

fluency (FSP) coefficient at beginning-of-year first grade is within the administrative purpose range (i.e. .69) but falls short for screening decisions. The word recoding (NMR) measure at the end of Grade 1 is inadequate in its present form and requires some improvement.

Additional reliability information can be drawn from the data for FLO and ROR since three forms of these measures were taken at different time points in Grade 1 and Grade 2. The zero-order correlations among the different forms of these tests are reported in Table 12.

Table 12

IDAPEL FLO Passage-Level Correlations Within Time of Year for Grades 1 and 2

| Passage Combination | FLO by Grade | | ROR by Grade | |
|--------------------------|--------------|----------|--------------|----------|
| | First | Second | First | Second |
| <i>Beginning of Year</i> | | | | |
| 1, 2 | -- | .97 (47) | -- | .82 (11) |
| 1, 3 | -- | .96 (47) | -- | .87 (11) |
| 2, 3 | -- | .97 (47) | -- | .90 (11) |
| <i>Middle of Year</i> | | | | |
| 1, 2 | .98 (79) | .94 (35) | .80 (49) | .88 (35) |
| 1, 3 | .95 (79) | .94 (35) | .77 (48) | .81 (35) |
| 2, 3 | .95 (89) | .97 (35) | .87 (48) | .80 (35) |
| <i>End of Year</i> | | | | |
| 1, 2 | .95 (86) | .98 (36) | .66 (58) | .86 (36) |
| 1, 3 | .94 (85) | .98 (36) | .75 (57) | .86 (36) |
| 2, 3 | .96 (85) | .98 (36) | .66 (57) | .89 (36) |

Note. Pair-wise sample sizes are indicated in parenthesis. FLO = Facilité en lecture orale; ROR = Rapport oral du récit. BOY = Beginning of Year, MOY = Middle of Year, EOY = End of Year. All correlations are significant, $p < .001$.

The data presented in Table 12 indicate that the scores on the different forms of oral reading fluency (FLO) and retell fluency (ROR) taken closely in time are typically highly correlated with one another. Most correlation coefficients range from .80 to .98. The one subset of measures that deviates from this pattern is ROR measured at the end of Grade 1. The lower correlations may reflect problems with the measures themselves or with the teacher assessment procedure. These measures need further attention and they may require improvement. Despite these qualifications, this set of results indicate that most of these measures meet Salvia et al.'s reliability standard for making important educational decisions concerning individual students.

Relationships Between the IDAPEL and the ÉCOLE Measures

The present study provided us an opportunity to investigate the construct validity of the IDAPEL measures by investigating their relationships with other tests designed to measure the same constructs. We examined concurrent, criterion-related validity of the IDAPEL measures by reviewing at student performance on the IDAPEL assessments along with their performance on the criterion ÉCOLE measures both taken at the end of the school year. These relationships were assessed by computing the Pearson Product-Moment correlation among conceptually related scores for K and Grade 1. Grade 2 data were discarded from these analyses because the student sample size was insufficient for estimating reliability coefficients. Relevant correlations are reported in table 13.

Table 13

Concurrent Criterion-Related Validity of IDAPEL and ÉCOLE Measures in Kindergarten and Grade 1.

| IDAPEL Measure | ÉCOLE Measure | Kindergarten | | Grade 1 | |
|----------------|---------------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | | <i>n</i> | <i>r</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>r</i> |
| FSP | IIP | 49 | .54** | 37 | -.09 |
| FSP | PHS | 49 | .54** | 37 | .18 |
| FSP | PHE | 49 | .50** | 37 | .25 |
| FDL | GRS | 49 | .68** | | |
| FNM | GRS | 49 | .65** | 37 | .52** |
| FNM | WRead | 49 | .62** | 37 | .58** |
| FNM | NWRead | 49 | .68** | 37 | .44** |
| FNM | TXTRed | 48 | .70** | 37 | .63** |
| NMR | WRead | 49 | .33* | 37 | .17 |
| NMR | NWRead | 49 | .28* | 37 | .10 |
| NMR | TXTRed | 48 | .32* | 37 | .21 |
| FLO | GRS | | | 37 | .71** |
| FLO | WRead | | | 37 | .87** |
| FLO | NWRead | | | 37 | .66** |
| FLO | TXTRed | | | 37 | .74** |
| FLO | WPM | | | 37 | .60** |
| FLO | SPM | | | 37 | .68** |
| ROR | WRead | | | 26 | .61** |
| ROR | NWRead | | | 26 | .52** |
| ROR | TXTRed | | | 26 | .66** |
| ROR | WPM | | | 26 | .60** |
| ROR | SPM | | | 26 | .63** |

Note. FSP: Facilité à segmenter les phonèmes; FDL : Facilité à dénommer les lettres; FNM : Facilité à lire les nonmots; FLO : Facilité en lecture orale; ROR : Rapport oral du récit; IIP : Identification of initial phoneme; PHS : Phonemic Segmentation; PHE : Phonemic Elision; GRS : Grapheme Sounding; WRead : Word reading; NWRead : Nonword reading; TXTRed : Text reading; WPM : Word-Picture matching; SPM : Sentence-picture matching. Symbol * means $p < .05$; ** means $p < .01$.

By design, IDAPEL assessments measure specific reading-related skills and the fluency of their deployment. By contrast, a large proportion of the ÉCOLE measures used in this study are self-paced and focused on response accuracy only. Therefore, several of the correlation coefficients reported in Table 13 exclude the common variance that would be attributable to method similarity (i.e., in relating two fluency measures). Although this exclusion was expected to lower the observed correlation coefficients, most were found to be equal or above .50.

Most IDAPEL measures that tapped phonological awareness, decoding or reading skills were positively and significantly correlated with conceptually related ÉCOLE measures. The two exceptions to this pattern are found among the measures used at the end of Grade 1. For instance, FSP was not significantly correlated with any of the phonological awareness measures of the ÉCOLE battery in Grade 1; whereas a clear linear relationship was observed at the end of Kindergarten. Since the same ÉCOLE measures were used in both grades, the evidence suggests that the FSP test at the end of Grade 1 needs further examination and possibly some improvement. The second exception to the general pattern pertains to NMR. However, as noted earlier, the reliability of both FSP and NMR have been found to be a cause for concern. The magnitude of the mean scores and standard deviations reported in Tables 7 and 9 seem to rule out the possibility of a ceiling effect in Grade 1 performance on these measures. These results suggest that the FSP and NMR measures used at the end of Grade 1 require closer analysis.

Predicting Year-End Outcome

The IDAPEL measures were primarily designed to track student progress over the school year. They could also serve to predict future success or failure in learning to read. This study permits us to explore the predictive validity of the IDAPEL measures by examining the

relationship between measures taken at the beginning of the school year and those taken at year end. In this section we report for Kindergarten and Grade 1 the correlations between measures taken at the beginning and the end of the school year. The correlations that pertain to Kindergarten and Grade 1 are reported in tables 14 and 15, respectively.

Table 14
Correlations Among the Measures Taken at The Beginning and The End of Kindergarten

| Measures taken at year end | Measures taken in the Fall | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | FPS | | FDL | |
| | <i>r</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>r</i> | <i>n</i> |
| FDL | .61** | 84 | .76** | 84 |
| FSP | .55** | 84 | .50** | 91 |
| FNM | .60** | 84 | .67** | 84 |
| NMR | .40** | 84 | .45** | 84 |
| IIP | .55** | 79 | .41** | 79 |
| PHS | .53** | 79 | .36** | 79 |
| PHE | .56** | 79 | .57** | 79 |
| GRS | .57** | 79 | .61** | 79 |
| WRead | .59** | 79 | .50** | 79 |
| NWread | .58** | 79 | .46** | 79 |
| TXTread | .58** | 65 | .65** | 65 |

*Note.*FSP: Facilité à segmenter les phonèmes; FDL : Facilité à dénommer les lettres; FNM : Facilité à lire les nonmots; FLO : Facilité en lecture orale; ROR : Rapport oral du récit; IIP : Identification of initial phoneme; PHS : Phonemic Segmentation; PHE : Phonemic Elision; GRS : Grapheme Sounding; WRead : Word reading; NWRead : Nonword reading; TXTRead : Text reading. Symbol * means $p < .05$; ** means $p < .01$.

The pattern of these results is clear and consistent: measures of FPS and FDL taken at the beginning of Kindergarten are positively and significantly correlated with all measures taken at year end (i.e., IDAPEL as well as ÉCOLE measures). All coefficients except for one are equal to

or greater than .40. These results strongly suggest that FPS and FDL are useful predictors of future performance in Kindergarten and they could be used to screen children at risk for difficulties in phonological analysis, letter learning, letter-string decoding, and single word reading.

The general pattern observed in the Grade 1 data is similar to that observed in the Kindergarten data: Measures taken at the beginning of the school year are positively and significantly correlated with most measures taken at year end. The significant correlations range from .19 to .74. The largest coefficients are found between early FDL and FNM and the late measures of oral reading (e.g. FLO, WRead). An unexpected finding is that the measure of NMR taken in the fall is not significantly correlated with the same measure taken in the spring. The dubious reliability of this measure has been noted earlier in this report. We now provide further evidence that it requires further analysis and adjustment. Overall, the results strongly suggest that FDL, FSP, and FNM are useful predictors of future performance in reading as indexed by multiple outcome indicators. According to Hopkins (2002) standards for predictive validity, correlations smaller than .09 indicate a very small relationship, .10 to .29 a small relationship, .30-.49 a moderate relationship, .50-.60 a moderate-strong relationship, and above .70 a strong relationship. The coefficients reported in Table 15 cover the entire range of these nominal categories. For the purpose of predicting future reading performance, FDL and FNM clearly are the best IDAPEL indicators.

IDAPEL PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES

Table 15
Correlations Among the Measures Taken at The Beginning and The End of Grade 1

| Measures taken at year end | Measures taken in the Fall | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | FDL | | FSP | | FNM | | NMR | |
| | <i>r</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>r</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>r</i> | <i>n</i> | <i>r</i> | <i>n</i> |
| FSP | 0.17 | 86 | .59** | 86 | .19* | 86 | 0.14 | 86 |
| FNM | .63** | 86 | .28** | 86 | .64** | 86 | .47** | 86 |
| NMR | .28** | 86 | .30** | 86 | .29** | 86 | 0.07 | 86 |
| FLO | .64** | 86 | .33** | 86 | .74** | 86 | .60** | 86 |
| ROR | .42** | 58 | 0.06 | 58 | .25* | 58 | .25* | 58 |
| IIP | 0.04 | 51 | 0.05 | 51 | .29* | 51 | .23* | 51 |
| PHS | 0.16 | 51 | .41** | 51 | .24* | 51 | .25* | 51 |
| PHE | .37** | 51 | .32* | 51 | .51** | 51 | .47** | 51 |
| GRS | .62** | 51 | .43** | 51 | .46** | 51 | .38** | 51 |
| WRead | .63** | 51 | .28* | 51 | .70** | 51 | .60** | 51 |
| NWread | .57** | 51 | 0.16 | 51 | .47** | 51 | .40** | 51 |
| TXTread | .68** | 51 | .24* | 51 | .47** | 51 | .36** | 51 |
| WPM | .48** | 51 | 0.21 | 51 | .41** | 51 | .37** | 51 |
| SPM | .51** | 51 | .35** | 51 | .42** | 51 | .31* | 51 |

Note. FSP: Facilité à segmenter les phonèmes; FDL: Facilité à dénommer les lettres; FNM: Facilité à lire les nonmots; NMR: Nombre de mots recodés; FLO: Facilité en lecture orale; ROR: Rapport oral du récit; IIP: Identification of initial phoneme; PHS: Phonemic Segmentation; PHE: Phonemic Elision; GRS: Grapheme Sounding; WRead: Word reading; NWRead: Nonword reading; TXTRead: Text reading; WPM: Word-Picture matching; SPM: Sentence-picture matching. Symbol * means $p < .05$; ** means $p < .01$.

Discussion

The primary purpose of the present study was to investigate the psychometric properties and usefulness of IDAPEL. Four general issues were considered: a) How sensitive are these indicators to changes in reading-related abilities over a school year? b) How reliable are these measures? c) How do these measures relate to an independent set of measures that tap the same constructs? And d) Can the measures taken at the beginning of a school year predict reading-related performance at year end? The results reported here provide fairly clear answers to these questions.

The main strategy for addressing the first question consisted of verifying if statistically significant change was detected from one measurement point to the next. The results indicate that most IDAPEL measures are sensitive to the change that occurred between the three time points at which data were collected (i.e. Fall, Winter, and Spring). The only measure that showed non-significant sensitivity is ROR in Grade 2. Grade 2 test results must be interpreted with caution as its sample size was exceedingly low, resulting in deflated statistical power. The same analyses were carried out on the ÉCOLE data to verify that these measures were also sensitive to changes in knowledge and skills from one year end to the next. Except for IIP, all measures were sensitive to change from the end of Kindergarten to the end of Grade 1. From Grade 1 to Grade 2, only measures of reading were found to be sensitive to skill growth; measures of phonological awareness and alphabetic knowledge were not. Again, the low sample size in Grade 2 may have prevented us from ascertaining real differences. Beyond these analyses Grade 2 data were not considered further.

The reliability of IDAPEL measures was investigated via the administration of alternate forms of the same test over a two-week time interval. Test-retest correlations and the application of

the Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula confirmed that the reliability of most IDAPEL measures is satisfactory for mostly screening decisions and some for making important educational decisions at the individual student level. Weaker results were found for NMR and FSP in Grade 1. Although the current state of FSP is within the range of acceptability, NMR does require further attention and improvement. A similar analysis indicated that the correlations among alternate forms of FLO and ROR are typically very high ($r \geq .80$), but lower at the end of Grade 1 (r between .66 and .75).

Construct validity was examined by inspecting the linear relationship between the IDAPEL measures and conceptually related ÉCOLE measures, both taken at the end of Kindergarten and Grade 1. Most IDAPEL measures were positively and significantly correlated with conceptually related ÉCOLE measures. FSP and NMR in Grade 1 were less strongly correlated with the outcome measures but this pattern is not entirely surprising since we found evidence that the reliability of these particular measures are on the low side of the spectrum. Such a condition is expected to lower the upper bound of their correlation with other measures and this is what was observed.

One desirable function of IDAPEL would be to help screen children at risk for future reading difficulty. Although the ideal time for such a screening operation is still an open question, there is fairly strong agreement that it should be done early, either in Kindergarten or early in Grade 1 (Fréchette & Desrochers, 2011; Rathvon, 2004). A required feature of screening tools is demonstrated predictive validity. To explore this feature we examined the correlation between all IDAPEL measures taken at the beginning of the school year and all measures taken at year end. In Kindergarten, early FPS and FDL were found to be strongly correlated with year-end measures of phonological awareness, letter knowledge and reading. In Grade 1 FDL and FNM were found to

be the most potent and consistent predictors of year-end measures of single-word and sentence reading.

To sum up, the present study permitted us to investigate several aspects of the IDAPEL measures: their sensitivity to change in student skills, their reliability, their construct validity, and their predictive validity. Even though some of these measures displayed some weaknesses, we report clear initial empirical evidence that the IDAPEL battery can serve several useful purposes (e.g. progress monitoring, screening children at risk of reading difficulty) and justify important screening decisions on individual students' standing.

As with any empirical study, continued study replication with similar sets of students remains important. The importance and need to replicate and extend findings with larger samples of student participants as well as with additional criterion measures cannot be understated.

References

- Adams, M.J. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ball, E. W., & Blachman, B. A. (1991). Does phoneme awareness training in kindergarten make a difference in early word recognition and developmental spelling? *Reading Research Quarterly*, 24(1), 49-66.
- Borzone de Manrique, A., & Signorini, A. (1994). Phonological awareness, spelling, and reading abilities in Spanish-speaking children. *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 64, 429-439.
- Blachman, B. A. (2000). Phonological Awareness. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research*, (Vol. III, pp. 483-502). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Carnine, D., Silbert, J., & Kame'enui, E. (1997). *Direct Instruction Reading* (3rd Ed). New York: Merrill.
- Comeau, L., Cormier, P., Grandmaison, E., & Lacroix, D. (1999). A longitudinal study of phonological processing skills in children learning to read in a second language. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 91(1), 29-43.
- Content, A. (1993). Le rôle de la médiation phonologique dans l'acquisition de la lecture. In J. P. Jaffre, L. Sprenger-Charolles, & M. Fayol (Eds.), *Lecture-écriture: Acquisition* (pp. 80-96). Paris: Nathan.

- Cossu, G., Shankweiler, D., Liberman, I. Y., Katz, L., & Tola, T. (1988). Awareness of phonological segments and reading ability in Italian children. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 9, 1-16.
- Daoust, F., Laroche, L., & Ouellet, L. (1996). *SATO. Système d'analyse de texte par ordinateur: version 4.0: manuel de référence*. Montréal, Service d'analyse de textes par ordinateur (SATO).
- Demont, E. (1994). Conscience phonologique, conscience syntaxique. In G. Gregoire & B. Piérart (Eds.), *Evaluer les troubles de la lecture: Les nouveaux modèles théoriques et leurs implications diagnostiques* (pp. 195-208). Gembloux, Belgique: De Boeck Université.
- Desrochers, A. (2011). *ÉCOLE: épreuves de compétence en lecture*. Manuscript in preparation, School of Psychology, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada.
- Desrochers, A., Cormier, P., & Thompson, G. (2005). La sensibilité phonologique et l'apprentissage de la lecture. *La Parole*, 34-35-36, 113-138.
- Desrochers, A., & Glickman, V. (2008). *National Strategy for Early Literacy. Reading assessment policy research: Understanding elementary reading assessment options*. London, ON: Canadian Language and Literacy Research Network. Retrieved July 10, 2009, from http://docs.cllrnet.ca/NSEL/Current/NSEL_ElementaryReading.pdf
- Desrochers, A., Simon, M., & Thompson, G. L. (2011). Formes et fonctions de l'évaluation de la littératie. In M. J. Berger & A. Desrochers (Eds.), *L'évaluation de la littératie* (pp. 29-61). Ottawa, Canada : Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa.
- Dewitz, P., & Dewitz, P. K. (2003). They can read the words, but they can't understand: Refining comprehension assessment. *Reading Teacher*, 56, 422-435.

- Dufour-Martel, C., & Good, R. H. (2009). Investigating the psychometric properties of three French language early reading measures, *Effective Education, 1*, 1, 87-100.
- Fréchette, S., & Desrochers, A. (2011). Le dépistage des élèves à risque de difficulté en lecture. In M. J. Berger & A. Desrochers (Eds.), *L'évaluation de la littératie* (pp. 81-116). Ottawa, Canada : Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa.
- Fuchs, L. S., & Deno, S. L. (1991). Curriculum-based measurement: Current applications and future directions. *Exceptional Children, 57*, 466-501.
- Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (1998). Treatment validity: A unifying concept for reconceptualizing the identification of learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 13*, 204-219.
- Fuchs, L.S., Fuchs, D., Hosp, M.K., and Jenkins, J.R. (2001). Oral reading fluency as an indicator of reading competence: A theoretical, empirical, and historical analysis. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 5*, 239-256.
- Good, R. H., III, Simmons, D. C., & Kame'enui, E. J. (2001). The importance and decision-making utility of a continuum of fluency-based indicators of foundational reading skills for third-grade high-stakes outcomes. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 5*(3), 257-288.
- Grandmaison, E. (1996). *Longitudinal relationships among phonological awareness, verbal working memory, lexical access, and reading achievement in English-speaking children placed in French immersion*. Conference papers presented at Quebec City, Quebec, Canada.
- Hamilton, C., & Shinn, M.R. (2003). Characteristics of word callers: An investigation of the accuracy of teachers' judgments of reading comprehension and oral reading skills. *School Psychology Review, 32*, 228-240.

- Hart, B. & Risley, T. R. (1995). *Meaningful Differences in the Everyday Experience of Young American Children*. Brookes Publishing
- Hasbrouck, J., & Tindal, G. A. (2006). Oral reading fluency norms: a valuable assessment tool for reading teachers. *The Reading Teacher*, 59, 7, 636-644.
- Henson, R. K. (2001). Understanding internal consistency reliability estimates: A conceptual primer on coefficient alpha. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*. Retrieved on-line 2/16/2011 <http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-80370171.html>
- Hopkins, W. G. (2002). A scale of magnitudes for the effect statistics. In *A review of statistics*. Retrieved July 30, 2010 from <http://www.sportsci.org/resource/stats/effectmag.html>.
- Huang, H. S., & Hanley, R. J. (1995). Phonological awareness and visual skills in learning to read Chinese and English. *Cognition* 54, 73-98.
- Kaminski, R. A., & Good, III, R. H. (1996). Toward a technology for assessing basic early literacy skills. *School Psychology Review* 25, 215-227.
- Lecocq, P. (1991). *Apprentissage de la lecture et dyslexie* [Learning reading and dyslexia]. Liege: Mardaga.
- Lété, B., Sprenger-Charolles, L., & Colé, P. (2004). MANULEX: A grade-level lexical database from French elementary school readers. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 36(1), 156-166
- Lundberg, I. (1994). Reading difficulties can be predicted and prevented: A Scandinavian perspective on phonological awareness and reading. In C. Hulme & M. Snoling (Eds.), *Reading development and dyslexia* (pp. 180-199). London: Whurr.
- McGill-Franzen, A. (1987). Failure to learn to read: Formulating a policy problem. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 22(4), 475-490.

- National Research Council. (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction: Report of the subgroups*. Bethesda, MD: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.
- Perfetti, C.A., & Zhang, S. (1996). What it means to learn to read. In M. F. Graves, B. M. Taylor, & P. van den Broek (Eds.), *The first R: Every child's right to read* (pp. 37-61). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Porpodas, C. (1993). The relation between phonemic awareness and reading and spelling of Greek words in the first school year. In M. Carretero, M. Pope, R. J. Simons, & J. I. Pozo (Eds.), *Learning and instruction* (vol. 3, pp. 203-217). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Rathvon, N. (2004). *Early reading assessment: A practitioner's handbook*. New York: Guilford.
- Saint-Laurent, L. & Giasson, J. (2010). *Épreuves informatisées des indicateurs des savoirs essentiels en lecture pour élèves francophones au début du primaire (INDISSE)*. Manuscript under review, Faculté des sciences de l'éducation, Université Laval, Québec, Canada.
- Salvia, J., Ysseldyke, J., & Bolt, S. (2007). *Assessment in special and inclusive education* (10th Ed). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Schargel, F. P., & Smink, J. (2001). *Strategies to help solve our school dropout problem*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

- Shinn, M.R. (Ed.). (1989). *Curriculum-based measurement: Assessing special children*. New York: Guilford.
- Shinn, M.R. (Ed.). (1998). *Advanced applications of Curriculum-Based Measurement*. New York: Guilford.
- Schneider, W., Kuspert, P., Roth, E., Vise, M., & Marx, H. (1997). Short- and long-term of training phonological awareness in kindergarten: Evidence from two German studies. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology* 66, 311-340.
- Simonart, G. (2006). *Échelle d'apprentissages scolaires primaires (ÉCHAS)*. Namur, Belgique : Association francophone des agents psycho-médico-sociaux.
- Snow, C. E., Burns, M. S., & Griffin, P. (Eds.) (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Statistique Canada^a (2006). Étude: Alphabétisme et minorités de langue officielle. Ottawa : Gouvernement du Canada. Retrieved October, 2009, from <http://www12.statcan.ca/census-recensement/index-fra.cfm>
- Statistics Canada^b (2006). Community Profiles from the 2006 Census: Ottawa. Retrieved April, 2010 from <http://www12.statcan.ca/census-recensement/2006/dp-pd/prof/92-591/index.cfm?Lang=E>
- Tindal, G., & Marston, D. (1990). *Classroom-based assessment: Testing for teachers*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Vacca, J. S. (2008). Crime can be prevented if schools teach juvenile offenders to read. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 30, (9), 1055-1062.

IDAPEL PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES

Yopp, Hallie Kay. (1988). The validity and reliability of phonemic awareness tests. *Reading Research Quarterly*, Vol. 23(2), 159–177.

Yopp, H. K. (1992). Developing phonemic awareness in young children. *Reading Teacher*, 45 (9), 696-703.