrated for phonological awareness and word/non-word reading, in relation to writing system type (see Table 11, Appendix A), may be due to language-specific linguistic influences or differential degree of proficiency across heritage and societal languages. In monolingual readers, orthography type mediates relationship between specific phonological awareness measures and reading. Phonemic awareness is strongly associated with word reading in alphabetic orthographies. Conversely, syllabic awareness is a

reliable precursor of character recognition in morpho-syllabic languages, primarily utilizing lexical strategies to process larger phonological grain sizes (McBride-Chang et al., 2004).

Cross-language transfer of sub-lexical and lexical reading strategies is evident, even between languages with differing scripts (O'Brien et al., 2019). As compared to Malay-English and Tamil-English bilinguals, speaking alphabetic-alphabetic combinations, Chinese-English bilinguals showed the strongest precursor-outcome associations for English onset-rime awareness, compared to phonemic and syllable awareness, in relation to reading. Along with sub-lexical phonemic processes, the bilinguals utilized lexical, involving onset- and syllable-level processing from the morpho-syllabic heritage language, strategies for English word reading (O'Brien et al., 2019). As such, we expected stronger correlations between phonemic awareness and word/non-word reading in the alphabetic-alphabetic bilingual group. However, syllabic-alphabetic bilinguals demonstrated moderate-level correlations, while alphabetic-alphabetic bilinguals demonstrated weak-level correlations (see Table 11 and Figure 10, Appendix A). These differences may be due to greater degree of language proficiency for the assessed alphabetic language in syllabic-alphabetic bilinguals — rather than orthographic influences.

Bilinguals comprise a heterogenous group, as they vary in language dominance, proficiency, sources of exposure, and linguistic context (De Bruin, 2019). While our review minimized heterogeneity by only focusing on simultaneous bilinguals, some factors (e.g., language proficiency and dominance) remain unexamined. This is because limited studies reported proficiency measures. Only 4/33 studies reported degree of language exposure (Hsu et al., 2019; Sun et al., 2021; Yang, 2010; Yeong et al., 2014) with 3/4 studies reporting language exposure details in both languages, while no studies reported degree of language usage.

Due to limited language background reporting, we considered country of assessment as an indirect indicator of English proficiency in Chinese-English bilinguals — assuming dominance for the societal language. The assessment country (i.e., whether English-dominant, such as Canada or the US, or non-English dominant, such as Singapore; Table 11 and Figure 11) did not mediate the relationship between English phonological awareness and word/non-word reading. However, this may be due to statistical power; only 11/33 independent studies assessed English phonological awareness and word/non-word reading skills across the two countries (Hipfner-Boucher et al., 2014; Yeong et al., 2014; Hsu et al., 2019; O'Brien et al., 2019; Lam et al., 2012; Ríos-López et al., 2017). We could not examine influences of assessment country on Chinese literacy skills, as few studies assessed both languages (Hsu et al., 2019; Mak, 2014).

**Precursors and Outcome Measures Assessed in Both Languages**

As evident in Table 8B (Appendix A), 11/33 studies assessed precursors and outcome measures in both languages (English and another language: n=9 [3, 7, 10, 11, 14, 17, 22, 25, 33]; Two other languages: n=2 [13, 15]). When both languages were assessed, three studies demonstrated significant within-language associations for one language[12] (7, 13, 33), 10 studies demonstrated significant within-language associations for both languages[13] (3, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 22, 25, 33), two studies demonstrated significant across-language associations for outcomes in one language[14] (17, 33), six studies demonstrated significant across-language associations for

[12] In Table 8B, *significant within-language precursor-outcome* associations *for one language* refers to precursors and outcomes assessed in the same language (and significant in one language).
[13] *Significant within-language precursor-outcome* associations *for both languages* refers to measures assessed in the same language (and significant in both languages).
[14] The term *significant across-language precursor-outcome* associations *for literacy outcomes in one language* refers to measures assessed in different languages (and significant for outcomes in one language).

outcomes in both languages[15] (10, 11, 13, 15, 17, 22), two studies demonstrated non-significant across-language associations (3, 33), and one study demonstrated non-significant within- and across-language associations in both languages (7).

Literacy precursors with significant consistent within- and/or across-language precursor-outcome associations, in relation to at least one assessed outcome measure, were the following *code-related* (phonological awareness [n=6: 3, 7, 14, 15, 22, 33], letter knowledge [13], serial recall [33]), *oral language* (oral language comprehension [n=2:10, 11], receptive/expressive vocabulary [n=5: 3, 10, 11, 25, 33], syntactic awareness [n=2: 17, 33], morphological awareness [n=2: 3, 33]), *domain-general cognitive* (working memory [n=2: 17, 33], non-verbal intelligence [33]), *word/non-word decoding* (33), and *additional identified* skills (spelling [17], VA span [15], and name writing [13]). Tables 7, 8A and 8B (Appendix A) indicate significant *precursor-outcome associations* for papers reporting at least one significant association for the same group, across multiple within- and/or across-language assessment measures or timepoints.

**Associations based on Word/Non-Word or Text Reading Measures**

In line with goal (iv), Table 7 (Appendix A) illustrates that precursors were assessed in relation to the following reading measures: word reading accuracy (n=24: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22, 23, 25, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33) and speed (n=3: 5, 15, 28), non-word reading accuracy (n=7: 9, 14, 15, 16, 17, 28, 33) and speed (n=2: 15, 28), text reading accuracy (n=5: 9, 15, 25, 28, 29) and speed (n=5: 9, 15, 19, 28, 29), and text comprehension (n=10:11, 16, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 33).

[15] *Significant across-language precursor-outcome* associations *for literacy outcomes in both languages* refers to measures assessed in different languages (and significant for outcomes in both languages).

A total of 13/33 studies assessed precursors in comparison to multiple outcome measures (5, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 23, 25, 28, 29, 30, 33). In 6/13 studies, bilinguals demonstrated significant precursor-outcome associations for *code-related* (phonological awareness:15), *oral language* (receptive vocabulary [30]; syntactic [17, 33] and morphological awareness [5]), *domain-general cognitive* (working memory [17, 33], non-verbal intelligence [33], and *additional identified* (VA span [15], sub-lexical speech perception [28]) literacy precursors, only in relation to specific outcome measures and assessment languages (see Table 7, Appendix A):

***Code-Related Precursors***

**Phonological Awareness.** Spanish-French bilinguals demonstrated significant associations between Spanish phonological awareness and word reading accuracy, and for Spanish and French non-word and text reading accuracy. However, non-significant associations were evident in relation to word, non-word and text reading speed across languages (study 15, Table 7 in Appendix A).

***Oral-Language Precursors***

**Vocabulary.** Turkish-Dutch bilinguals demonstrated significant associations between receptive vocabulary and text reading comprehension, but not word reading accuracy (30).

**Syntactic Awareness.** Italian-English bilinguals demonstrated significant associations between Italian and English syntactic awareness and word reading accuracy, and for Italian non-word reading accuracy (17). Chinese-English bilinguals demonstrated significant associations between syntactic awareness and text reading comprehension, but not word and non-word reading accuracy (33).

**Morphological Awareness.** Malay-English bilinguals demonstrated significant associations between morphological awareness and word reading accuracy, but not word reading speed (5).

### *Domain-General Cognitive Precursors*

**Working Memory.** Italian-English bilinguals demonstrated significant associations between Italian working memory and word reading accuracy, but not non-word reading accuracy, across languages (17). Chinese-English bilinguals demonstrated significant associations between working memory and text reading comprehension, but not word and non-word reading accuracy (33).

**Non-Verbal Intelligence.** Chinese-English bilinguals demonstrated significant associations between non-verbal intelligence and text reading comprehension, but not word and non-word reading accuracy (33).

### *Additional Identified Precursors*

**Semantic Awareness.** Simultaneous bilinguals demonstrated non-significant associations for semantic awareness across word, non-word and text reading accuracy (7, 9), text reading speed (9) and comprehension (26) outcome measures.

**Visual Attention (VA) Span.** Spanish-French bilinguals demonstrated significant associations for VA span in relation to Spanish and French word and non-word reading accuracy and speed, and text reading speed, and for French text reading accuracy (15).

**Sub-Lexical/Phonological Speech Perception.** Basque-Spanish bilinguals demonstrated significant associations for speech perception in relation to word, non-word and text reading speed, but not accuracy (28).

**Interim Discussion**

We also found that type of outcome measure, whether word, non-word or text-level reading, can also affect literacy precursor assessment (see goal iv). Reading measures may be differentially sensitive for certain precursors, depending on AoA, proficiency, reading experience, and languages of assessment (Lervåg & Aukrust, 2009; Limbird et al., 2014; Rhys & Thomas, 2013). To the best of our knowledge, this has not been investigated in monolingual English-speaking children. Previous studies have not compared associations for specific literacy precursors in relation to multiple reading measures, assessed at the same time-point. In English monolinguals, reading experience has been highlighted as a factor influencing associations for code-related and oral language skills, in relation to specific outcome measures. Kindergarten code-related skills, including phonemic awareness, are a comparatively stronger predictor of early Grade 1 and 2 word/non-word-level decoding and recognition. Conversely, prior reading and oral language skills, including vocabulary and grammar, strongly contribute to Grade 3-4 reading comprehension (e.g., Hulme et al., 2015; Storch & Whitehurst, 2002).

In Spanish-English and French-English simultaneous bilinguals with shared romance language families, receptive vocabulary more strongly correlated with text comprehension — compared to word reading for sequential bilinguals (Bérubé & Marinova-Todd, 2012; Dunn et al., 2011). Further, Turkish-Dutch bilinguals demonstrated significant associations between vocabulary and text comprehension, but not for word reading (van den Bosch et al., 2020). The language of assessment also mediated associations for code-related precursors evaluated in relation to multiple reading measures. Spanish-French bilinguals demonstrated significant associations for phonological awareness in relation to non-word and text-reading accuracy across languages; however, reading speed was not a sensitive outcome measure. Further, they showed

significant associations in relation to Spanish word reading, but not when assessed in French (Lallier et al., 2014). To address concerns regarding word/non-word reading – compared to text comprehension – difficulties, further research is needed to investigate which skills are reliable precursors of specific reading measures in bilingual children, depending on language(s) spoken.

**Language Background Measures Assessed in Relation to Precursors and Word/Non-Word and Text Reading Measures**

To address goal (v), this section reports language background influences on code-related, oral-language, domain general cognitive and additional identified precursors and reading skills across the 33 included papers. As evident in Table 13 (Appendix A), 26/33 studies assessed language proficiency (1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33). Most studies assessed parent-completed questionnaires/interviews (n=24:1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33), then oral language comprehension/production tasks (n=6: 7, 10, 11, 14, 20, 24), teacher-completed questionnaires/interviews or classroom observations (n=5: 8, 14, 15, 24, 27), child-completed interviews (n=3: 20, 24, 26), and word/non-word reading tasks (n=2: 14, 17). Five studies analyzed language proficiency influences on precursor and outcome measure performance (12, 17, 28, 31, 32), with two studies (17 and 32) demonstrating significant moderating effects of proficiency on literacy precursor (i.e., Italian and English syntactic awareness and spelling, but not working memory [17]) and outcome (i.e., Italian and English word/non-word reading [17] and Chinese character recognition [32]) performance.

Out of 16/33 studies assessing receptive/expressive vocabulary as precursors in relation to outcome measures (1, 3, 6, 8, 10, 11, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 30, 33), 6/16 studies demonstrated significant associations between vocabulary and additional precursors (1, 3, 8, 16,

23, 33), and between outcome measures. However, 10/16 studies analyzed vocabulary in relation to literacy outcomes, but not additional precursors (6, 10, 11, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 30).

## General Discussion

While code-related, oral-language and domain-general cognitive literacy precursors are relatively well studied in monolinguals (e.g., Hjetland et al., 2020; Kirby et al., 2008, 2010; Melby-Lervåg et al., 2012), factors shaping biliteracy development are still not well understood. Bilingual performance on oral language and literacy measures is typically affected by AoA and proficiency across spoken languages (Kovelman et al., 2008, 2015; Thordardottir, 2019). Here, we kept AoA constant by focusing on simultaneous bilinguals – and examined other language background influences, including *proficiency level*, *cross-language transfer effects* and *language(s) of assessment*, on emergent literacy skills.

It is unclear which *language proficiency* measures are reliably associated with literacy performance. While most studies assessed multiple proficiency measures, few reported specific exposure or usage rates across both languages (Yeong et al., 2014; Hsu et al., 2019; Yang, 2010), and analyzed proficiency influences on emergent literacy skills (D'angiulli et al., 2001; Oller et al., 2007; Ríos-López et al., 2017; Sun et al., 2021; Yang, 2010).

Along with parental reports and standardized oral language measures, vocabulary is a good indicator of language proficiency, and contributes to reading ability (Peets et al., 2019). Studies assessed vocabulary as a precursor in relation to reading (see Table 13, Appendix A); however, they did not use vocabulary as a proficiency measure, nor analyze influences on precursor-outcome associations. Convergent validity between vocabulary and language background measures was also not examined in the reviewed studies. Assessing vocabulary, both as distinct and combined skills across spoken languages, would enable analysis of language-

specific proficiency, as compared to language-general ability, contributions to biliteracy development. Further, receptive and expressive vocabulary measures each inform different aspects of bilingual status; however, only one study assessed both vocabulary constructs (Mak, 2014). Expressive vocabulary may be an indicator of language dominance in non-balanced simultaneous bilinguals, while receptive vocabulary allows comparison across language dominance due to earlier onset (Gibson et al., 2014). Receptive measures are particularly informative, when expressive vocabulary cannot be assessed depending on proficiency levels.

While vocabulary measures are a relatively objective language proficiency measure, they do not capture sufficient bilingual profile information — including AoA, linguistic distance[16] and duration/quality of language exposure, usage and dominance — which also influences code-related and oral language skills (Haman et al., 2017; Jasińska et al., 2019). Assessing multiple proficiency measures, such as standardized oral language tools and parental reports, will enable analysis of how different aspects of proficiency influence biliteracy development (De Bruin et al., 2017). Access to adequate language background information would enable interpretation of correlational strength differences demonstrated, between syllabic-alphabetic and alphabetic-alphabetic bilinguals, for phonological awareness and reading. These differences may be due to *language proficiency* or *linguistic* (e.g., orthographic systems or cross-language interference from an alphabetic language with closer linguistic distance) reasons (Table 11 and Figure 10).

Comprehensive language background evaluation will facilitate a better understanding of oral-language, compared to domain-general cognitive, influences on meta-linguistic precursors such as phonological awareness. These skills involve both language (via vocabulary knowledge) and cognition/memory (via identification and manipulation of familiar spoken-sound structures)

[16] The percentage of shared phonologically or semantically-related cognates across languages.

components. Such analysis is important for disentangling language-general, compared to language-specific proficiency, influences of oral-language measures for literacy acquisition. This is because vocabulary skills can be an indicator of proficiency – in addition to their role as precursors of emergent literacy development, including age-appropriate phonological awareness, in monolingual and bilingual children (Chung & Bidelman, 2021; Kalia et al., 2018).

Along with examining associations for code-related and oral-language precursors in the same language (i.e., within-language testing), some studies also examined *cross-language transfer effects* for these precursors across different languages (i.e., across-language testing). The cross-language transfer effects for phonological awareness and vocabulary highlight how supporting precursors in the heritage language can facilitate reading development in the educational language (and vice-versa; see Tables 8A-B for across-language precursor-outcome associations, and Tables 11-12, Appendix A for meta-analyses across testing condition[17]). Given limited language-specific precursor screening tools, such bi-directional findings are informative for clinicians. It should also be examined whether print-based precursors, such as name writing (Bengochea et al., 2017), visual attention (VA) span (Lallier et al., 2014) and serial recall (Spencer & Hanley, 2003), can be assessed once to reflect literacy skills of bilingual children speaking language combinations with shared orthographic/numeral systems and closer linguistic distance. Clinicians can facilitate literacy development, in the language of education, by assessing and providing early reading intervention for code-related and oral-language precursors in the dominant heritage or societal language (Kim & Piper, 2019). While within-language

[17] Whether children were assessed for phonological awareness or vocabulary literacy precursors in relation to word/non-word reading outcome measures in the same (within-language) or different (across-language) language. See Tables 11 and 12 (Appendix A), for correlational meta-analyses pertaining to testing condition.

testing in both languages enables comprehensive evaluation of biliteracy development milestones, across-language testing may contribute preliminary diagnostic information for early identification of oral language and reading difficulties — if literacy assessments are not available across spoken languages.

Assessing bilinguals across spoken languages will also enable identification of factors, such as linguistic and orthographic[18] distance, that facilitate bidirectional cross-language transfer of code-related and oral language precursors in *Simple View of Reading (SVR)* and *Dual Route Model of Reading*. Spanish-French, Spanish-English and Welsh-English bilinguals, with shared alphabetic orthographies and closer linguistic distance, demonstrated significant within- and bidirectional across-language associations for phonological awareness (Lallier et al., 2014; Spencer & Hanley, 2003) and oral language (Dunn et al., 2011; Hammer et al., 2007; Rhys & Thomas, 2013). However, Chinese (morpho-syllabic) - English (alphabetic) bilinguals only demonstrated significant within-language associations (Hsu et al., 2019; Mak, 2014).

This review also demonstrated an English-*language assessment* bias, with limited studies assessing literacy skills across heritage and societal languages. Most assessments were conducted only in English (Hipfner-Boucher et al., 2014; Yeong et al., 2014; Chiappe et al., 2002; Hsu et al., 2019; O'Brien et al., 2019; Bérubé & Marinova-Todd, 2012; Lam et al., 2012; Sun et al., 2021; Yang, 2010), or in English and a heritage language (Hsu et al., 2019; Jasińska et al., 2018; Hammer et al., 2007; Dunn et al., 2011; Cherodath & Singh, 2015; D'angiulli et al., 2001; Spencer & Hanley, 2003; Rhys & Thomas, 2013; Mak, 2014). The stronger correlations for within-, compared to across-, language testing for vocabulary and word/non-word reading

[18] The degree of orthographic variation, including the smallest unit of sound-symbol representation, across languages.

emphasize importance of developing language-specific precursor screening tools to evaluate and support emergent literacy skills across spoken languages (Table 12, Appendix A).

Assessing both languages will also enable investigation of factors facilitating — or inhibiting — biliteracy development and cross-language transfer of emergent literacy skills, in speakers of disparate orthographic combinations such as Chinese-English bilinguals (Bérubé & Marinova-Todd, 2012; Hipfner-Boucher et al., 2014; Lam et al., 2012). Reading models, including *Script Dependent Hypothesis (SDH)* and *Linguistic Interdependence Hypothesis* (*LIH)*, have predominantly examined reading development in monolingual readers of alphabetic and non-alphabetic languages, and cross-language transfer effects in alphabetic-alphabetic bilinguals (e.g., Ellis & Hooper, 2001). In monolinguals, type of orthographic system and degree of orthographic depth influence the relationship between phonological awareness measures and word/non-word reading (McBride-Chang et al., 2004; Defior, 2004). While phonemic awareness is a strong contributor to word recognition across orthographic depth in alphabetic languages, syllable awareness is a more sensitive measure of phonological awareness abilities in morpho-syllabic languages (McBride-Chang et al., 2004). Further, orthographic depth influences onset and age-related contributions of phonological awareness to reading in alphabetic orthographies. While readers of transparent languages develop awareness of phonological units earlier (Defior, 2004), phonological awareness is a comparatively stronger long-term contributor to reading, across primary and secondary grades, in opaque orthographies (Furnes & Samuelsson, 2010; Ziegler et al., 2010).

Limited studies have investigated how interactions between language-specific factors, such as linguistic distance and orthographic depth — whether transparent[19] or opaque[20] — in addition to proficiency levels, mediate relationships between specific precursors and outcome measures, across the two languages. Specific to bilinguals, degree of proficiency and linguistic/orthographic distance across spoken languages influence emergent biliteracy development, including cross-language transfer effects. Interactions between phonological and orthographic systems, whether shared or disparate, may influence cross-language transfer of sub-lexical and lexical reading strategies and underlying code-related and oral-language skills. Due to statistical limitations, our meta-analyses did not investigate language background influences on reported precursor-outcome associations. Such research would allow a better understanding of relevance of current reading models for bilingual populations across language background and dominancy profiles. Linguistically-diverse research would also enable assessment and interpretation of bilingual performance on standardized literacy measures, based on norms derived from populations with similar language status — rather than direct comparison with English monolinguals**.**

[19] Writing systems with a one-to-one phoneme-grapheme correspondence such as Hindi, Spanish and Welsh. In phonologically-consistent/transparent alphabetic orthographies, word reading is more directly predicted by spelling. This is due to the predictable relationship between an individual phoneme and its representation/grapheme, which helps children with acquiring the alphabetic principle and learning to read (i.e., via sub-lexical reading strategies).

[20] Phonologically inconsistent writing systems, such as English or French, where an individual phoneme can be represented by multiple graphemes. In opaque alphabetic orthographies, words cannot always be phonologically decoded due to unpredictable phoneme-grapheme correspondences; children learn to recognize/memorize and read high frequency and irregular words via whole/sight word reading (i.e., lexical) strategies.

### Study Limitations: Correlational Meta-Analyses

Most research in this domain examines correlational analyses (e.g., Hjetland et al., 2017; NELP, 2008). While papers typically combine correlational values for studies reporting multiple values, across literacy measures and assessment timepoints, averaging dependent studies may overestimate sampling error. Common Fisher-z Transformation of r-coefficients and Hunter-Schmidt (20115) corrections are based on test assumptions not typically reported, such as sample statistical independence and bivariate normality. The Hunter-Schmidt (2015) method also requires access to inter-correlational values for combined measures or timepoints. These values are comparatively difficult to access, as limited biliteracy studies assess specific language combinations and similar literacy measures. To ensure statistical independence, we selected one correlation, based on common assessment and language features, for studies reporting multiple coefficients for the same precursor across reading outcomes, languages and timepoints. Further, correlational studies typically analyze precursors in isolation. This limits examination of factors, including interactions between code-related and oral-language precursors, facilitating — or inhibiting — biliteracy development (Castles & Colthart, 2004; Lonigan, 2007).

## Summary and Future Directions

This review screened 33 studies, identifying 17 literacy precursors, which– apart from semantic awareness – were significantly associated with word/non-word reading and/or text reading comprehension in simultaneous bilinguals. These include precursors also used in

monolingual children[21], in addition to less commonly used precursors[22]. Phonological awareness and vocabulary were commonly-assessed precursors consistently associated with reading, across languages. To address the evident English assessment bias, future research should:

- Develop language-specific[23] precursor screening tools across spoken languages.
- Examine reliability of non-linguistic precursors, including environmental print awareness working memory and non-verbal intelligence, when screening tools are not available in both languages.
- Report (and include in analyses) adequate and detailed language background measures across both languages, to understand the contribution of linguistic factors (e.g., language balance/dominance, proficiency, etc.) to literacy development in bilinguals.
- Examine precursors (e.g., code-related vs. oral-language skills) best suited for early screening/identification of specific reading difficulties (e.g., word/non-word reading compared to text comprehension) in biliteracy development.
- Examine interactions between various precursors, along with individual and combined contributions to reading, in linguistically-diverse bilinguals across proficiency profiles. Such research would contribute to reading models, such as *SVR*, *Dual Route Model of Reading, LIH* and *SDH,* predominantly based on monolingual alphabetic readers.

[21] The literacy precursors commonly assessed in English-speaking monolingual children are: *code-related skills* (phonological awareness, letter knowledge, serial recall), *oral language and grammar skills* (oral language/linguistic comprehension, vocabulary, grammar [morphological and syntactic awareness]), *domain-general cognitive skills* (memory, non-verbal intelligence), and word/non-word decoding.
[22] The additional literacy precursors identified in this review are: semantic awareness, spelling, VA span, orthographic processing skills, environmental print awareness, name writing, sub-lexical/phonological speech perception and sentence priming.
[23] Based on phonological and orthographic properties.

## References

Adesope, O. O., Lavin, T., Thompson, T., & Ungerleider, C. (2010). A systematic review and meta-analysis of the cognitive correlates of bilingualism. Review of Educational Research, 80(2), 207-245.

Adlof, S., Catts, H., & Lee, J. (2010). Kindergarten predictors of second vs. eighth grade reading comprehension impairments. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 43, 332-345. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177%2F0022219410369067

Akoglu, H. (2018). User's guide to correlation coefficients. Turkish Journal of Emergency Medicine, 18(3), 91-93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tjem.2018.08.001

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (2006). *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth*. Routledge.

Bengochea, A., Justice, L. M., & Hijlkema, M. J. (2017). Print knowledge in Yucatec Maya-Spanish bilingual children: An initial inquiry. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 20*(7), 807-822. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1103699

Bérubé, D., & Marinova-Todd, S. (2012). The development of language and reading skills in the second and third languages of multilingual children in French immersion. *International Journal of Multilingualism 9*, 272-293. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2011.631708

Bialystok, E., Luk, G., & Kwan, E. (2005). Bilingualism, biliteracy, and learning to read: Interactions among languages and writing systems. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, *9*(1), 43-61. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532799xssr0901_4

Birgisdottir, F., Gestsdottir, S., & Geldhof, G. J. (2020). Early predictors of first and fourth grade reading and math: The role of self-regulation and early literacy skills. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *53*, 507-519. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2020.05.001

Blom, E., Boerma, T., Bosma, E., Cornips, L., van den Heuij, K., & Timmermeister, M. (2020). Cross-language distance influences receptive vocabulary outcomes of bilingual children. *First Language*, *40*(2), 151-171. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0142723719892794

Blom, E., Küntay, A. C., Messer, M., Verhagen, J., & Leseman, P. (2014). The benefits of being bilingual: Working memory in bilingual Turkish-Dutch children. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 128*, 105-119. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2014.06.007

Bosse, M. L., & Valdois, S. (2009). Influence of the visual attention span on child reading performance: a cross-sectional study. *Journal of Research in Reading, 32*(2), 230-253. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9817.2008.01387.x

Both-de Vries, A. C., & Bus, A. G. (2010). The proper name as starting point for basic reading skills. *Reading and Writing*, *23*(2), 173-187. https://dx.doi.org/10.1007%2Fs11145-008-9158-2

Caravolas, M., Lervåg, A., Mikulajová, M., Defior, S., Seidlová-Málková, G., & Hulme, C. (2019). A cross-linguistic, longitudinal study of the foundations of decoding and

reading comprehension ability. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 23* (5), 386-402. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2019.1580284

Castles, A., & Coltheart, M. (2004). Is there a causal link from phonological awareness to success in learning to read? *Cognition*, *91*(1), 77–111. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0277(03)00164-1

Castles, A., Rastle, K., & Nation, K. (2018). Ending the reading wars: Reading acquisition from novice to expert. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, *19*(1), 5-51. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1529100618772271

Cherodath, S., & Singh, N. C. (2015). The influence of orthographic depth on reading networks in simultaneous biliterate children. *Brain and Language, 143,* 42-51. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2015.02.001

Chiappe, P., Siegel, L. S., & Gottardo, A. (2002). Reading-related skills of kindergartners from diverse linguistic backgrounds. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 23*(1), 95-116. https://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S014271640200005X

Chung, W. L., & Bidelman, G. M. (2021). Mandarin-speaking preschoolers' pitch discrimination, prosodic and phonological awareness, and their relation to receptive vocabulary and reading abilities. Reading and Writing, 34(2), 337-353. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-020-10075-9

The Cochrane Collaboration. (2011). *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions* [Version 5.1.0, updated March 2011]. (J.P.T. Higgins & S. Green, Eds.). Cochrane. www.handbook.cochrane.org.

D'angiulli, A., Siegel, L. S., & Serra. E. (2001). The development of reading in English and Italian in bilingual children. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 22* (4): 479-507. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716401004015

Daniels, P. T., & Share, D. L. (2018). Writing system variation and its consequences for reading and dyslexia. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, *22*(1), 101-116. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2017.1379082

De Bruin, A. (2019). Not all bilinguals are the same: A call for more detailed assessments and descriptions of bilingual experiences. *Behavioral Sciences*, *9*(3), 33. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs9030033

De Bruin, A., Carreiras, M., & Duñabeitia, J. A. (2017). The BEST dataset of language proficiency. *Frontiers in psychology*, *8*, 522. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00522

Defior S. (2004) Phonological Awareness and Learning to Read: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective. In: Nunes T., Bryant P. (eds) Handbook of Children's Literacy. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-1731-1_33

Dong, Y., Tang, Y., Chow, B. W. Y., Wang, W., & Dong, W. Y. (2020). Contribution of vocabulary knowledge to reading comprehension among Chinese students: A meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, 2349. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.525369

Dunn, D.M., Hammer, C., & Lawrence, F. R. (2011). Associations between preschool language and first grade reading outcomes in bilingual children. *Journal of Communication Disorders, 44*(4), 444-458. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2011.02.003

Ellis, N. C., & Hooper, A. M. (2001). Why learning to read is easier in Welsh than in English: Orthographic transparency effects evinced with frequency-matched tests. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 22,* 571-599. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716401004052

Foorman, B. R., Herrera, S., Petscher, Y., Mitchell, A., & Truckenmiller, A. (2015). The structure of oral language and reading and their relation to comprehension in kindergarten through Grade 2. *Reading and Writing, 28(5)*, 655-681. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-015-9544-5

Friesen, D. C., & Bialystok, E. (2012). Metalinguistic ability in bilingual children: The role of executive control. *Rivista Di Psicolinguistica Applicata, 12(3)*, 47.

Furnes, B., & Samuelsson, S. (2010). Predicting reading and spelling difficulties in transparent and opaque orthographies: a comparison between Scandinavian and US/Australian children. *Dyslexia*, *16*(2), 119–142. https://doi.org/10.1002/dys.401

García, J. R., & Cain, K. (2014). Decoding and reading comprehension: A meta-analysis to identify which reader and assessment characteristics influence the strength of the relationship in English. *Review of Educational Research, 84,* 74-111. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24434229

Geva, E., Siegel, L.S. (2000). Orthographic and cognitive factors in the concurrent development of basic reading skills in two languages. *Reading and Writing* (12), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008017710115

Gibson, T. A., Peña, E. D., & Bedore, L. M. (2014). The receptive–expressive gap in bilingual children with and without primary language impairment. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *23*(4), 655-667. https://doi.org/10.1044/2014_AJSLP-12-0119

Grosjean, F. (2010). Bilingual: Life and reality. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gupta, A., & Jamal, G. (2007). Reading strategies of bilingual normally progressing and dyslexic readers in Hindi and English. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 28*(1), 47-68

Haman, E., Wodniecka, Z., Marecka, M., Szewczyk, J., Białecka-Pikul, M., Otwinowska, A., Mieszkowska, K., Łuniewska, M., Kołak, J., Miękisz, A., & Kacprzak, A. (2017). How does L1 and L2 exposure impact L1 performance in bilingual children? Evidence from Polish-English migrants to the United Kingdom. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, 1444. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01444

Hammer, C.S., Lawrence, F. R., & Miccio, A. W. (2007). Bilingual children's language abilities and early reading outcomes in head start and kindergarten. *Language, Speech & Hearing Services in Schools, 38*(3), 237-48. https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461(2007/025)

Hipfner-Boucher, K., Lam, K., & Chen, X. (2014). The effects of bilingual education on the English language and literacy outcomes of Chinese-speaking children. *Written Language and Literacy, 17*(1), 116-138. https://doi.org/10.1075/wll.17.1.06hip

Hjetland, H. N., Brinchmann, E. I., Scherer, R., & Melby-Lervåg, M. (2017). Preschool predictors of later reading comprehension ability: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, *14*, 1-156. https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2017.14

Hjetland, H. N., Brinchmann, E. I., Scherer, R., Hulme, C., & Melby-Lervåg, M. (2020). Preschool pathways to reading comprehension: A systematic meta-analytic review. *Educational Research Review*, *30*, 100323. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100323

Hsu, L. S., Ip, K. I., Arredondo, M. M., Tardif, T., & Kovelman, I. (2019). Simultaneous acquisition of English and Chinese impacts children's reliance on vocabulary, morphological and phonological awareness for reading in English. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 22*(2), 207-223. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1246515

Hulme, C., Nash, H. M., Gooch, D., Lervåg, A., & Snowling, M. J. (2015). The foundations of literacy development in children at familial risk of dyslexia. *Psychological Science, 26*, 1877-1886. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0956797615603702

Hulme, C., Zhou, L., Tong, X., Lervåg, A., & Burgoyne, K. (2019). Learning to read in Chinese: Evidence for reciprocal relationships between word reading and oral language skills. *Developmental Science*, *22*(1), e12745. https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12745

Ibrahim, R., Eviatar, Z., & Aharon-Peretz, J. (2007). Metalinguistic awareness and reading performance: A cross language comparison. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 36*(4), 297-317. https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10936- 006-9046-3

Jackson, D., & Turner, R. (2017). Power analysis for random-effects meta-analysis. *Research Synthesis Methods*, *8*(3), 290-302. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdfdirect/10.1002/jrsm.1240

Jasińska, K., Kaja, K., & Petitto, L. A. (2018). Age of bilingual exposure is related to the contribution of phonological and semantic knowledge to successful reading development. *Child Development, 89*(1), 310-331. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12745

Jasińska, K. K., Wolf, S., Jukes, M. C., & Dubeck, M. M. (2019). Literacy acquisition in multilingual educational contexts: Evidence from Coastal Kenya. *Developmental Science, 128*(28). https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12828

Joanna Briggs Institute. (2017). Critical appraisal checklist for quasi-experimental studies (non-randomized experimental studies). Retrieved from https://joannabriggs.org/sites/default/files/2019-05/JBI_Quasi-Experimental_Appraisal_Tool2017_0.pdf

Kalia, V., Lane, P. D., & Wilbourn, M. P. (2018). Cognitive control and phonological awareness in the acquisition of second language vocabulary within the Spanish-English dual immersion context. Cognitive Development, 48, 176-189. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2018.08.010

Kim, Y. S. G., & Piper, B. (2019). Cross-language transfer of reading skills: An empirical investigation of bidirectionality and the influence of instructional environments. *Reading and Writing*, *32*(4), 839-871. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-018-9889-7

Kirby, J. R., Desrochers, A., Roth, L., & Lai, S. S. (2008). Longitudinal predictors of word reading development. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne*, *49*(2), 103.

Kirby, J. R., Georgiou, G. K., Martinussen, R., & Parrila, R. (2010). Naming speed and reading: From prediction to instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *45*(3), 341-362.

Kovelman, I., Baker, S. A., & Petitto, L. A. (2008). Age of first bilingual language exposure as a new window into bilingual reading development. *Bilingualism (Cambridge, England)*, *11*(2), 203–223. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728908003386

Kovelman, I., Salah-Ud-Din, M., Berens, M. S., & Petitto, L. (2015). "One glove does not fit all" in bilingual reading acquisition: Using the age of first bilingual language exposure to understand optimal contexts for reading success. *Cogent Education, 2*(1). doi:10.1080/2331186X.2015.1006504

Kroll, J. F., Bobb, S. C., & Hoshino, N. (2014). Two languages in mind: Bilingualism as a tool to investigate language, cognition, and the brain. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *23*(3), 159-163.

Kuo, L. J., Chen, Z., & Ko, S. W. (2016). The impact of bilingual experience on the literacy development of struggling readers. *Journal of Childhood & Development Disorders, 2*(2), 1-5. https://doi.org/10.4172/2472-1786.100009

Lallier, M., Valdois, S., Lassus-Sangosse, D., Prado, C., & Kandel, S. (2014). Impact of orthographic transparency on typical and atypical reading development: Evidence in French-Spanish bilingual children. *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 35*(5), 1177-1190. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2014.01.021

Lam, K., Chen, X., Geva, E., Luo, Y. C., & Li, H. (2012). The role of morphological awareness in reading achievement among young Chinese-speaking English language learners: A longitudinal study. *Reading and Writing*, *25*(8), 1847-1872. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-011-9329-4

Lervåg, A., & Aukrust, V. G. (2009). Vocabulary knowledge is a critical determinant of the difference in reading comprehension growth between first and second language learners." *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 51* (5): 612-620. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2009.02185.x

Lesaux, N. K., & Geva, E. (2006). *Synthesis: Development of Literacy in Language-Minority Students.* In D. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Developing literacy in second-language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth* (p. 53–74). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Limbird, C. K., Maluch, J. T., Rjosk, C., Stanat, P., & Merkens, H. (2014). Differential growth patterns in emerging reading skills of Turkish-German bilingual and German monolingual primary school students. *Reading and Writing*, *27*(5), 945-968. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-013-9477-9

Lonigan, C. J. (2007). Vocabulary development and the development of phonological awareness skills in preschool children. *Vocabulary acquisition: Implications for reading comprehension*, 15-31.

Mak, K.C.L. (2014). Reading comprehension in Chinese-English bilingual children: A cognitive perspective. *Masters Abstracts International 2014.*

Melby-Lervåg, M., Lyster, S. A., & Hulme, C. (2012). Phonological skills and their role in learning to read: a meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *138*(2), 322–352. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026744

McBride-Chang, C., Bialystok, E., Chong, K. K., & Li, Y. (2004). Levels of phonological awareness in three cultures. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *89*(2), 93-111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2004.05.001

Meir, N., & Armon-Lotem, S. (2017). Independent and combined effects of socioeconomic status (SES) and bilingualism on children's vocabulary and verbal short-term memory. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, 1442. https://dx.doi.org/10.3389%2Ffpsyg.2017.01442

Muter, V., Hulme, C., Snowling, M.J. & Stevenson, J. (2004). Phonemes, rimes and language skills as foundations of early reading development: Evidence from a longitudinal study. *Developmental Psychology*, 40, 66-–681. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.40.5.665

National Early Literacy Panel (NELP). (2008). *Developing early literacy: Report of the National Early Literacy Panel*. Washington, DC: National Center for Family Literacy. https://lincs.ed.gov/publications/pdf/NELPReport09.pdf

Nation, K., & Snowling, M. J. (1998). Individual differences in contextual facilitation: Evidence from dyslexia and poor reading comprehension. *Child Development, 69*(4), 996-1011. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1998.tb06157.x

Oakhill, J., & Kyle, F. (2000). The relation between phonological awareness and working memory. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *75*(2), 152-164. https://doi.org/10.1006/jecp.1999.2529

O'Brien, B. A., Mohamed, M. B. H., Yussof, N. T., & Ng, S. C. (2019). The phonological awareness relation to early reading in English for three groups of simultaneous bilingual children. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 32*(4), 909-937. https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11145-018-9890-1

Oller, D. K., Pearson, B. Z., & Cobo-lewis, A. (2007). Profile effects in early bilingual language and literacy. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 28*(2), 191. https://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0142716407070117

Patterson, J. (2002). Relationships of expressive vocabulary to frequency of reading and television experience among bilingual toddlers. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 23(4), 493-508. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716402004010

Peets, K. F., Yim, O., & Bialystok, E. (2019). Language proficiency, reading comprehension and home literacy in bilingual children: The impact of context. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1677551

Ramirez, G., Chen, X., & Pasquarella, A. (2013). Cross-linguistic transfer of morphological awareness in Spanish-speaking English language learners: The facilitating effect of cognate knowledge. *Topics in Language Disorders, 33*(1), 73-92. https://doi.org/10.1097/TLD.0b013e318280f55a

Rhys, M., & Thomas, E. M. (2013). Bilingual Welsh-English children's acquisition of vocabulary and reading: Implications for bilingual education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 16*(6), 633-656. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2012.706248

Richardson, W. S., Wilson, M. C., Nishikawa, J., & Hayward, R. S. (1995). The well-built clinical question: a key to evidence-based decisions. *ACP Journal Club, 123*(3). https://doi.org/10.7326/ACPJC-1995-123-3-A12

Ríos-López, P., Molnar, M. T., Lizarazu, M., & Lallier, M. (2017). The role of slow speech amplitude envelope for speech processing and reading development. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, 1497. https://dx.doi.org/10.3389%2Ffpsyg.2017.01497

Ripamonti, E., Aggujaro, S., Molteni, F., Zonca, G., Frustaci, M., & Luzzatti, C. (2014). The anatomical foundations of acquired reading disorders: a neuropsychological verification of the dual-route model of reading. *Brain and Language*, *134*, 44-67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2014.04.001

Ritchie, S., & Bates, T. (2013). Enduring links from childhood mathematics and reading achievement to adult socioeconomic status. *Psychological Science, 24*(7), 1301-1308. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0956797612466268

Ruan, Y., Georgiou, G. K., Song, S., Li, Y., & Shu, H. (2018). Does writing system influence the associations between phonological awareness, morphological awareness, and reading? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 110*(2), 180. https://doi.apa.org/doi/10.1037/edu0000216

Ryan, C. (2013). Language use in the United States: 2011. *American Community Survey Reports, ACS-22*. U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC. Retrieved from https://www2.census.gov/library/publications/2013/acs/acs-22/acs-22.pdf

Schaars, M. M., Segers, E., & Verhoeven, L. (2019). Cognitive and linguistic precursors of early first and second language reading development. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *72*, 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2019.03.008

Schmidt, F., & Hunter, J. (2015). *Methods of meta-analysis* (Third Edition ed.). SAGE Publications, Ltd https://www.doi.org/10.4135/9781483398105

Spatgens, T., & Schoonen, R. (2018). The semantic network, lexical access, and reading comprehension in monolingual and bilingual children: An individual differences study. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 39*(1), 225-256. https://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0142716417000224

Spencer, L.H., & Hanley, J.R. (2003), Effects of orthographic transparency on reading and phoneme awareness in children learning to read in Wales. *British Journal of Psychology, 94:* 1-28. https://doi.org/10.1348/000712603762842075

Spencer, L. H., & Hanley, J. R. (2004). Learning a transparent orthography at five years old: Reading development of children during their first year of formal reading instruction in Wales. *Journal of Research in Reading, 27,* 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9817.2004.00210.x

Sun, H., Bornstein, M.H., & Esposito, G. (2021). The specificity principle in young dual language learners' English development. *Child Development.* https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13558

Tamis-LeMonda, C., Song, L., Luo, R., Kuchirko, Y., Kahana-Kalman, R., Yoshikawa, H., & Raufman, J. (2014). Children's vocabulary growth in English and Spanish across early development and associations with school readiness skills. *Developmental Neuropsychology, 39*(2), 69-87. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/87565641.2013.827198

Thordardottir, E. (2019). Amount trumps timing in bilingual vocabulary acquisition: Effects of input in simultaneous and sequential school-age bilinguals. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 23(1)*, 236–255. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006917722418

Tighe, E. L., Wagner, R. K., & Schatschneider, C. (2015). Applying a multiple group causal indicator modeling framework to the reading comprehension skills of third, seventh, and tenth grade students. *Reading and Writing*, *28*(4), 439-466. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1007/s11145-014-9532-1

Tong, X., Tong, X., & McBride, C. (2017). Unpacking the relation between morphological awareness and Chinese word reading: Levels of morphological awareness and vocabulary. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *48*, 167-178. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2016.07.003

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2017). More than one-half of children and adolescents are not learning worldwide. Retrieved from https://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/fs46-more-than-half-children-not-learning-en2017.pdf

van den Bosch, L. J., Segers, E., & Verhoeven, L. (2020). First and second language vocabulary affect early second language reading comprehension development. *Journal of Research in Reading, 43*(3), 290-308. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.12304

Vanvooren, S., Poelmans, H., De Vos, A., Ghesquière, P., & Wouters, J. (2017). Do prereaders' auditory processing and speech perception predict later literacy? *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, *70*, 138-151. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/j.ridd.2017.09.005

Vital, H., & Karniol, R. (2011). Procedural versus narrative cross-language priming and bilingual children's reading and sentence sequencing of same genre and opposite genre text in the other language. *Bilingualism, 14*(4), 547-561. https://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1366728910000520

Wood, C., Fitton, L., & Rodriguez, E. (2018). Home literacy of dual-language learners in kindergarten from low-SES backgrounds. *AERA Open.* https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858418769613

Yan, M., Li, Y., Sun, X., Zhou, X., Hui, Y., & Li, H. (2021). The roles of decoding and vocabulary in Chinese reading development: Evidence from a 3-year longitudinal study. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *91*(1), 300-314. https://bpspsychub.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/bjep.12365

Yang, F.Y. (2010). Biliteracy effects on phonological awareness, oral language proficiency and reading skills in Taiwanese Mandarin-English bilingual children. *Dissertation Abstracts International, B: Sciences and Engineering 2010*.

Yang, X & Qiao, L. (2021). Effects of spatial skills and working memory on Chinese character reading in young children. *Infant and Child Development, 11*(12): 1-13. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/icd.2231

Yeong, S. H. M., Fletcher, J., & Bayliss, D. M. (2014). Importance of phonological and orthographic skills for English reading and spelling: A comparison of English monolingual and Mandarin-English bilingual children. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 106*(4), 1107. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0036927

Zhang, D. (2016). Morphology in Malay-English biliteracy acquisition: An intervention study. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 19*(5), 546-562. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.102687

Ziegler, J. C., Bertrand, D., Tóth, D., Csépe, V., Reis, A., Faísca, L., Saine, N., Lyytinen, H., Vaessen, A., & Blomert, L. (2010). Orthographic depth and its impact on universal predictors of reading: a cross-language investigation. *Psychological Science*, *21*(4), 551–559. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610363406

Ziegler, J. C., & Goswami, U. (2005). Reading acquisition, developmental dyslexia, and skilled reading across languages: a psycholinguistic grain size theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, *131*(1), 3. https://doi.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0033-2909.131.1.3

# Appendices

## **Appendix A.** Tables and Figures for Systematic Literature Review and Meta-Analysis

*Tables*

**Table 1**

*Database Search Terms used in the PICO Search.* Table of the database search terms, based on the PICO search tool's four criteria (indicated on the left: Population, Intervention, Comparison and Outcome), for the four Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts (LLBA), Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), MLA International Bibliography (MLA) and PsycINFO (ProQuest) electronic databases.

| **PICO Tool Criteria** | **Database Search Terms** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts (LLBA) | Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) | MLA International Bibliography (MLA) | PsycINFO (ProQuest) |
| **Population (P)**<br><br>*AND* | mainsubject (Child*) *OR* mainsubject (Infants) *AND* mainsubject (Bilingual*) *OR* mainsubject (Multilingual*) *OR* mainsubject (Second Language Learner*) | mainsubject (Child*) *OR* mainsubject (Infants) *AND* mainsubject (Bilingual*) *OR* mainsubject (Multilingual*) *OR* mainsubject (Second Language Learner*) | mainsubject (Child*) *OR* mainsubject (Infants) *AND* mainsubject (Bilingual*) *OR* mainsubject (Multilingual*) *OR* mainsubject (Second Language Learner*) | mainsubject (Child*) *OR* mainsubject (Infants) *AND* mainsubject (Bilingual*) *OR* mainsubject (Multilingual*) *OR* mainsubject (Second Language Learner*) |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Intervention**<br><br>(Literacy Precursor Assessed; I)<br><br>*AND* | Phonological Awareness *OR* phonem* awareness *OR* letter knowledge *OR* grapheme knowledge *OR* Grapheme Phoneme Correspondence *OR* sound symbol* *OR* Serial Recall *OR* Oral Comprehension *OR* Verbal Comprehension *OR* Listening Comprehension *OR* Vocabulary *OR* Word Knowledge *OR* grammar *OR* Syntax *OR* Syntac* *OR* Synta* *OR* Morpholog* *OR* Morphem* *OR* Visual Short Term Memory *OR* Phonological Short Term Memory *OR* Short Term Memory *OR* Working Memory *OR* Visual Memory *OR* Verbal Memory OR Nonverbal Memory *OR* Nonverbal Ability *OR* Nonverbal Intelligence *OR* Nonverbal IQ *OR* Precursor Literacy *OR* Precursor Reading *OR* Predictor Literacy *OR* Predictor Reading *OR* Precursor Literacy Skills *OR* Precursors of Reading Ability *OR* Early Predictors of Later Conventional Literacy Skills *OR* Predictive Literacy Skills *OR* Predictors of Later Reading Skills *OR* Preschool Literacy | Phonological Awareness *OR* phonem* awareness *OR* letter knowledge *OR* grapheme knowledge *OR* Grapheme Phoneme Correspondence *OR* sound symbol* *OR* Serial Recall *OR* Oral Comprehension *OR* Verbal Comprehension *OR* Listening Comprehension *OR* Vocabulary *OR* Word Knowledge *OR* grammar *OR* Syntax *OR* Syntac* *OR* Synta* *OR* Morpholog* *OR* Morphem* *OR* Visual Short Term Memory *OR* Phonological Short Term Memory *OR* Short Term Memory *OR* Working Memory *OR* Visual Memory *OR* Verbal Memory OR Nonverbal Memory *OR* Nonverbal Ability *OR* Nonverbal Intelligence *OR* Nonverbal IQ *OR* Precursor Literacy *OR* Precursor Reading *OR* Predictor Literacy *OR* Predictor Reading *OR* Precursor Literacy Skills *OR* Precursors of Reading Ability *OR* Early Predictors of Later Conventional Literacy Skills *OR* Predictive Literacy Skills *OR* Predictors of Later Reading Skills *OR* Preschool Literacy | Phonological Awareness *OR* phonem* awareness *OR* letter knowledge *OR* grapheme knowledge *OR* Grapheme Phoneme Correspondence *OR* sound symbol* *OR* Serial Recall *OR* Oral Comprehension *OR* Verbal Comprehension *OR* Listening Comprehension *OR* Vocabulary *OR* Word Knowledge *OR* grammar *OR* Syntax *OR* Syntac* *OR* Synta* *OR* Morpholog* *OR* Morphem* *OR* Visual Short Term Memory *OR* Phonological Short Term Memory *OR* Short Term Memory *OR* Working Memory *OR* Visual Memory *OR* Verbal Memory OR Nonverbal Memory *OR* Nonverbal Ability *OR* Nonverbal Intelligence *OR* Nonverbal IQ *OR* Precursor Literacy *OR* Precursor Reading *OR* Predictor Literacy *OR* Predictor Reading *OR* Precursor Literacy Skills *OR* Precursors of Reading Ability *OR* Early Predictors of Later Conventional Literacy Skills *OR* Predictive Literacy Skills *OR* Predictors of Later Reading Skills *OR* Preschool Literacy | Phonological Awareness *OR* phonem* awareness *OR* letter knowledge *OR* grapheme knowledge *OR* Grapheme Phoneme Correspondence *OR* sound symbol* *OR* Serial Recall *OR* Oral Comprehension *OR* Verbal Comprehension *OR* Listening Comprehension *OR* Vocabulary *OR* Word Knowledge *OR* grammar *OR* Syntax *OR* Syntac* *OR* Synta* *OR* Morpholog* *OR* Morphem* *OR* Visual Short Term Memory *OR* Phonological Short Term Memory *OR* Short Term Memory *OR* Working Memory *OR* Visual Memory *OR* Verbal Memory OR Nonverbal Memory *OR* Nonverbal Ability *OR* Nonverbal Intelligence *OR* Nonverbal IQ *OR* Precursor Literacy *OR* Precursor Reading *OR* Predictor Literacy *OR* Predictor Reading *OR* Precursor Literacy Skills *OR* Precursors of Reading Ability *OR* Early Predictors of Later Conventional Literacy Skills *OR* Predictive Literacy Skills *OR* Predictors of Later Reading Skills *OR* Preschool Literacy |
| **Comparison (C)** | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

*AND*

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Outcome (O)** | Word Decoding *OR* Reading Fluency *OR* Word Recognition *OR* Reading Ability *OR* Reading Skills *OR* Literacy Skills OR Reading Comprehension | Word Decoding *OR* Reading Fluency *OR* Word Recognition *OR* Reading Ability *OR* Reading Skills *OR* Literacy Skills *OR* Reading Comprehension | Word Decoding *OR* Reading Fluency *OR* Word Recognition *OR* Reading Ability *OR* Reading Skills *OR* Literacy Skills *OR* Reading Comprehension | Word Decoding *OR* Reading Fluency *OR* Word Recognition *OR* Reading Ability *OR* Reading Skills *OR* Literacy Skills *OR* Reading Comprehension |

*Note.* PICO = Population, Intervention, Comparison and Outcome; *AND* = mandatory search terms; *OR* = optional search terms; * = truncation symbol to retrieve multiple search terms with a common root in the Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts, Educational Resources Information Center, MLA International Bibliography and PsycINFO (ProQuest) databases; N/A = not applicable.

**Table 2**

*Full Electronic Database Search Strategy for the Four Databases.* Table of the full electronic search strategy, along with the search fields and limits specified, for the four Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts (LLBA), Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), MLA International Bibliography (MLA) and PsycINFO (ProQuest) databases.

| Database Search Terms | | | | Search Fields | Search Limits |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts (LLBA) | Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) | MLA International Bibliography (MLA) | PsycINFO (ProQuest) | | |
| (Phonological Awareness *OR* phonem* awareness *OR* letter knowledge *OR* grapheme knowledge *OR* Grapheme Phoneme Correspondence *OR* sound symbol* *OR* Serial Recall *OR* Oral Comprehension *OR* Verbal Comprehension *OR* Listening Comprehension *OR* Vocabulary *OR* Word Knowledge *OR* grammar *OR* Syntax *OR* Syntac* *OR* Synta* *OR* Morpholog* *OR* Morphem* *OR* Visual Short Term Memory *OR* Phonological Short Term Memory *OR* Short Term Memory *OR* Working Memory *OR* Visual Memory *OR* Verbal Memory OR Nonverbal Memory *OR* Nonverbal Ability *OR* Nonverbal Intelligence *OR* Nonverbal IQ *OR* Precursor Literacy *OR* Precursor Reading *OR* Predictor Literacy *OR* Predictor Reading *OR* Precursor Literacy Skills *OR* Precursors of Reading Ability *OR* Early Predictors of Later Conventional Literacy Skills *OR* Predictive Literacy Skills *OR* Predictors of Later Reading Skills *OR* Preschool Literacy) *AND* (Word Decoding *OR* Reading Fluency *OR* Word Recognition *OR* Reading Ability *OR* Reading Skills *OR* Literacy Skills *OR* Reading Comprehension) *AND* mainsubject (Child* *OR* Infants) | (Phonological Awareness *OR* phonem* awareness *OR* letter knowledge *OR* grapheme knowledge *OR* Grapheme Phoneme Correspondence *OR* sound symbol* *OR* Serial Recall *OR* Oral Comprehension *OR* Verbal Comprehension *OR* Listening Comprehension *OR* Vocabulary *OR* Word Knowledge *OR* grammar *OR* Syntax *OR* Syntac* *OR* Synta* *OR* Morpholog* *OR* Morphem* *OR* Visual Short Term Memory *OR* Phonological Short Term Memory *OR* Short Term Memory *OR* Working Memory *OR* Visual Memory *OR* Verbal Memory OR Nonverbal Memory *OR* Nonverbal Ability *OR* Nonverbal Intelligence *OR* Nonverbal IQ *OR* Precursor Literacy *OR* Precursor Reading *OR* Predictor Literacy *OR* Predictor Reading *OR* Precursor Literacy Skills *OR* Precursors of Reading Ability *OR* Early Predictors of Later Conventional Literacy Skills *OR* Predictive Literacy Skills *OR* Predictors of Later Reading Skills *OR* Preschool Literacy) *AND* (Word Decoding *OR* Reading Fluency *OR* Word Recognition *OR* Reading Ability *OR* Reading Skills *OR* Literacy Skills *OR* Reading Comprehension) *AND* mainsubject (Child* *OR* Infants) *AND* mainsubject (Bilingual* *OR* Multilingual* *OR* Second Language Learner*) | (Phonological Awareness *OR* phonem* awareness *OR* letter knowledge *OR* grapheme knowledge *OR* Grapheme Phoneme Correspondence *OR* sound symbol* *OR* Serial Recall *OR* Oral Comprehension *OR* Verbal Comprehension *OR* Listening Comprehension *OR* Vocabulary *OR* Word Knowledge *OR* grammar *OR* Syntax *OR* Syntac* *OR* Synta* *OR* Morpholog* *OR* Morphem* *OR* Visual Short Term Memory *OR* Phonological Short Term Memory *OR* Short Term Memory *OR* Working Memory *OR* Visual Memory *OR* Verbal Memory OR Nonverbal Memory *OR* Nonverbal Ability *OR* Nonverbal Intelligence *OR* Nonverbal IQ *OR* Precursor Literacy *OR* Precursor Reading *OR* Predictor Literacy *OR* Predictor Reading *OR* Precursor Literacy Skills *OR* Precursors of Reading Ability *OR* Early Predictors of Later Conventional Literacy Skills *OR* Predictive Literacy Skills *OR* Predictors of Later Reading Skills *OR* Preschool Literacy) *AND* (Word Decoding *OR* Reading Fluency *OR* Word Recognition *OR* Reading Ability *OR* Reading Skills *OR* Literacy Skills *OR* Reading Comprehension) | All | None |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *AND* mainsubject (Bilingual* *OR* Multilingual* *OR* Second Language Learner*) | *AND* mainsubject (Child* *OR* Infants) *AND* mainsubject (Bilingual* *OR* Multilingual* *OR* Second Language Learner*) | *AND* mainsubject (Child* *OR* Infants) *AND* mainsubject (Bilingual* *OR* Multilingual* *OR* Second Language Learner*) |

*Note. AND* = mandatory search terms; *OR* = optional search terms; * = truncation symbol to retrieve multiple search terms with a common root in the Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts, Educational Resources Information Center, MLA International Bibliography and PsycINFO (ProQuest) electronic databases.

**Table 3**

*Database Search Terms for Literacy Precursors, Literacy Outcome Measures and Participant Demographic Characteristics.* Table of database search terms for the nine literacy precursors (phonological awareness, letter knowledge, serial recall, oral language/listening comprehension, vocabulary, grammar, memory, non-verbal intelligence and word decoding) and general literacy precursors, two literacy outcome measures (word/non-word reading and text reading comprehension) and participant characteristics (age and type of language background) for the four Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts (LLBA), Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), MLA International Bibliography (MLA) and PsycINFO (ProQuest) databases.

| **Literacy Precursors** | **Phonological Awareness** | **Letter Knowledge** | **Serial Recall** | **Oral Language/Listening Comprehension** | **Vocabulary** | **Grammar** | **Memory** | **Non-Verbal Intelligence** | **Word Decoding** | **General Literacy Precursors** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Search Query** | Phonological Awareness | Letter Knowledge | Serial Recall | Oral Comprehension | Vocabulary | Grammar | Visual Short Term Memory | Nonverbal Ability | Word Decoding | Precursor Literacy |
| | Phonem* Awareness | Grapheme Knowledge | | Verbal Comprehension | Word Knowledge | Syntax | Phonological Short Term Memory | Nonverbal Intelligence | Reading Fluency | Precursor Reading |
| | | Phoneme Grapheme Correspondence | | Listening Comprehension | | Syntac* | Short Term Memory | Nonverbal IQ | Word Recognition | Predictor Literacy |
| | | Sound Symbol* | | | | Synta* | Working Memory | | Reading Ability | Predictor Reading |
| | | | | | | Morpholog* | Visual Memory | | Reading Skills | Precursor Literacy Skills |

| **Literacy Precursors** | **Phonological Awareness** | **Letter Knowledge** | **Serial Recall** | **Oral Language/ Listening Comprehension** | **Vocabulary** | **Grammar** | **Memory** | **Non-Verbal Intelligence** | **Word Decoding** | **General Literacy Precursors** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Search Query** | | | | | | | Nonverbal Memory | | | Early Predictors of Later Conventional Literacy Skills |

Predictive Literacy Skills

Predictors of Later Reading Skills

Preschool Literacy

| **Literacy Outcomes** | **Word/Non-Word Decoding Or Reading** | **Reading Comprehension** |
|---|---|---|
| **Search Query** | Word Decoding<br>Reading Fluency<br>Word Recognition<br>Reading Ability<br>Reading Skills<br>Literacy Skills | Reading Comprehension |

| **Participant Demographic Characteristics** | **Age Demographic (Children)** | **Type of Language Background (Multilinguals/Bilinguals)** |
|---|---|---|
| **Search Query** | Child*<br>Infants | Bilingual*<br>Multilingual*<br>Second Language Learner* |

*Note.* * = truncation symbol to retrieve multiple search terms with a common root in the electronic databases.

**Table 4**

*Studies with Assigned Study Numbers Included in the Systematic Literature Review and Meta-Analysis.* Table indicating the databases, assigned study numbers and statistical methods for the 33 study citations. The study numbers in Tables 5, 6, 7, 8A, 8B, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 will refer to the corresponding citations in Table 4.

| Database | Reference | In-Text Citation | Statistics | Assigned Study Number |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| LLBA | Hipfner-Boucher, K., Lam, K., & Chen, X. (2014). The effects of bilingual education on the English language and literacy outcomes of Chinese-speaking children. *Written Language and Literacy, 17*(1), 116-138. | Hipfner-Boucher et al., 2014 | Pearson's, hierarchical multiple regression (for some variables) | 1 |
| LLBA | Yeong, S. H. M., Fletcher, J., & Bayliss, D. M. (2014). Importance of phonological and orthographic skills for English reading and spelling: A comparison of English monolingual and Mandarin-English bilingual children. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 106*(4), 1107. | Yeong et al., 2014 | Pearson's, hierarchical multiple regression | 2 |
| LLBA | Hsu, L. S., Ip, K. I., Arredondo, M. M., Tardif, T., & Kovelman, I. (2019). Simultaneous acquisition of English and Chinese impacts children's reliance on vocabulary, morphological and phonological awareness for reading in English. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 22*(2), 207-223. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1246515 | Hsu et al., 2019 | Pearson's, path analysis | 3 |
| MLA; PsycINFO | Chiappe, P., Siegel, L. S., & Gottardo, A. (2002). Reading-related skills of kindergartners from diverse linguistic backgrounds. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 23*(1), 95-116. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S014271640200005X | Chiappe et al., 2002 | Pearson's, stepwise multiple regression | 4 |
| MLA | Zhang, D. (2016). Morphology in Malay-English biliteracy acquisition: An intervention study. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 19*(5), 546-562. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1026873 | Zhang, 2016 | ANOVA (effect size, Cohen's d) | 5 |
| PsycINFO | Tamis-LeMonda, C., Song, L., Luo, R., Kuchirko, Y., Kahana-Kalman, R., Yoshikawa, H., & Raufman, J. (2014). Children's vocabulary growth in English and Spanish across early development and associations with school readiness skills. *Developmental Neuropsychology, 39*(2), 69-87. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/87565641.2013.827198 | Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2014 | Multiple regression | 6 |
| PsycINFO | Jasińska, K., Kaja, K., & Petitto, L. (2018). Age of bilingual exposure is related to the contribution of phonological and semantic knowledge to successful reading | Jasińska et al., 2018 | Multigroup structural equation modelling | 7 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | development. *Child Development, 89*(1), 310-331. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12745 | | | |
| PsycINFO | O'Brien, B. A., Mohamed, M. B. H., Yussof, N. T., & Ng, S. C. (2019). The phonological awareness relation to early reading in English for three groups of simultaneous bilingual children. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 32*(4), 909-937. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11145-018-9890-1 | O'Brien et al., 2019 | Pearson's, multiple regression, linear regression | 8 |
| LLBA | Ibrahim, R., Eviatar, Z., & Aharon-Peretz, J. (2007). Metalinguistic awareness and reading performance: A cross language comparison. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 36*(4), 297-317. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10936- 006-9046-3 | Ibrahim et al., 2007 | Pearson's, multiple regression | 9 |
| LLBA; PsycINFO | Hammer, C.S., Lawrence, F. R., & Miccio, A. W. (2007). Bilingual children's language abilities and early reading outcomes in head start and kindergarten. *Language, Speech & Hearing Services in Schools, 38*(3), 237-48. | Hammer et al., 2007 | Growth curve modelling | 10 |
| LLBA; PsycINFO; ERIC | Dunn, D.M., Hammer, C., & Lawrence, F. R. (2011). Associations between preschool language and first grade reading outcomes in bilingual children. *Journal of Communication Disorders, 44*(4), 444-458. | Dunn et al., 2011 | Growth curve modelling | 11 |
| LLBA | Oller, D. K., Pearson, B. Z., & Cobo-lewis, A. (2007). Profile effects in early bilingual language and literacy. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 28*(2), 191. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0142716407070117 | Oller et al., 2007 | Scheffe test/MANOVA (effect size, Cohen's d) | 12 |
| LLBA; ERIC | Bengochea, A., Justice, L. M., & Hijlkema, M. J. (2017). Print knowledge in Yucatec Maya-Spanish bilingual children: An initial inquiry. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 20*(7), 807-822. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1103699 | Bengochea et al., 2017 | Pearson's | 13 |
| PsycINFO | Cherodath, S., & Singh, N. C. (2015). The influence of orthographic depth on reading networks in simultaneous biliterate children. *Brain and Language, 143,* 42-51. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2015.02.001 | Cherodath & Singh, 2015 | Repeated measures ANOVA | 14 |
| PsycINFO | Lallier, M., Valdois, S., Lassus-Sangosse, D., Prado, C., & Kandel, S. (2014). Impact of orthographic transparency on typical and atypical reading development: Evidence in French-Spanish bilingual children. *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 35*(5), 1177-1190. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2014.01.021 | Lallier et al., 2014 | Pearson's | 15 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Additional Search | Bérubé, D., & Marinova-Todd, S. (2012). The development of language and reading skills in the second and third languages of multilingual children in French immersion. *International Journal of Multilingualism 9*: 272-293. | Bérubé & Marinova-Todd, 2012 | Pearson's, hierarchical multiple regression | 16 |
| Additional Search | D'angiulli, A., Siegel, L. S., & Serra. E. (2001). The development of reading in English and Italian in bilingual children. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 22* (4): 479-507. doi:10.1017/S0142716401004015. | D'angiulli et al., 2001 | Pearson's | 17 |
| Additional Search | Ellis, N. C., & Hooper, A. M. (2001). Why learning to read is easier in Welsh than in English: Orthographic transparency effects evinced with frequency-matched tests. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 22,* 571-599. | Ellis & Hooper, 2001 | Multiple regression | 18 |
| Additional Search | Jasińska, K. K., Wolf, S., Jukes, M. C., & Dubeck, M. M. (2019). Literacy acquisition in multilingual educational contexts: Evidence from Coastal Kenya. *Developmental Science, 128*(28). | Jasińska et al., 2019 | Multiple regression | 19 |
| Additional Search | Kovelman, I., Salah-Ud-Din, M., Berens, M. S., & Petitto, L. (2015). "One glove does not fit all" in bilingual reading acquisition: Using the age of first bilingual language exposure to understand optimal contexts for reading success. *Cogent Education, 2*(1). doi:10.1080/2331186X.2015.1006504 | Kovelman et al., 2015 | Repeated measures MANOVA | 20 |
| Additional Search | Lervåg, A., & Aukrust, V. G. (2009). Vocabulary knowledge is a critical determinant of the difference in reading comprehension growth between first and second language learners." *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 51* (5): 612-620. | Lervåg & Aukrust, 2009 | Hierarchical multiple regression | 21 |
| Additional Search | Spencer, L.H., & Hanley, J.R. (2003), Effects of orthographic transparency on reading and phoneme awareness in children learning to read in Wales. *British Journal of Psychology, 94:* 1-28. doi:10.1348/000712603762842075 | Spencer & Hanley, 2003 | Pearson's, stepwise multiple regression | 22 |
| Additional Search | Lam, K., Chen, X., Geva, E., Luo, Y. C., & Li, H. (2012). The role of morphological awareness in reading achievement among young Chinese-speaking English language learners: A longitudinal study. *Reading and Writing*, *25*(8), 1847-1872. | Lam et al., 2012 | Pearson's, hierarchical multiple regression | 23 |
| Additional Search | Limbird, C. K., Maluch, J. T., Rjosk, C., Stanat, P., & Merkens, H. (2014). Differential growth patterns in emerging reading skills of Turkish-German bilingual and German monolingual primary school students. *Reading and Writing*, *27*(5), 945-968. | Limbird et al., 2014 | Pearson's, multigroup structural equation modelling | 24 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| PsycINFO | Rhys, M., & Thomas, E. M. (2013). Bilingual Welsh-English children's acquisition of vocabulary and reading: Implications for bilingual education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 16*(6), 633-656. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2012.706248 | Rhys & Thomas, 2013 | Pearson’s | 25 |
| LLBA | Spatgens, T., & Schoonen, R. (2018). The semantic network, lexical access, and reading comprehension in monolingual and bilingual children: An individual differences study. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 39*(1), 225-256. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0142716417000224 | Spatgens & Schoonen, 2018 | Fixed and random effects estimate analysis | 26 |
| Additional Search | Gupta, A., & Jamal, G. (2007). Reading strategies of bilingual normally progressing and dyslexic readers in Hindi and English. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 28*(1), 47-68 | Gupta & Jamal, 2007 | ANOVA | 27 |
| Additional Search | Ríos-López, P., Molnar, M. T., Lizarazu, M., & Lallier, M. (2017). The role of slow speech amplitude envelope for speech processing and reading development. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, 1497. | Ríos-López et al., 2017 | Pearson’s | 28 |
| LLBA | Vital, H., & Karniol, R. (2011). Procedural versus narrative cross-language priming and bilingual children's reading and sentence sequencing of same genre and opposite genre text in the other language. *Bilingualism, 14*(4), 547-561. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1366728910000520 | Vital & Karniol, 2011 | ANOVA | 29 |
| LLBA; PsycINFO | van den Bosch, L. J., Segers, E., & Verhoeven, L. (2020). First and second language vocabulary affect early second language reading comprehension development. *Journal of Research in Reading, 43*(3), 290-308. | van den Bosch et al., 2020 | Pearson’s, ANOVA | 30 |
| Additional Search: Research Callout | Sun, H., Bornstein, M.H., & Esposito, G. (2021). The specificity principle in young dual language learners’ English development. *Child Development.* https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13558 | Sun et al., 2021 | LASSO | 31 |
| LLBA | Yang, F.Y. (2010). Biliteracy effects on phonological awareness, oral language proficiency and reading skills in Taiwanese Mandarin-English bilingual children. *Dissertation Abstracts International, B: Sciences and Engineering 2010*. | Yang, 2010 | Hierarchical multiple regression; ANOVA/MANOVA (effect size, Cohen’s d) | 32 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| LLBA | Mak, K.C.L. (2014). Reading comprehension in Chinese-English bilingual children: A cognitive perspective. *Masters Abstracts International 2014.* | Mak, 2014 | Pearson's, hierarchical multiple regression; Cohen's d (effect size) | 33 |

*Note.* LLBA= Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts database; ERIC= Educational Resources Informational Center database, MLA= MLA International Bibliography database; Additional Search = Google Scholar and manual citation search.

**Table 5**

*Extracted Data Items Corresponding to Studies Included in the Systematic Literature Review and Meta-Analysis.* Summary table indicating the bilingual language groups, type of literacy precursor, testing medium, languages and measures of literacy precursor assessment, type of literacy outcome, languages and measures of literacy outcome assessment, mean age at assessment, sample size, and country of assessment corresponding to the 33 studies listed in Table 4.

| Study | Bilingual Language Group | Literacy Precursors | Testing Medium | Languages and Measures of Literacy Precursor Assessment | Literacy Outcomes | Languages and Measures of Literacy Outcome Assessment | Mean Age (in years) | n | Country of Assessment |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1** | Chinese-English | Phonological Awareness | Within; Across | Chinese (phoneme and syllable deletion); English (Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing; CTOPP; phoneme and syllable deletion) | Word Reading Accuracy | English (Letter-Word Identification subtest, Woodcock Language Proficiency Battery; WLPB) | | | Canada |
| | | Receptive Vocabulary | Within | English (Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test; PPVT) | Word Reading Accuracy | English (Letter-Word Identification subtest; WLPB) | | | |
| | | Morphological Awareness | Within | English (Compound word awareness) | Word Reading Accuracy | English (Letter-Word Identification subtest; WLPB) | | | |
| *1A* | Bilingual Chinese-English | | | | | | 6.10 | 20 | |
| *1B* | English-only schooling | | | | | | 6.07 | 33 | |
| **2** | Chinese-English | Phonological Awareness | Within | English (CTOPP: Silent Phonological Choice Task); phoneme and syllable blending; phonological recording | Word Reading Accuracy | English (Wechsler Individual Achievement Test 2: Australian Adaptation; WIAT) | | | Singapore |
| | | Orthographic Processing Skills | Within | English (orthographic choice task; homophone verification task; non-lexical choice task) | Word Reading Accuracy | English (WIAT) | | | |
| *2A* | Grade 2-3 English L1 | | | | | | 8.02 | 29 | |
| *2B* | Grade 2-3 Mandarin L1 | | | | | | 8.02 | 27 | |
| *2C* | Grade 5-6 English L1 | | | | | | 11 | 25 | |
| *2D* | Grade 5-6 Mandarin L1 | | | | | | 11 | 25 | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **3** | Chinese-English | Phonological Awareness | Within; Across | Chinese (phoneme and syllable deletion); English (CTOPP; phoneme and syllable deletion) | Word Reading Accuracy | Chinese (Character recognition test); English (Word Identification subset of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests – Revised; WRMT-R) | 8.07 | 57 | US |
| | | Receptive Vocabulary | Within; Across | Chinese (Cantonese Receptive Vocabulary Test; CRVT); English (vocabulary subtest, Kaufman Brief Intelligence Test, Second Edition; KBIT-2) | Word Reading Accuracy | Chinese (Character recognition test); English (Word Identification subset; WRMT-R) | | | |
| | | Morphological Awareness | Within; Across | Chinese (Morphological Construction Judgement Task); English (Test of Morphological Structure) | Word Reading Accuracy | Chinese (Character recognition test); English (Word Identification subset; WRMT-R) | | | |
| **4** | Heterogenous (Farsi, Japanese, Spanish , Tagalog, Chinese, French, Slovakian, Squamish, Arabic, German, Greek, Hindi or Indonesian) - English | Phonological Awareness | Within | English (sound mimicry, rhyme detection, syllable and phoneme identification, and phoneme deletion) | Word Reading Accuracy | English (letter-word reading subtest of the Wide Range Achievement Test–3 ; WRAT-3) | 5.04 | 59 | Canada |
| | | Verbal Short-Term Memory | Within | English (Memory for Sentences subtest of the Stanford Binet Test) | Word Reading | English (letter-word reading subtest; WRAT-3) | | | |
| | | Syntactic Awareness | Within | English (oral cloze task) | Word Reading Accuracy | English (letter-word reading subtest; WRAT-3) | | | |
| | | Letter Knowledge | Within | English (letter identification task) | Word Reading Accuracy | English (letter-word reading subtest; WRAT-3) | | | |
| | | Serial Recall | Within | English (rapid picture naming) | Word Reading Accuracy | English (letter-word reading subtest; WRAT-3) | | | |
| | | Spelling | Within | English (word spelling) | Word Reading Accuracy | English (letter-word reading subtest; WRAT-3) | | | |
| | | Environmental Print Awareness | Within | English (naming of common English logos) | Word Reading Accuracy | English (letter-word reading subtest; WRAT-3) | | | |
| **5** | Malay-English | Morphological Awareness | Within; Across | English | Word Reading Accuracy; Word Reading Speed | English; Malay | 9.04 | 64 | Singapore |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **6** | Spanish-English | Expressive Vocabulary | Within; Across | English (vocabulary growth (word type/minute) during book-sharing sessions); Spanish (vocabulary growth (word type/minute) during book-sharing sessions) | Word Reading Accuracy | English (letter-word identification subtest, Woodcock Johnson III Tests of Achievement; WJ-III) | 2-5 | 133 | US |
| **7** | Heterogenous (Spanish, Tamil, Arabic, Hungarian, Urdu, or Chinese)-English ; French-English | Phonological Awareness* | Within | English (initial phoneme deletion, final phoneme deletion and phoneme segmentation) | Word Reading Accuracy | English (WLPB-R) | 8.05 | 139 | Canada |
| | | Semantic Awareness | Within | English (passage comprehension, synonym generation and antonym generation; Woodcock Language Proficiency Battery–Revised | Word Reading Accuracy | English (WLPB-R) | | | |
| **8** | Malay-English; Tamil-English; Mandarin-English | Phonological Awareness | Within | English (CTOPP: onset-rime, syllable and phoneme deletion and blending) | Word Reading Accuracy | English (Wide Range Achievement Test; WRAT-4) | | | Singapore |
| | | Receptive Vocabulary | Across | Mandarin(8A)/Malay(8B)/Tamil(8C): Bilingual Language Assessment Battery (BLAB) | Word Reading Accuracy | English (WRAT-4) | | | |
| *8A* | Mandarin-English | | | | | | 4.08-5.08 | 311 | |
| *8B* | Malay-English | | | | | | 4.08-5.08 | 147 | |
| *8C* | Tamil-English | | | | | | 4.08-5.08 | 163 | |
| **9** | Russian-Hebrew | Phonological Awareness | Within | Hebrew (initial phoneme detection, final phoneme detection, and syllable/phoneme detection) | Word Reading Errors; Non-Word Reading Accuracy Errors; Text Reading Errors; Text Reading Speed | Hebrew | 6.10-7.03 | 19 | Middle-East |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Semantic Awareness | Within | Hebrew (WISC-R: word definition test) | Word Reading Errors; Non-Word Reading Accuracy Errors; Text Reading Errors; Text Reading Speed | Hebrew | | | |
| **10** | Spanish-English | Receptive Vocabulary and Oral Language Comprehension | Within; Across | Spanish(Test de vocabulario en ima´genes Peabody; TVIP and Preschool Language Scale-3; PLS-3); English (PPVT-III and Test of Early Language Development- 3; TELD-3) | Word Reading Accuracy | Spanish (WLPB-R); English (WLPB-R) | 3.09 | 53 | US |
| **11** | Spanish-English | Receptive Vocabulary | Within; Across | Spanish (TVIP); English (PPVT-III) | Word Reading Accuracy; Text Reading Comprehension | Spanish (letter–word identification and passage comprehension subtests; WLPB-R); English (letter–word identification and passage comprehension subtests; WLPB-R) | 3.08 | 48 | US |
| | | Oral Language | Within; Across | Spanish (receptive language subtestPLS-3); English (auditory comprehension subtest; TELD-3) | Word Reading Accuracy; Text Reading Comprehension | Spanish (letter–word identification and passage comprehension subtests; WLPB-R); English (letter–word identification and passage comprehension subtests; WLPB-R) | | | |
| **12** | Spanish-English | Type of Literacy Outcome Measure | Within | Spanish (Woodcock–Johnson and Woodcock–Munoz language and literacy evaluations); English (Woodcock–Johnson and Woodcock–Munoz language and literacy evaluations) | Non-Word Reading Accuracy | Spanish (Woodcock–Johnson and Woodcock–Munoz language and literacy evaluations); English (Woodcock–Johnson and Woodcock–Munoz language and literacy evaluations) | | | US |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *12A* | Grade 2 | | | | | | Grade 2 | 704 | |
| *12B* | Grade 5 | | | | | | Grade 5 | 704 | |
| **13** | Maya-Spanish | Letter Knowledge | Within; Across | Spanish (Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening-PreK; PALS); Maya | Word Reading Accuracy | Spanish; Maya | 4.10 | 84 | Spain |
| | | Name Writing | Across | Spanish; Maya | Word Reading Accuracy | Spanish; Maya | | | |
| **14** | Hindi-English | Phonological Awareness (Neural Study) | Within; Across | Hindi; English | Word Reading Accuracy; Non-Word Reading Accuracy | Hindi; English | 9.21 | 44 | India |
| **15** | Spanish-French | Phonological Awareness* | Within | Spanish (initial phoneme deletion and acronym task); French (initial phoneme deletion and acronym task) | Non-Word Reading Accuracy; Text Reading Speed | Spanish; French | 10.04 | 9 | Spain |
| | | VA Span | Within | Spanish and French (whole report task and partial report task) | Word Reading Accuracy; Word Reading Speed; Non-Word Reading Accuracy; Non-Word Reading Speed; Text Reading Errors; Text Reading Speed | Spanish; French | | | |
| **16** | Alphabetic (Africans, Amharic, Croatian, Czech, Danish, Fanti, German, Greek, | Receptive Vocabulary | Within | English (PPVT-III) | Word Reading Accuracy; Non-Word Reading Accuracy; Text Reading Comprehension | English (Woodcock Language Battery Proficiency; WLPB-R) | | | Canada |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Hungarian, Korean, Polish, Serbian, Spanish, Tagalog or Vietnamese ) - English; Logographic (Cantonese, Japanese, Mandarin Chinese, Shanghainese ) -English | Oral Language Comprehension | Within | English (Listening Comprehension subtest, Woodcock Language Battery Proficiency; WLPB-R) | Word Reading Accuracy; Non-Word Reading Accuracy; Text Reading Comprehension | English (Woodcock Language Battery Proficiency; WLPB-R) | | | |
| *16A* | Alphabetic L1 | | | | | | 9 | 26 | |
| *16B* | Logographic L1 | | | | | | 9 | 13 | |
| **17** | Italian-English | Syntactic Awareness | Within; Across | Italian (oral cloze); English (oral cloze) | Word Reading Accuracy; Non-Word Reading Accuracy | Italian; English (reading subtest; WRAT-R and Word Attack subtest; WRMT-R) | 9-13 | 81 | Canada |
| | | Working Memory | Within; Across | Italian (missing word repetition); English (missing word repetition) | Word Reading Accuracy; Non-Word Reading Accuracy | Italian; English (reading subtest; WRAT-R and Word Attack subtest; WRMT-R) | | | |
| | | Spelling | Within; Across | Italian; English (Spelling sub-test, Wide Range Achievement Test–Revised; WRAT-R) | Word Reading Accuracy; Non-Word Reading Accuracy | Italian; English (reading subtest; WRAT-R and Word Attack subtest; WRMT-R) | | | |
| **18** | Welsh-English | Type of Literacy Outcome Measure | Across | Welsh; English | Word Reading Accuracy; Word Reading Errors; Word Reading Speed; Text Reading Comprehension | Welsh; English | 6-7 | 20 | Wales |
| **19** | Heterogenous-Kiswahili | Phonological Awareness* | Within; Across | Kiswahili (initial sound matching) | Word Reading Speed | Kiswahili; English | 6.8-8.6 | 977 | Kenya |
| | | Receptive Vocabulary | Within; Across | Kiswahili (word picture matching) | Word Reading Speed | Kiswahili; English | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **20** | Spanish-English | Type of Reading Instruction | Within | Spanish; English (Phonics Reading Instruction; Success for All; SFA and Whole Language Reading Instruction) | Word Reading Accuracy; Non-Word Reading Accuracy; Text Reading Comprehension | Spanish; English | 7-9 | 23 | US |
| **21** | Urdu-Norwegian | Receptive Vocabulary | Within | Norwegian (PPVT-III and Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children III; WISC III) | Text Reading Comprehension | Norwegian (passage comprehension subtest; WRMT-PC and the Neale Analysis of Reading Ability II ; NARA II) | 7.6 | 90 | Norway |
| | | Word Decoding | Within | Norwegian (Test of Word Reading Efficiency; TOWRE) | Text Reading Comprehension | Norwegian (passage comprehension subtest; WRMT-PC and NARA II) | | | |
| **22** | Welsh-English | Phonological Awareness* | Within; Across | Welsh (phoneme segmentation); English (phoneme segmentation) | Word Reading Accuracy | Welsh; English | 6.01-7.0 | 74 | Wales |
| | | Receptive Vocabulary | Within; Across | Welsh (British Picture Vocabulary Scale; BPVS) | Word Reading Accuracy | Welsh; English | | | |
| | | Serial Recall | Within; Across | Welsh and English (Digit span test, WISC-R) | Word Reading Accuracy | Welsh; English | | | |
| | | Non-Verbal Intelligence | Within; Across | Welsh and English (Raven's Coloured Progressive Matrices; CPM) | Word Reading Accuracy | Welsh; English | | | |
| **23** | Chinese-English | Phonological Awareness* | Within | English (CTOPP-2: phoneme deletion) | Word Reading Accuracy; Text Reading Comprehension | English (Reading Comprehension subtest, Peabody Individual Achievement Test—Revised; PIAT-R) | | | Canada |
| | | Receptive Vocabulary | Within | English (PPVT-III) | Word Reading Accuracy; Text Reading Comprehension | English (Reading Comprehension subtest; PIAT-R) | | | |
| | | Morphological Awareness | Within | English (Derivational Awareness task and Compound Awareness Task | Word Reading Accuracy; Text Reading Comprehension | English (Reading Comprehension subtest; PIAT-R) | | | |
| | | Word Decoding | Within | English (Letter-Word Identification subtest; WLPB) | Text Reading Comprehension | English (Reading Comprehension subtest; PIAT-R) | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *23A*<br>*23B* | Kindergarten<br>Grade 1 | | | | | | 5.05<br>6.07 | 46<br>34 | |
| **24** | Turkish-German | Phonological Awareness* | Within | German (Basiskompetenzen fu¨r Lese-Rechtschreibleistungen; BAKO 1–4: phoneme identification, deletion, word remainder determination and sound categorization) | Text Reading Comprehension | German Text Comprehension subtest, Ein Leseversta¨ndnistest fu¨r Elementarschu¨ler'; ELFE) | 7.09 | 100 | Germany |
| | | Expressive Vocabulary | Within | German (Bilingual Verbal Abilities Test; BVAT) | Text Reading Comprehension | German Text Comprehension subtest, Ein Leseversta¨ndnistest fu¨r Elementarschu¨ler'; ELFE) | | | |
| | | Word Decoding | Within | German (Wu¨rzburg Silent Reading Test; WLLP) | Text Reading Comprehension | German Text Comprehension subtest, Ein Leseversta¨ndnistest fu¨r Elementarschu¨ler'; ELFE) | | | |
| **25** | Welsh-English | Receptive Vocabulary | Within | Welsh Prawf Geirfa Cymraeg; PGC); English (BPVS) | Word Reading Accuracy; Text Reading Comprehension | Welsh (Profion Darllen Glannau Menai); English (NARA-II) | 7-11 | 38 | Wales |
| **26** | Heterogenous-Dutch | Receptive Vocabulary | Within | Dutch (Cito Leeswoordenschat) | Text Reading Comprehension | Dutch (Begrijpend Lezen 678) | 11.03 | 86 | Netherlands |
| | | Semantic Awareness | Within | Dutch (auditory semantic decision task) | Text Reading Comprehension | Dutch (Begrijpend Lezen 678) | | | |
| | | Word Decoding | Within | Dutch (Drie Minuten Toets) | Text Reading Comprehension | Dutch (Begrijpend Lezen 678) | | | |
| | | Serial Recall | Within | Dutch (Rapid Automatized Naming Test; RAN and Rapid Alternating Stimulus Test). | Text Reading Comprehension | Dutch (Begrijpend Lezen 678) | | | |
| **27** | Hindi-English | Type of Literacy Outcome Measure | Within | Hindi; English | Word Reading Accuracy | Hindi; English | 8.06 | 30 | India |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **28** | Basque-Spanish | Speech Perception | Within | Spanish | Word Reading Accuracy; Word Reading Errors; Non-Word Reading Accuracy; Non-Word Reading Errors; Text Reading Errors; Text Reading Speed | Spanish (El principito and PROLEC-R) | | 20 | Spain |
| *28A* | Grade 2 | | | | | | 7.07 | | |
| *28B* | Grade 5 | | | | | | 11 | | |
| **29** | Hebrew-English | Sentence Priming | Across | English | Text Reading Errors; Text Reading Speed; Text Reading Comprehension | Hebrew | Grades 5-6 | 101 | Middle-East |
| **30** | Turkish-Dutch | Receptive Vocabulary | Within; Across | Turkish (PPVT); Dutch (T-TOS) | Word Reading Accuracy; Non-Word Reading Accuracy; Text Reading Comprehension | Dutch | 7.05 | 71 | Netherlands |
| | | Word Decoding | Within | Dutch | Text Reading Comprehension | Dutch | | | |
| | | Non-Word Decoding | Within | Dutch | Text Reading Comprehension | Dutch | | | |
| **31** | Chinese-English | Working Memory | Within | English (Backward Digit Recall) | Word Reading Accuracy | English (Word Reading Subtest; WRAT) | 4.01-5.05 | 736 | Singapore |
| | | Non-Verbal Intelligence | Within | English (Raven's CPM) | Word Reading Accuracy | English (Word Reading Subtest; WRAT) | | | |
| **32** | Chinese-English | Phonological Awareness | Within; Across | Chinese (onset-rime matching task and tone matching task); English (onset-rime matching task and final phoneme matching task) | Word Reading Accuracy | Chinese (Graded Character Recognition Task); English (Word Identification Subtest; WRAT-R) | 8.05 | 40 | US |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Non-Verbal Intelligence | Within | English (Test of Nonverbal Intelligence, Third Edition; TONI-3) | Word Reading Accuracy | English (Word Identification Subtest; WRAT-R) | | | |
| **33** | Chinese-English | Phonological Awareness | Within; Across | Chinese (onset-rime and syllable deletion); English (CTOPP: phoneme deletion) | Word Reading Accuracy; Non-Word Reading Accuracy; Text Reading Comprehension | Chinese (Character Recognition Test, Pseudo-Character Test and Gray Oral Reading Test Forth Edition; GORT-4); English (Word Identification Subtest, WRMT-R, Word Attack Subtest; WRMT-R and NARA) | 11 | 47 | Canada |
| | | Serial Recall | Within; Across | Chinese (Forward Digit Span subtest, Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children - Third Edition; WISC-III) and English (Forward Digit Span subtest; WISC-III) | Word Reading Accuracy; Non-Word Reading Accuracy; Text Reading Comprehension | Chinese (Character Recognition Test, Pseudo-Character Test and Gray Oral Reading Test Forth Edition; GORT-4); English (Word Identification Subtest, WRMT-R, Word Attack Subtest; WRMT-R and NARA) | | | |
| | | Receptive Vocabulary | Within; Across | Chinese (PPVT-III); English (PPVT-III) | Word Reading Accuracy; Non-Word Reading Accuracy; Text Reading Comprehension | Chinese (Character Recognition Test, Pseudo-Character Test and Gray Oral Reading Test Forth Edition; GORT-4); English (Word Identification Subtest, WRMT-R, Word Attack Subtest; WRMT-R and NARA) | | | |
| | | Expressive Vocabulary | Within; Across | Chinese (Expressive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test - Third edition; EOWPVT-III); English ( EOWPVT-III) | Word Reading Accuracy; Non-Word Reading Accuracy; Text Reading Comprehension | Chinese (Character Recognition Test, Pseudo-Character Test and Gray Oral Reading Test Forth Edition; GORT-4); English (Word Identification Subtest, WRMT-R, Word Attack Subtest; WRMT-R and NARA) | | | |
| | | Non-Verbal Intelligence | Within; Across | Chinese and English (Matrix Analogies Test) | Word Reading Accuracy; Non-Word Reading Accuracy; Text Reading Comprehension | Chinese (Character Recognition Test, Pseudo-Character Test and Gray Oral Reading Test Forth Edition; GORT-4); English (Word Identification | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Subtest, WRMT-R, Word Attack Subtest; WRMT-R and NARA) |
| Word Decoding | Within; Across | Chinese (Chinese Character Recognition test); English (word identification subtest; WRMT-R) | Word Reading Accuracy; Non-Word Reading Accuracy; Text Reading Comprehension | Chinese (Character Recognition Test, Pseudo-Character Test and Gray Oral Reading Test Forth Edition; GORT-4); English (Word Identification Subtest, WRMT-R, Word Attack Subtest; WRMT-R and NARA) |
| Non-Word Decoding | Within; Across | Chinese (Chinese Pseudo-Character Test); English (word attack subtest; WRMT-R) | Word Reading Accuracy; Non-Word Reading Accuracy; Text Reading Comprehension | Chinese (Character Recognition Test, Pseudo-Character Test and Gray Oral Reading Test Forth Edition; GORT-4); English (Word Identification Subtest, WRMT-R, Word Attack Subtest; WRMT-R and NARA) |
| Verbal Working Memory/Serial Recall | Within; Across | Chinese (Backward Digit Span subtest; WISC-III and Verbal Working Memory Task); English (Backward Digit Span subtest; WISC-III and Verbal Working Memory Task) | Word Reading Accuracy; Non-Word Reading Accuracy; Text Reading Comprehension | Chinese (Character Recognition Test, Pseudo-Character Test and Gray Oral Reading Test Forth Edition; GORT-4); English (Word Identification Subtest, WRMT-R, Word Attack Subtest; WRMT-R and NARA) |
| Non-Verbal Working Memory | Within; Across | Chinese and English (Swanson's Visual Matrix subtest, Test of Working Memory) | Word Reading Accuracy; Non-Word Reading Accuracy; Text Reading Comprehension | Chinese (Character Recognition Test, Pseudo-Character Test and Gray Oral Reading Test Forth Edition; GORT-4); English (Word Identification Subtest, WRMT-R, Word Attack Subtest; WRMT-R and NARA) |
| Syntactic Awareness | Within; Across | Chinese (Chinese Syntactic Awareness Task); English (Syntactic Judgment task) | Word Reading Accuracy; Non-Word Reading Accuracy; Text Reading Comprehension | Chinese (Character Recognition Test, Pseudo-Character Test and Gray Oral Reading Test Forth Edition; GORT-4); English (Word Identification |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Subtest, WRMT-R, Word Attack Subtest; WRMT-R and NARA) |
| Morphological Awareness | Within; Across | Chinese (Chinese Derivational and Compound Morpheme Awareness Test); English (Test of Morphological Structure) | Word Reading Accuracy; Non-Word Reading Accuracy; Text Reading Comprehension | Chinese (Character Recognition Test, Pseudo-Character Test and Gray Oral Reading Test Forth Edition; GORT-4); English (Word Identification Subtest, WRMT-R, Word Attack Subtest; WRMT-R and NARA) |

*Note.* Studies 1, 2, 8, 12, 16, 23 and 28 assess multiple simultaneous bilingual language groups; *= Studies (7, 15, 19, 22, 23, 24) that only assessed phonemic awareness; Within-Language Testing Medium refers to literacy precursors and outcome measures assessed in the same language; Across-Language Testing Medium refers to literacy precursors and outcome measures assessed in different languages.

**Table 6**

*Literacy Precursors and Literacy Outcome Measures Assessed in One or Both Bilingual Languages, based on Bilingual Language Background.* Table indicating the bilingual language background (i.e., combination of languages spoken and assessed, along with the number of studies: indicated on the left) of simultaneous bilinguals and the language(s) of literacy precursor and literacy outcome measure assessment (i.e., whether assessed in one or both bilingual languages) for each study.

| ***Type of Bilinguals (n=number of studies):*** | **Literacy Precursors and Outcomes Assessed in Both Bilingual Languages** | **Literacy Precursors and Outcomes Assessed in 1 Bilingual Language** | **Literacy Precursors Assessed in Both Bilingual Languages and Outcomes Assessed in 1 Bilingual Language** | **Literacy Precursors Assessed in 1 Bilingual Language and Outcomes Assessed in Both Bilingual Languages** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 14 studies | 13 studies | 6 studies | 1 study |
| *Heterogenous-English (n=4)* | | 4*(Farsi, Japanese, Spanish, Tagalog, Chinese, French, Slovakian, Squamish, Arabic, German, Greek, Hindi or Indonesian) - English<br>**PL & OL** (English);<br>7*(Spanish, Tamil, Arabic, Hungarian, Urdu<br>or Chinese) - English<br>**PL & OL** (English);<br>16*Alphabetic (Africans, Amharic, Croatian, Czech, Danish, Fanti, German, Greek, Hungarian, Korean, Polish, Serbian, Spanish, Tagalog or Vietnamese ) - English<br>or Logographic (Cantonese, Japanese, Mandarin Chinese, Shanghainese ) language -English<br>**PL & OL** (English) | 8*(Malay, Tamil or Mandarin-Chinese) + English<br>**PL** (Malay, Tamil or Mandarin-Chinese and English)<br>**OL** (English) | |
| *Spanish-English (n=5)* | 10 **PL & OL** (Spanish and English);<br>11 **PL & OL** (Spanish and English);<br>12 **PL & OL** (Spanish and English);<br>20 **PL & OL** (Spanish and English) | | 6 **PL** (Spanish and English)<br>**OL** (English) | |
| *Mandarin (Chinese)-English (n=7)* | 3 **PL & OL** (Chinese and English)<br>33 **PL & OL** (Chinese and English) | 2 **PL & OL** (English);<br>23 **PL & OL** (English);<br>31 **PL & OL** (English) | 1 **PL** (Chinese and English)<br>**OL** (English);<br>32 **PL** (Chinese and English)<br>**OL** (English) | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Hindi-English (n=2)* | 14 PL & OL (Hindi and English);<br>27 PL & OL (Hindi and English) | | |
| *Welsh-English (n=3)* | 22 PL & OL (Welsh and English);<br>25 PL & OL (Welsh and English) | 18 PL & OL (Welsh) | |
| *Malay-English (n=1)* | | | 5 PL (English)<br>OL (Malay and English) |
| *Italian-English (n=1)* | 17 PL & OL (Italian and English) | | |
| *Hebrew-English (n=1)* | | 29 PL & OL (Hebrew) | |
| *French- English (n=1)* | 7 PL & OL (French and English) | | |
| *Heterogenous-Dutch (n=1)* | | 26 PL & OL (Dutch) | |
| *Heterogeneous-Kiswahili (n=1)* | | 19 PL & OL (Kiswahili) | |
| *Russian-Hebrew (n=1)* | | 9 PL & OL (Hebrew) | |
| *Spanish-French (n=1)* | 15 PL & OL (Spanish and French) | | |
| *Basque-Spanish (n=1)* | | 28 PL & OL (Spanish) | |
| *Maya-Spanish (n=1)* | 13 PL & OL (Maya and Spanish) | | |
| *Turkish-German (n=1)* | | 24 PL & OL (German) | |
| *Turkish-Dutch (n=1)* | | | 30 PL (Turkish and Dutch)<br>OL (Dutch) |
| *Urdu-Norwegian (n=1)* | | | 21 PL (Norwegian and Urdu)<br>OL (Norwegian) |

*Note.* * = specifies type of Heterogenous-English simultaneous bilingual language background; PL= (precursor language) indicates language(s) assessed for literacy precursor measures; OL= (outcome language) indicates language(s) assessed for literacy outcome measures.

**Table 7**

*Precursor-Outcome Associations in Simultaneous Bilingual Children, based on the Type of Literacy Precursor and Literacy Outcome Measure Assessed.* Table of significant and non-significant precursor-outcome associations, based on the type of literacy precursor (indicated on the left) and literacy outcome measure (indicated on top) assessed – along with the bilingual language combinations spoken by simultaneous bilinguals in each study (as denoted by *). Table 7 indicates significant and non-significant associations between given literacy precursors (indicated on the left) and given literacy outcome measures (indicated on top), as reported by the individual studies listed in Table 4.

| | **Word Reading Accuracy** | | **Word Reading Speed** | | **Non-Word Reading Accuracy** | | **Non-Word Reading Speed** | | **Text Reading Accuracy** | | **Text Reading Speed** | | **Text Reading Comprehension** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Significant* | *Not Significant* | *Significant* | *Not Significant* | *Significant* | *Not Significant* | *Significant* | *Not Significant* | *Significant* | *Not Significant* | *Significant* | *Not Significant* | *Significant* | *Not Significant* |
| **Literacy Precursors** (n=number of studies) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Phonological Awareness** (n=15) | 1*Chinese-English; 2*Chinese (dominant)-English and English (dominant)-Chinese; 3*Chinese-English; 4*Heterogeneous-English; +7*French-English, and Other-English; 8*Heterogeneous (Malay; Tamil; Mandarin Chinese)-English 9*Russian-Hebrew; 14*Hindi-English; | | 9*Russian-Hebrew; 14*Hindi-English; | | | | | | 9*Russian-Hebrew; | | 9*Russian-Hebrew; | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | +15*Spanish-English (Spanish); | +15*Spanish-English (French) | +15*Spanish-English (French & Spanish) | +15*Spanish-English (French & Spanish); | +15*Spanish-English (French & Spanish) | +15*Spanish-English (French & Spanish) | | +15*Spanish-English (French & Spanish) | | |
| | +22*Welsh-English<br>+23*Chinese-English;<br>32*Chinese-English;<br>33*Chinese-English | | | 33*Chinese-English | | | +19*Mijikenda; Kikamba-Kiswahili | | 23*Chinese-English<br>+24*Turkish-German;<br>33*Chinese-English | |
| **Letter Knowledge**<br>(n=2) | 4*Heterogeneous-English;<br>13*Maya-Spanish | | | | | | | | | |
| **Serial Recall**<br>(n=4) | 4*Heterogeneous-English;<br>22*Welsh-English;<br>33*Chinese-English | | | 33*Chinese-English | | | | | 33*Chinese-English | 26*Heterogeneous-Dutch |
| **Oral Language/Listening Comprehension**<br>(n=3) | 10*Spanish-English;<br>11*Spanish-English;<br>16*Logographic-English and Alphabetic-English | | | 16*Logographic-English and Alphabetic-English | | | | | 11*Spanish-English;<br>16*Logographic-English and Alphabetic-English | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Receptive Vocabulary** (n=14) | 1*Chinese-English; 3*Chinese-English; 8*Heterogeneous (Malay; Tamil; Mandarin Chinese)-English 10*Spanish-English; 11*Spanish-English; 16*Logographic-English and Alphabetic-English; 22*Welsh-English; +23*Chinese-English 25*Welsh-English; 33*Chinese-English | 30*Turkish-Dutch | 16*Logographic-English and Alphabetic-English; 33*Chinese-English | | +19*Mijikenda; Kikamba-Kiswahili 25*Welsh-English | 11* Spanish-English; 16*Logographic-English and Alphabetic-English; 21*Urdu-Norwegian; 23*Chinese-English; 25*Welsh-English; 26*Heterogenous-Dutch 30*Turkish-Dutch; |
| **Expressive Vocabulary** (n=3) | 6*Spanish-English; 33*Chinese-English | | 33*Chinese-English | | | 24*Turkish-German ; 33*Chinese-English |
| **Syntactic Awareness** (n=3) | 4*Heterogeneous-English; 17*Italian-English (Italian and English) | 33*Chinese-English | 17*Italian-English (Italian) | 17*Italian-English (English); 33*Chinese-English | | 33*Chinese-English |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Morphological Awareness** (n=5) | 3*Chinese-English; 5*Malay-English +23*Chinese-English; 33*Chinese-English | 1*Chinese-English | 5*Malay-English | 33*Chinese-English | | +23*Chinese-English; 33*Chinese-English |
| **Working Memory** (n=3) | 17*Italian-English (Italian) | 17*Italian-English (English); 31*Chinese-English; 33*Chinese-English | | 17*Italian-English (Italian and English); 33*Chinese-English | | 33*Chinese-English |
| **Verbal Short-Term Memory** (n=1) | | 4*Heterogeneous-English | | | | |
| **Non-Verbal Intelligence** (n=4) | 22*Welsh-English; 32*Chinese-English | 31*Chinese-English; 33*Chinese-English | | 33*Chinese-English | | 33*Chinese-English |
| **Word/Non-Word Decoding** (n=6) | | | | | 21*Urdu-Norwegian; 23*Chinese-English; 24*Turkish-German 30*Turkish-Dutch; 33*Chinese-English | 26*Heterogeneous-Dutch |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Semantic Awareness** (n=3) | | 7*French-English; 9*Russian-Hebrew | | | 9*Russian-Hebrew | | 9*Russian-Hebrew | 9*Russian-Hebrew | 26*Heterogeneous-Dutch |
| **Spelling** (n=2) | 4*Heterogeneous-English; 17*Italian-English (Italian and English) | | | 17*Italian-English (Italian and English) | | | | | |
| **VA Span** (n=1) | 15*Spanish-English (French & Spanish) | | 15*Spanish-English (French & Spanish) | 15*Spanish-English (French & Spanish) | 15*Spanish-English (French & Spanish) | 15*Spanish-English (French) | 15* Spanish-English (Spanish) | 15* Spanish-English (French & Spanish) | |
| **Orthographic Processing** (n=1) | 2* Younger English (dominant)-Chinese and Older Chinese (dominant)-English | 2*Younger Chinese (dominant)-English and Older English (dominant)-Chinese | | | | | | | |
| **Environmental Print Awareness** (n=1) | 4*Heterogeneous-English | | | | | | | | |
| **Name Writing** (n=1) | 13*Maya-Spanish | | | | | | | | |
| **Sub-Lexical/Phonological Speech Perception Task** (n=1) | | 28*Basque-Spanish | 28*Basque-Spanish | | 28*Basque-Spanish | 28*Basque-Spanish | | 28*Basque-Spanish | 28*Basque-Spanish | |
| **Sentence Priming Task** (n=1) | | | | | | 29*Hebrew-English | | 29*Hebrew-English | 29*Hebrew-English |

*Note.* * = specifies type of bilingual language background; [+]= Studies (7, 15, 19, 22, 23, 24) that only assessed phonemic awareness.

**Table 8A**

*Precursor-Outcome Associations Assessed in One Language for Simultaneous Bilingual Children.* Table of significant and non-significant within- and across-language precursor-outcome associations for the literacy precursors (indicated on the left, along with number of studies assessed) and/or outcome measures assessed in one bilingual language – along with the language(s) of assessment (as denoted by $^{PL}$ and $^{OL}$). Table 8A indicates significant and non-significant associations between given literacy precursors (indicated on the left) and literacy outcome measures, as reported by the individual studies listed in Table 4.

| | ***Literacy Precursors and Outcomes Assessed in 1 Bilingual Language*** | | | ***Literacy Precursors Assessed in Both Bilingual Languages and Outcomes Assessed in 1 Bilingual Language*** | | ***Literacy Precursors Assessed in 1 Bilingual Language and* Outcomes *Assessed in Both Bilingual Languages*** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Literacy Precursors** (n=number of studies) | *Significant Within-Language* | *Significant Across-Language* | *Not Significant (Within-Language)* | *Significant Within-Language* | *Significant Across-Language* | *Significant Within-Language* | *Significant Across-Language* |
| **Phonological Awareness** (n=10) | 2 $^{PL\ \&\ OL}$ (English);<br>4 $^{PL\ \&\ OL}$ (English);<br>$^{+}$7(Heterogenous-English bilinguals)<br>$^{PL\ \&\ OL}$ (English);<br>8 $^{PL\ \&\ OL}$ (English);<br>9 $^{PL\ \&\ OL}$ (Hebrew);<br>$^{+}$19 $^{PL\ \&\ OL}$ (Kiswahili);<br>+23 $^{PL\ \&\ OL}$ (English)<br>$^{+}$24 $^{PL\ \&\ OL}$ (German) | | | 1 $^{PL}$ (Chinese and English)<br>$^{OL}$ (English);<br>32 $^{PL\ \&\ OL}$ (Chinese and English) | 1 $^{PL}$ (Chinese and English)<br>$^{OL}$ (English);<br>32 $^{PL}$ (Chinese and English)<br>$^{OL}$ (English) | | |
| **Letter Knowledge** (n=1) | 4 $^{PL\ \&\ OL}$ (English) | | | | | | |
| **Serial Recall** (n=3) | 4 $^{PL\ \&\ OL}$ (English) | | 26 $^{PL\ \&\ OL}$ (Dutch) | | | 22 $^{PL\ \&\ OL}$ (Welsh and English) | 22 $^{PL\ \&\ OL}$ (Welsh and English) |
| **Oral Language/Listening Comprehension** (n=1) | 16 $^{PL\ \&\ OL}$ (English) | | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Receptive Vocabulary** (n=9) | 1 PL & OL (English);<br>16 PL & OL (English);<br>19 PL & OL (Kiswahili);<br>23 PL & OL (English);<br>26 PL & OL (Dutch) | | 8 PL (Malay, Tamil or Mandarin-Chinese and English)<br>OL (English);<br>21 PL (Norwegian and Urdu)<br>OL (Norwegian)<br>30 PL (Turkish and Dutch)<br>OL (Dutch) | 8 PL (Malay, Tamil or Mandarin-Chinese and English)<br>OL (English);<br>21 PL (Norwegian and Urdu)<br>OL (Norwegian) | 22 PL (Welsh)<br>OL (Welsh and English) | 22 PL (Welsh)<br>OL (Welsh and English) |
| **Expressive Vocabulary** (n=2) | 24 PL & OL (German) | | | 6 PL (Spanish and English)<br>OL (English) | | |
| **Syntactic Awareness** (n=1) | 4 PL & OL (English) | | | | | |
| **Morphological Awareness** (n=3) | 23 PL & OL (English) | 1 PL (Chinese)<br>OL (English)<br>^ns across language associations (different languages assessed for literacy precursor and outcome measure) | | | 5 PL (English)<br>OL (Malay and English) | 5 PL (English)<br>OL (Malay and English) |
| **Working Memory** (n=1) | | 31 PL & OL (English) | | | | |
| **Verbal Short-Term Memory** (n=1) | | 4 PL & OL (English) | | | | |
| **Non-Verbal Intelligence** (n=3) | 32 OL (English) | 31 OL (English) | | | 22 OL (Welsh and English) | 22 OL (Welsh and English) |
| **Word/Non-Word Decoding** (n=5) | 21 PL & OL (Norwegian);<br>23 PL & OL (English);<br>24 PL & OL (German)<br>30 PL & OL (Dutch) | 26 PL & OL (Dutch) | | | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Semantic Awareness** (n=3) | | 7(Heterogenous-English bilinguals) [PL & OL] (English); 9 [PL & OL] (Hebrew); 26 [PL & OL] (Dutch) |
| **Spelling** (n=1) | 4 [PL & OL] (English) | |
| **Orthographic Processing** (n=1) | 2 [PL & OL] (English); | |
| **Environmental Print Awareness** (n=1) | 4 [PL & OL] (English) | |
| **Sub-Lexical/Phonological Speech Perception Task** (n=1) | 28 [PL & OL] (Spanish) | |
| **Sentence Priming Task** (n=1) | | 29 [PL & OL](Hebrew) |

^Different languages assessed for literacy precursor and outcome measure

*Note.* ^ = specifies additional information; ns= not significant; [+]= Studies (7, 19, 23, 24) that only assessed phonemic awareness; [PL]= (precursor language) indicates language assessed for literacy precursor measures; [OL]= (outcome language) indicates language assessed for literacy outcome measures.

**Table 8B**

*Precursor-Outcome Associations Assessed in Both Bilingual Languages for Simultaneous Bilingual Children.* Table of significant and non-significant within- and across-language precursor-outcome associations for the literacy precursors (indicated on the left, along with number of studies assessed) and outcome measures assessed in both bilingual languages – along with the language(s) of assessment (as denoted by [PL] and [OL]). Table 8B indicates significant and non-significant associations between given literacy precursors (indicated on the left) and literacy outcomes, as reported by the individual studies listed in Table 4.

***Literacy Precursors and Outcomes Assessed in Both Bilingual Languages***

| **Literacy Precursors** (n=number of studies) | ***Significant Within-Language for 1 Bilingual Language*** | ***Significant Within-Language for Both Bilingual Languages*** | ***Significant Across-Language for 1 Bilingual Language*** | ***Significant Across-Language for Both Bilingual Languages*** | ***Not Significant (Across-Language)*** | ***Not Significant (Both Within- and Across-Language)*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Phonological Awareness** (n=6) | +7(French-English bilinguals) [PL & OL] (French and ^English); 33 [PL & OL](*English and Chinese) | 3 [PL & OL] (Chinese and English); 14 [PL] (neural study) [& OL] (Hindi and English); +15 [PL & OL] (Spanish and French); +22 [PL & OL] (Welsh and English) 13 [PL & OL] (Maya and Spanish) 33 [PL & OL](English and Chinese) | 33 [PL & OL](English and Chinese) *Chinese serial recall – English reading | +15 [PL & OL] (Spanish and French); +22 [PL & OL] (Welsh and English) 13 [PL & OL] (Maya and Spanish) | 3 [PL & OL] (Chinese and English); 33 [PL & OL] (English and Chinese) | |
| **Letter Knowledge** (n=1) | | | | | | |
| **Serial Recall** (n=1) | | | | | | |
| **Oral Language/Listening Comprehension** (n=2) | | 10 [PL & OL] (Spanish and English); 11 [PL & OL] (Spanish and English) | | 10 [PL & OL] (Spanish and English); 11 [PL & OL] (Spanish and English) | | |
| **Receptive Vocabulary** (n=5) | | 3 [PL & OL] (Chinese and English); 10 [PL & OL] (Spanish and English); 11 [PL & OL] (Spanish and English); 25 [PL & OL] (Welsh and English); 33 [PL & OL](English and Chinese) | | 10 [PL & OL] (Spanish and English); 11 [PL & OL] (Spanish and English) | 3 [PL & OL] (Chinese and English); 33 [PL & OL](English and Chinese) | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Expressive Vocabulary** (n=1) | | 33 PL & OL(English and Chinese) | 33 PL & OL(English and Chinese)<br>*English vocabulary – Chinese reading | | |
| **Syntactic Awareness** (n=2) | 33 PL & OL(*English and Chinese) | 17 PL & OL (Italian and English) | 17 PL & OL (Italian and English)<br>*English syntactic awareness- Italian reading | | 33 PL & OL(English and Chinese) |
| **Morphological Awareness** (n=2) | | 3 PL & OL (Chinese and English);<br>33 PL & OL(English and Chinese) | | | 3 PL & OL (Chinese and English);<br>33 PL & OL(English and Chinese) |
| **Working Memory** (n=2) | | 33 PL & OL(English and Chinese) | 17 PL & OL (Italian and English)<br>*English working memory- Italian reading;<br>33 PL & OL(English and Chinese)<br>* Chinese working memory- English reading | | |
| **Non-Verbal Intelligence** (n=1) | 33 PL & OL(*English and Chinese) | | 33 PL & OL(English and Chinese)<br>*Chinese non-verbal intelligence vocabulary – English reading | | |
| **Word/Non-Word Decoding** (n=1) | | 33 PL & OL(English and Chinese) | | | 33 PL & OL(English and Chinese) |
| **Semantic Awareness** (n=1) | | | | | 7(French-English bilinguals)<br>PL & OL (French and English) |
| **Spelling** (n=1) | | 17 PL & OL (Italian and English) | | 17 PL & OL (Italian and English) | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **VA Span** (n=1) | | 15 [PL & OL] (Spanish and French) | 15 [PL & OL] (Spanish and French) |
| **Name Writing** (n=1) | 13 [OL] (*Maya and Spanish) | | |

*Note.*[+]= Studies (7, 15, 22) that only assessed phonemic awareness; [PL]= (precursor language) indicates language assessed for literacy precursor measures; [OL]= (outcome language) indicates language assessed for literacy outcome measures; ^= literacy precursor assessed in both bilingual languages, but only statistically analyzed in one bilingual language; *= language(s) with significant precursor-outcome associations.

**Table 9**

*Correlational Meta-Analyses Results Across Precursor Type, in relation to Word and Non-Word Reading.* We listed correlational effect size, along with number of studies (n), 95% CI, p-values and heterogeneity values, for **phonological awareness**, **vocabulary** and **morphological awareness**, in relation to word/non-word reading. When possible, we conducted two analyses, based on the assessment language (i.e., whether assessed in English only, or another language only).

| **Literacy Precursor** | **n (studies)** | **Effect Size (Correlation)** | **95% CI** | | **p** | **Heterogeneity** | | **Figure** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Lower | Upper | | I2 | p | |
| **Phonological Awareness** | | | | | | | | |
| *English* | 15 | 0.5068 | 0.4055 | 0.5958 | *< 0.0001 | 64.1% | 0.0004 | 2 |
| *Other Language (Non-English)* | 5 | 0.3563 | 0.1169 | 0.5565 | *0.0042 | 58.8% | 0.0455 | 3 |
| **Vocabulary**: | | | | | | | | |
| *English* | 12 | 0.4027 | 0.2862 | 0.5075 | *< 0.0001 | 60.9% | 0.0031 | 4 |
| *Other Language (Non-English)* | 5 | 0.3133 | 0.1383 | 0.4692 | *0.0006 | 53.5% | 0.0719 | 5 |
| **Morphological Awareness** | 6 | 0.5005 | 0.1441 | 0.7420 | *0.0078 | 85.8% | < 0.0001 | 6 |

*Note* *= significant p-value <0.05. See Figures 2-6 for corresponding random-effect models.

**Table 10**

*Correlational Meta-Analyses Results Across Precursor Type, in relation to Text Reading Comprehension.* We listed correlational effect size, along with number of studies (n), 95% CI, p-values and heterogeneity values, for **vocabulary** and **word/non-word decoding**, in relation to text comprehension.

| **Literacy Precursor** | **n (studies)** | **Effect Size (Correlation)** | **95% CI** | | **p** | **Heterogeneity** | | **Figure** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | I2 | p | |
| | | | Lower | Upper | | | | |
| **Vocabulary** | 8 | 0.5706 | 0.3669 | 0.7221 | *< 0.0001 | 77.9% | < 0.0001 | 7 |
| **Word and Non-Word Decoding** | 5 | 0.6741 | 0.3705 | 0.8476 | *0.0002 | 90.3% | < 0.0001 | 8 |

*Note* *= significant p-value <0.05. See Figures 7-8 for corresponding random-effect models.

**Table 11**

*Correlational Meta-Analyses Results for Phonological Awareness in relation to Word/Non-Word Reading, based on Type of Literacy Precursor and Outcome Measure Testing, Writing System, and Country of Assessment.* We listed correlational effect size, along with number of studies (n), test for subgroup differences, 95% CI, p-values and heterogeneity values, for **phonological awareness** in relation to word/non-word reading as an outcome measure, based on the type of *testing* (i.e., whether phonological awareness and word/non-word reading measures were assessed in the same [within-language] or different [across-language] language), *writing system* (i.e., whether simultaneous bilinguals, assessed on phonological awareness and word/non-word reading measures in an alphabetic language [all within-language assessments were conducted in English, except for Hebrew in study 9 and French in study 15], spoke syllabic-alphabetic or alphabetic-alphabetic bilingual language combinations), and *country of assessment* (i.e., whether Chinese-English simultaneous bilinguals were assessed, on English phonological awareness and word/non-word reading measures, in Canada/US or Singapore).

| **Subgroup** | **n (studies)** | **Test for Subgroup Differences (Random Effects Model)** | | **Effect Size (Correlation)** | **95% CI** | | **p (Overall Model)** | **Heterogeneity** | | **Figure** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Q | p | | Lower | Upper | | I2 | p | |
| ***Testing (within vs. across languages)*** | 22 | 2.48 | 0.1154 | | | | | | | 9 |
| Overall Model | | | | 0.4713 | 0.3850 | 0.5494 | <0.0001 | 60.5% | 0.0001 | |
| Within-Language | 17 | | | 0.5031 | 0.4098 | 0.5860 | | 59.0% | | |
| Across-Language | 5 | | | 0.3485 | 0.1577 | 0.5142 | | 41.6% | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***Writing System*** | 16 | 3.97 | *0.0463 | | | | | | | 10 |
| Overall Model | | | | 0.5161 | 0.4220 | 0.5992 | <0.0001 | 58.7% | 0.0016 | |
| Syllabic-Alphabetic | 11 | | | 0.5708 | 0.4813 | 0.6485 | | 27.5% | | |
| Alphabetic-Alphabetic | 5 | | | 0.3763 | 0.1781 | 0.5451 | | 73.0% | | |
| ***Country of Assessment*** | 11 | 0.09 | 0.7610 | | | | | | | 11 |
| Overall Model | | | | 0.5708 | 0.4813 | 0.6485 | <0.0001 | 27.5% | 0.1827 | |
| Canada/US | 6 | | | 0.5813 | 0.4453 | 0.6910 | | 46.5% | | |
| Singapore | 5 | | | 0.5553 | 0.4322 | 0.6581 | | 0.0% | | |

*Note* *= significant p-value <0.05. See Figures 9-11 for corresponding random-effect models.

**Table 12**

*Correlational Meta-Analyses Results for Vocabulary in relation to Word/Non-Word Reading, based on Type of Literacy Precursor and Outcome Measure Testing.* We listed correlational effect size, along with number of studies (n), test for subgroup differences, 95% CI, p-values and heterogeneity values, for **vocabulary** in relation to word/non-word reading as an outcome measure, based on the type of *testing* (i.e., whether vocabulary and word/non-word reading measures were assessed in the same [within-language] or different [across-language] language).

| **Subgroup** | **n (studies)** | **Test for Subgroup Differences (Random Effects Model)** | | **Effect Size (Correlation)** | **95% CI** | | **p (Overall Model)** | **Heterogeneity** | | **Figure** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | **I2** | **p** | |
| | | Q | p | | Lower | Upper | | | | |
| ***Testing (within vs. across languages)*** | 18 | 5.32 | *0.0210 | | | | | | | 12 |
| Overall Model | | | | 0.3254 | 0.2135 | 0.4289 | p< 0.0001 | 63.8% | 0.0001 | |
| Within-Language | 11 | | | 0.4221 | 0.2889 | 0.5392 | | 54.0% | | |
| Across-Language | 7 | | | 0.2026 | 0.0644 | 0.3332 | | 58.3% | | |

*Note* *= significant p-value <0.05. See Figure 12 for corresponding random-effect model.

**Table 13**

*Types of Child Language Proficiency Measures Assessed and Analyzed in Relation to Precursor-Outcome Associations.* Table indicating types of child language proficiency measures (indicated on top) assessed and analyzed in the reviewed studies (listed in Table 4), along with studies that assessed receptive and/or expressive vocabulary as a literary precursor. These measures are presented in relation to precursor-outcome associations for simultaneous bilinguals in each study.

| **Child Language Proficiency Measure** | | | | | | | **Receptive or Expressive Vocabulary Literacy Precursor** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Parent Questionnaire or Interview** | | **Child Language Interview** | **Teacher Questionnaire, Interview or Classroom Observations** | **Oral Language/Listening Comprehension or Production Screening Test** | **Word and Non-Word Reading Screening Test** | | | |
| *Assessed and Analyzed* | *Assessed and Did Not Analyze* | *Assessed and Did Not Analyze* | *Assessed and Did Not Analyze* | *Assessed and Did Not Analyze* | *Assessed and Analyzed* | *Assessed and Did Not Analyze* | *Assessed and Analyzed (in relation to other literacy precursors)* | *Assessed and Analyzed (in relation to literacy outcome measures)* |
| Not Significant | Significant | | | | Significant | | Significant | Significant |
| 12; 28; 31 | 32^ significant in relation to reading performance (Chinese character recognition); did not analyze in relation to precursor-outcome associations | 1; 2; 3; 7; 8; 10; 11; 13; 14; 15; 16; 18; 20; 21; 23; 25; 27; 29; 30; 33 | 20; 24; 26 | 8; 14; 15; 24; 27 | 7; 10; 11; 14; 20; 24 | 17^ significant in relation to literacy precursors (English and Italian syntactic awareness and spelling, but not working memory) and reading performance (English and Italian word and non-word reading accuracy); did not analyze in relation to precursor-outcome associations | 14 | 1[RV]; 3[RV]; 8[RV]; 16[RV]; 23[RV]; 33[RV&EV] | 1[RV]; 3[RV]; 6[EV]; 8[RV]; 10[RV]; 11[RV];16[RV]; 19[RV]; 21[RV]; 22[RV]; 23[RV]; 24[EV]; 25[RV]; 26[RV]; 30[RV]; 33[RV&EV] |

*Note.* [RV] = assessed receptive vocabulary; [EV]= assessed expressive vocabulary; ^ = specifies additional information.

## *Figures*

**Figure 1**

*Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) Flow Diagram for the Systematic Literature Review Search.* PRISMA Flow Diagram specifying number of studies included at title/abstract, full-text, additional Google Scholar and manual citation search, and critical appraisal levels of screening.



**Figure 2**

*Meta-Analysis for Phonological Awareness in relation to Word and Non-Word Reading (English language only)*. Forestplot indicating correlational effect size for random-effects model (r= 0.5068; 95% CI: 0.4055, 0.5958; p< 0.0001) and individual correlations/study between phonological awareness and word/non-word reading, for within-language studies that only assessed phonological awareness and word/non-word reading measures in English.



**Figure 3**

*Meta-Analysis for Phonological Awareness in relation to Word and Non-Word Reading (Other language only)*. Forestplot indicating correlational effect size for random-effects model (r= 0.3563; 95% CI: 0.1169, 0.5569; p=0.0042) and individual correlations/study between phonological awareness and word/non-word reading, for within-language studies that only assessed phonological awareness and word/non-word reading measures in another (non-English) language.



**Figure 4**

*Meta-Analysis for Vocabulary in relation to Word and Non-Word Reading (English language only)*. Forestplot indicating correlational effect size for random-effects model (r= 0.4027; 95% CI: 0.2862, 0.5075; p< 0.0001) and individual correlations/study between vocabulary and word/non-word reading, for within-language studies that only assessed vocabulary and word/non-word reading measures in English.



**Figure 5**

*Meta-Analysis for Vocabulary in relation to Word and Non-Word Reading (Other language only)*. Forestplot indicating correlational effect size for random-effects model (r= 0.3133; 95% CI: 0.1383, 0. 4692; p< 0.0006) and individual correlations/study between vocabulary and word/non-word reading, for within-language studies that only assessed vocabulary and word/non-word reading measures in another (non-English) language.



**Figure 6**

*Meta-Analysis for Morphological Awareness in relation to Word and Non-Word Reading*. Forestplot indicating correlational effect size for random-effects model (r= 0.5005; 95% CI: 0.1441, 0.7420; p=0.0078) and individual correlations/study between morphological awareness and word/non-word reading.



**Figure 7**

*Meta-Analysis for Vocabulary in relation to Text Reading Comprehension*. Forestplot indicating correlational effect size for random-effects model (r= 0.5706; 95% CI: 0.3669, 0.7221; p< 0.0001) and individual correlations/study between vocabulary and text reading comprehension.



**Figure 8**

*Meta-Analysis for Word/Non-Word Decoding in relation to Text Reading Comprehension*. Forestplot indicating correlational effect size for random-effects model (r= 0.6741; 95% CI: 0.3705, 0.8476; p=0.0002) and individual correlations/study between word/non-word decoding and text reading comprehension.



**Figure 9**

*Meta-Analysis for Phonological Awareness in relation to Word/Non-Word Reading, based on Type of Literacy Precursor and Outcome Measure Testing.* Forestplot indicating correlational effect size for random-effects model (r= 0.4713; 95% CI: 0.3850, 0.5494; p<0.0001) and individual correlations/study between phonological awareness and word/non-word reading, based on type of testing (i.e., whether phonological awareness and word/non-word reading measures were assessed in the same [within-language; r= 0.5031; 95% CI: 0.4098, 0.5860] or different [across-language; r= 0.3485; 95% CI: 0.1577, 0.5142] language; test for subgroup differences: Q=2.48; p=0.1154).



**Figure 10**

*Meta-Analysis for Phonological Awareness in relation to Word/Non-Word Reading, based on Type of Writing System.* Forestplot indicating correlational effect size for random-effects model (r= 0.5161; 95% CI: 0.4220, 0.5992; p<0.0001) and individual correlations/study between phonological awareness and word/non-word reading, based on type of writing system (i.e., whether simultaneous bilinguals, assessed on phonological awareness and word/non-word reading measures in an alphabetic language, spoke syllabic-alphabetic [r= 0.5708; 95% CI: 0.4813, 0.6485] or alphabetic-alphabetic [r= 0.3763; 95% CI: 0.1781, 0.5451] bilingual language combinations; test for subgroup differences: Q=3.97; p=0.0463).



**Figure 11**

*Meta-Analysis for Phonological Awareness in relation to Word/Non-Word Reading, based on Country of Assessment.* Forestplot indicating correlational effect size for random-effects model (r= 0.5708; 95% CI: 0.4813, 0.6485; p<0.0001) and individual correlations/study between phonological awareness and word/non-word reading, based on country of assessment (i.e., whether Chinese-English simultaneous bilinguals were assessed, on English phonological awareness and word/non-word reading measures, in Canada/US [r= 0.5813; 95% CI: 0.4453, 0.6910] or Singapore [r= 0.5553; 95% CI: 0.4322, 0.6581]; test for subgroup differences: Q=0.09; p=0.7610).



**Figure 12**

*Meta-Analysis for Vocabulary in relation to Word/Non-Word Reading, based on Type of Literacy Precursor and Outcome Measure Testing.* Forestplot indicating correlational effect size for random-effects model (r= 0.3254; 95% CI: 0.2135, 0.4289; p<0.0001) and individual correlations/study between vocabulary and word/non-word reading, based on type of testing (i.e., whether vocabulary and word/non-word reading measures were assessed in the same [within-language; r= 0.4221; 95% CI: 0.28889, 0.5392] or different [across-language; r= 0.2026; 95% CI: 0.0644, 0.3332] language; test for subgroup differences: Q=5.32; p=0.0210).



## *Files*

**Supplemental File 1: Database Search Syntax**

Note: For purposes of our database search, '*OR*' is used to specify terms that are optional or alternatives for a specified term while '*AND*' specifies terms that are mandatory.

***Database Search of the 8 Literacy Precursors (in Relation to Word/Non-Word Decoding or Reading)***

(Phonological Awareness *OR* phonem* awareness *OR* letter knowledge *OR* grapheme knowledge *OR* Grapheme Phoneme Correspondence *OR* sound symbol* *OR* Serial Recall *OR* Oral Comprehension *OR* Verbal Comprehension *OR* Listening Comprehension *OR* Vocabulary *OR* Word Knowledge *OR* grammar *OR* Syntax *OR* Syntac* *OR* Synta* *OR* Morpholog* *OR* Morphem* *OR* Visual Short Term Memory *OR* Phonological Short Term Memory *OR* Short Term Memory *OR* Working Memory *OR* Visual Memory *OR* Verbal Memory *OR* Nonverbal Memory *OR* Nonverbal Ability *OR* Nonverbal Intelligence *OR* Nonverbal IQ) *AND* (Word Decoding *OR* Reading Fluency *OR* Word Recognition *OR* Reading Ability *OR* Reading Skills *OR* Literacy Skills) *AND* (mainsubject(Child*) *OR* mainsubject(Infants)) *AND* (mainsubject(Bilingual*) *OR* mainsubject(Multilingual*) *OR* mainsubject(Second Language Learner*))

***Database Search of the 9 Literacy Precursors (in Relation to Reading Comprehension)***

(Phonological Awareness *OR* phonem* awareness *OR* letter knowledge *OR* grapheme knowledge *OR* Grapheme Phoneme Correspondence *OR* sound symbol* *OR* Serial Recall *OR* Oral Comprehension *OR* Verbal Comprehension *OR* Listening Comprehension *OR* Vocabulary *OR* Word Knowledge *OR* grammar *OR* Syntax *OR* Syntac* *OR* Synta* *OR* Morpholog* *OR* Morphem* *OR* Visual Short Term Memory *OR* Phonological Short Term Memory *OR* Short Term Memory *OR* Working Memory *OR* Visual Memory *OR* Verbal Memory *OR* Nonverbal Memory *OR* Nonverbal Ability *OR* Nonverbal Intelligence *OR* Nonverbal IQ *OR* Word Decoding *OR* Reading Fluency *OR* Word Recognition *OR* Reading Ability *OR* Reading Skills OR Literacy Skills) *AND* (Reading Comprehension) *AND* (mainsubject(Child*) *OR* mainsubject(Infants)) *AND* (mainsubject(Bilingual*) *OR* mainsubject(Multilingual*) *OR* mainsubject(Second Language Learner*))

***Database Search of General Literacy Precursors (in Relation to Word/Non-Word Decoding or Reading)***

(Precursor Literacy *OR* Precursor Reading *OR* Predictor Literacy *OR* Predictor Reading *OR* Precursor Literacy Skills *OR* Precursors of Reading Ability *OR* Early Predictors of

Later Conventional Literacy Skills *OR* Predictive Literacy Skills *OR* Predictors of Later Reading Skills *OR* Preschool Literacy) *AND* (Word Decoding *OR* Reading Fluency *OR* Word Recognition *OR* Reading Ability *OR* Reading Skills *OR* Literacy Skills) *AND* (mainsubject(Child*) *OR* mainsubject(Infants)) *AND* (mainsubject(Bilingual*) *OR* mainsubject(Multilingual*) *OR* mainsubject(Second Language Learner*))

***Database Search of General Literacy Precursors (in Relation to Reading Comprehension)***

(Precursor Literacy *OR* Precursor Reading *OR* Predictor Literacy *OR* Predictor Reading *OR* Precursor Literacy Skills *OR* Precursors of Reading Ability *OR* Early Predictors of Later Conventional Literacy Skills *OR* Predictive Literacy Skills *OR* Predictors of Later Reading Skills *OR* Preschool Literacy) *AND* (Reading Comprehension) *AND* (mainsubject(Child*) *OR* mainsubject(Infants)) *AND* (mainsubject(Bilingual*) *OR* mainsubject(Multilingual*) *OR* mainsubject(Second Language Learner*))