Manuscript currently under review

Data and conclusions are unchanged from earlier draft titled “Morphological awareness contributes to early literacy in linguistically diverse readers”

Morphological awareness and its role in early word reading in English monolinguals, Spanish-English, and Chinese-English simultaneous bilinguals

Rebecca A. Marks¹, Danielle Labotka¹, Xin Sun¹, Nia Nickerson¹, Kehui Zhang¹, Rachel L. Eggleston¹, Chi-Lin Yu¹, Yuuko Uchikoshi², Fumiko Hoeft^{3,4,5}, & Ioulia Kovelman¹

¹ Department of Psychology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109

² School of Education, University of California Davis, Davis, CA 95616

³ Department of Psychiatry and Weill Institute for Neurosciences, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA 94143

⁴ Department of Psychological Sciences and Brain Imaging Research Center (BIRC), University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06269

⁵ Haskins Laboratories, New Haven, CT 06511

Acknowledgements:

The authors would like to thank many people for their efforts in project coordination and data collection, in particular Isabel Hernandez, Jessica Kim, Jocelyn Cabellero, Matt David and Kelsey Maki. We also acknowledge and thank Dr. Amanda Goodwin for her guidance and expertise. This research was supported by NIH grants R01HD092498 (PI: Kovelman) and R01HD078351 (PI: Hoeft). Dr. Hoeft was additionally supported by NICHD R01HD086168, R01HD096261, P50HD052120 (PI: R. Wagner), University of California Office of the President Multicampus Research Programs and Initiatives Award MRP-17-454925, Oak Foundation ORIO-16-012, UCSF Dyslexia Center, Ray & Lori dePole, Dyslexia Training Institute, The Potter Family, and ALTA.

Address for correspondence:

Rebecca A. Marks, Ph.D. (marksre@umich.edu)
Department of Psychology
530 Church Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Abstract

Words' morphemic structure and their orthographic representations vary across languages. How do bilingual experiences with structurally distinct languages influence children's morphological processes for word reading? Focusing on English literacy in monolinguals and bilinguals ($N = 350$, ages 5-9), we first revealed unique contributions of derivational (*friend-li-est*) and compound (*girl-friend*) morphology to early word reading. We then examined mechanisms of bilingual transfer in matched samples of Spanish-English and Chinese-English dual first language learners. Results revealed a principled cross-linguistic interaction between language group (Spanish vs. Chinese bilinguals) and type of morphological awareness. Specifically, bilinguals' proficiency with the type of morphology that was less characteristic of their home language explained greater variance in their English literacy. These findings showcase the powerful effects of bilingualism on word reading processes in children who have similar reading proficiency but different language experiences, thereby advancing theoretical perspectives on literacy across diverse learners.

Key words: Morphological awareness, bilingual transfer, word reading, literacy development

Morphological awareness and its role in early word reading in English monolinguals, Spanish-English, and Chinese-English simultaneous bilinguals

1. Introduction

How does bilingual language experience influence the word reading process? Dual first language learners are exposed to both of their languages within the sensitive period of brain development, and have the opportunity to develop maximally language-specific neurocognitive pathways to support both of their languages (Weber-Fox & Neville, 1996). At the same time, two languages housed within a single cognitive system are known to interact (Chung, Chen, & Geva, 2019; Petitto, 2009). Here, we investigate the nature of this cross-linguistic interaction and its effect on word reading development through the lens of lexical morphology. Although all words are made of morphemes, the smallest units of meaning, there is substantial cross-linguistic variability in words' morphological structure and how it maps onto print. To uncover the mechanisms underlying bilingual transfer, we examine morphological awareness and its role in English literacy among young Spanish-English and Chinese-English dual first language learners. In the present study, we ask: How does bilingual experience with structurally distinct languages influence the morphological processes that support English word reading? We first address lingering questions around the role of morphology in early English word reading (Study 1) before turning to our core inquiry into bilingual transfer of morphology in the context of word reading development (Study 2).

1.1 Theories of Bilingual Transfer and Reading Development

Theories of bilingualism suggest that cross-linguistic transfer is most likely at points of similarity between a bilingual's two languages (Chung et al., 2019; Proctor, August, Snow, Barr, & Proctor, 2010). Some skills, such as phonological awareness, are thought to be relatively language general, and thus likely to transfer across languages (Marks, Satterfield & Kovelman, in press). Conversely, a child's knowledge of morphology -- or the underlying structure of words -- depends on their knowledge of the lexical units in a given language, and the rules that govern how these units can be combined (Zhang & Ke, 2020). Importantly, there is great variability across languages in words' morphemic structure and how it is reflected in print. Morphological transfer depends on a bilingual's language-specific knowledge as well as the similarity in linguistic

structure of their two languages. Morphology therefore provides a unique opportunity to examine the linguistic processes underlying bilingual transfer between structurally distinct languages.

Much of our knowledge of the effects of bilingualism on English literacy has been informed by studies of English language learners (ELLs), or children who have high proficiency in a heritage language and are beginning to acquire English through formal schooling. Nevertheless, bilingual theories suggest that transfer may vary as a function of a learner's proficiency (Chung et al., 2019), the linguistic structure of the specific language pairings, and points of similarity between the two (Proctor et al., 2010). This leaves a gap in our understanding of bilingual transfer among children who vary in points of structural similarity between their two languages and have a relatively high proficiency in those languages.

Dual first language learners, those exposed to two languages within the early sensitive periods of brain development for language function, are generally considered to have been afforded the opportunity to build maximally language-specific (or 'monolingual-like') linguistic and orthographic representations for each of their languages (Marks, Satterfield & Kovelman, in press). At the same time, a growing body of research predicts cross-linguistic interactions that make even the earliest bilingual learners distinct from their monolingual peers (Ip, Hsu, Arredondo, Tardif, & Kovelman, 2016). Here we explore the cognitive basis of cross-linguistic interactions in a sample of dual first language learners, specifically within the context of learning to read.

1.2 The Role of Morphology in Reading Across Languages

Morphological awareness plays a role in learning to read across languages and orthographies (Kuo & Anderson, 2006). However, as the process of learning to read varies across languages and learning contexts, the precise contributions of morphological awareness to reading development may vary. In particular, Psycholinguistic Grain Size Theory (Ziegler & Goswami, 2005) suggests that orthographies differ in the size of the linguistic unit that is key for reading success. This variation is due, in part, to cross-linguistic differences in how units of sound and meaning map onto letters, as well as the underlying morphological structure of a given language.

In the case of Spanish, individual sounds map consistently onto units of print. Furthermore, Spanish is rich with derivational morphology, in which affixes can be added to root morphemes (e.g., as in the word *person+al+ity*) to change tense, gender, aspect, and part of speech. The

phonological transparency of Spanish may allow children to use smaller grain sizes (individual phonemes) to access these morphemes early in reading acquisition (e.g., Manolitsis, Grigorakis, & Georgiou, 2017). Accessing larger morphemic units then aids children's recognition of long, polysyllabic words, and may even serve as a mechanism for children with reading difficulties (Portuguese: Oliveira, Levesque, Deacon, & da Mota, 2020; Italian: Suárez-Coalla & Cuetos, 2013). In contrast, the written characters in Chinese correspond to units of meaning (morphemes), rather than units of sound. Furthermore, over 90% of Chinese words are lexical compounds, as in *snow+man*. Logically, lexical knowledge, such as morphological awareness or vocabulary, are critical predictors of Chinese literacy (McBride-Chang et al., 2005). For instance, greater awareness of compound morphology in kindergarten is associated with better single word/character reading, and steeper growth trajectories in reading over time (Lin, Sun, & McBride, 2019).

English uses both derivational morphology and lexical compounding to form new words. This creates a point of contact at which morphological awareness could potentially transfer for both Spanish-English, and Chinese-English bilinguals. It is therefore possible that children's bilingual experiences may affect their sensitivity to specific morphemic structures, influencing the reading process in English. However, the role of morphology in early English reading remains somewhat less clear, due in part to the notoriously inconsistent sound-to-letter mappings. We must therefore address lingering questions around the role of morphology in early English literacy.

English word reading presents somewhat of a paradox, due to the inconsistency of sound-to-letter mapping. This is because English orthography is morpho-phonological; spellings in English are based on both units of sound and units of meaning (Carlisle & Addison, 2005). In some cases, one phoneme might be spelled multiple ways (such as the /k/ sound in *castle*, *kitten*, *locker*, and *echo*). In other cases, spelling might remain consistent across words to maintain the underlying morphemic structure, even when the phonology changes (e.g., *music-musician* or *heal-healthy*). As a result, English readers may need to rely on larger grain sizes, such as morpho-syllables, to successfully read words (Ziegler & Goswami, 2006). Yet at the same time, these larger grains may be difficult to access, given the phonological and orthographic complexity of the language. Theoretical models suggest that English readers only begin to recognize morphemic units in the consolidated alphabetic phase of development, after they have mastered sound-to-print correspondences and are able to decode words (Ehri, 1995, 2014). Yet, given that every word

consists of one or more morphemes, we might expect morphology to play a role in beginning, as well as more proficient, English word reading. We therefore begin by clarifying the role of morphological awareness in early English literacy, before turning to questions of bilingual transfer.

1.3 The Present Study

The present study asks: how does bilingual experience with distinct morphological structures, such as derivational morphology in Spanish, or lexical compounding in Chinese, influence the role of morphological awareness in English reading? To answer this bilingual question, we first addressed the lingering question on the relation between lexical morphology and word reading in English. We thus developed and validated a measure tapping into children's awareness of derivational and compound morphology with a large, linguistically diverse sample of children, ages 5-9. In Study 1, we tested the prediction that derivational and compound morphological awareness would be related to children's concurrent word reading skills in kindergarten through 3rd grade. In Study 2, we examined potential bilingual differences in the contribution of morphological awareness to English word reading between Spanish-English bilingual, Chinese-English bilingual, and monolingual English groups. We hypothesized that dual-language proficiency in Spanish or Chinese would have a contrasting, language-specific impact on children's general linguistic systems, thereby influencing the reading processes in English. Together, Study 1 and Study 2 shed light on the contribution of morphological awareness to early reading across linguistically diverse learners, and reveal language-specific transfer effects in Spanish-English and Chinese-English bilinguals.

2. Method

2.1 Participants and Procedure

Participants were recruited as part of two larger neuroimaging studies of bilingual reading development from a college town in the Midwestern United States and a large urban center on the West coast. We intentionally recruited monolingual and bilingual populations, targeting heritage language schools and bilingual community centers. According to parental reports, half of our sample spoke a language other than English at home (22% Spanish, 25% Chinese, 3% other). All children were also proficient English speakers with age-appropriate vocabulary knowledge, as

defined by standard scores above 80 on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (D. M. Dunn, 2018; L. M. Dunn & Dunn, 2007).

We collected data from a large, socio-linguistically diverse sample of $N = 396$ children, ages 5-9. All participating children were in grade 3 or below. To be included in data analysis, children were required to be proficient English speakers with at least elementary word reading ability (details below). This left a final sample of $N = 350$ children (190 boys, 160 girls; $M_{\text{age}} = 7.40$ years old, $SD = 1.06$). Participants were of varied racial and ethnic backgrounds: the sample was 35% White, 27% Asian, 20% Latinx, and 2% Black. 16% of children came from multiracial or multiethnic backgrounds. Children came from highly educated homes, with nearly 88% of mothers having a college degree or above. Demographic characteristics for all participants are presented in Supplementary Table 1.

This full sample of $N = 350$ children informed our research questions about English morphology development and English literacy more broadly (Study 1). To answer our specific questions about bilingual transfer from contrasting languages, we limited our inquiry to children who were dual first-language speakers of English, and either Spanish or Chinese (Study 2). We used the MatchIt package in R to identify subsamples of English monolinguals, Spanish-English bilinguals, and Chinese-English bilinguals with equivalent English vocabulary knowledge and word reading skill (Supplementary Table 1). This resulted in three matched groups of $N = 69$ each, leading to a sample of $N = 207$. More details about bilinguals' language exposure, and dual language proficiency will follow in Results 3.2.

2.2 Assessing Derivational and Compound Morphological Awareness

To answer our question about bilingual transfer, we needed to develop a morphology measure that targeted children's sensitivity to derived and compound morphemic structures. One well-established task relies on the decomposition model (Carlisle, 2000), in which children are asked to extract the base of a multimorphemic word to complete a sentence. For the present study, we developed a measure based on the Extract the Base task by Goodwin and colleagues (2012), which was extensively piloted and validated with a large group of linguistically diverse 3rd to 5th graders.

We modified this measure to ensure that it was well-suited to this research, first by making it more accessible to young children, and then by adding items that tapped into awareness of

compound morphology. To ensure that our measure was accessible to pre-readers as well as readers, the task was administered orally, with no visual or written component. The experimenter told each participant, “I will say a word, and then you will use *part* of that word to help me finish my sentence.” The experimenter then said a multimorphemic word, followed by an incomplete sentence (e.g., *Friendly. She is my best..._____*). Children were expected to complete the sentence using the root word (e.g., *friend*). Participants received feedback on this training item. No feedback was given on subsequent testing items, which were presented in a fixed order with increasing levels of difficulty. Testing was discontinued if the child made 10 consecutive errors.

We made a few notable changes to the specific items presented in the original Extract the Base task (Goodwin et al., 2012). First, we expanded the assessment to include compound morphology in addition to derivational morphology. We further redesigned existing task items to place all target words at the end of a simple sentence, thereby reducing working memory load, and replaced later-acquired, academic vocabulary with earlier-acquired words. For instance, instead of asking children to extract the base *fear* from *fearful*, or *dense* from *density*, children extracted *color* from *colorful* and *person* from *personality*. This change was intended to make the task more accessible to young children.

Our final Early Lexical Morphology Measure (ELMM) consisted of 40 items (15 compound, 25 derived). Five derivational items were identical to those in Goodwin’s (2012) measure. Six were modeled on items from Goodwin and colleagues (2012) but used a modified sentence prompt that was more accessible to young children. For instance, instead of the prompt, “*Combination*. Which chemicals should I ____?” our participants heard, “Which colors should the painter ____?” The final task also included 29 newly developed items, 15 of which assessed compound morphology (see Supplement). Fifteen items overall required a phonological shift (e.g., *discussion* – *discuss*).

Because of our focus on the role of compound and derivational awareness in young bilingual readers, the ELMM contains a subset of 13 compound and 13 derived items with base words acquired prior to age 6. The multimorphemic prompt words in this subset had a mean age of acquisition (Kuperman, Stadthagen-Gonzalez, & Brysbaert, 2012) of 5.60 ($SD = 1.50$), while the base words had a mean age of acquisition of 4.75 ($SD = 1.25$). Independent sample *t*-tests confirmed that there were no significant differences between root morphemes in derived versus compound items in terms of their age of acquisition ($t(24) = 1.62, p = .119$; Kuperman et al., 2012),

frequency in child-directed speech ($t(24) = -1.43, p = .165$; MacWhinney, 2000), nor frequency in adult speech ($t(24) = -1.07, p = .297$; Davies, 2008). We present data from these 26 matched, early acquired derivations and compounds when testing a priori hypotheses about bilingual transfer of derivational versus compound morphology.

We first validated this measure with a large, socio-linguistically diverse sample of 340 monolingual, bilingual, and multilingual speakers (see Results 3.1). We then compared morphological awareness, as well as the role of MA in English reading, in three matched groups of English monolinguals, Chinese-English bilinguals, and Spanish-English bilinguals, using standardized measures of English language and literacy.

2.3 Standardized Measures of Language and Literacy

Receptive vocabulary was assessed using the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT). Participants on the West coast were assessed using the PPVT-4 (L. M. Dunn & Dunn, 2007) as part of a larger, longitudinal study that began in 2015. Data collection at the Midwestern site began in 2019, using the updated PPVT-5 (D. M. Dunn, 2018). Of the $N = 396$ children tested, 17 bilingual and one monolingual participant were excluded due to low English vocabulary. This exclusion criterion allowed us to focus our analyses on the literacy mechanisms of readers who had achieved grade-appropriate English proficiency. In addition to the English receptive vocabulary measure, Spanish-English bilingual participants completed the Test de Vocabulario en Imágenes (L. M. Dunn, Padilla, Lugo, & Dunn, 1986), while Chinese-English bilingual participants completed the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test – Revised in Chinese (Lu & Liu, 1998).

Single word reading was assessed using the Letter-Word Identification subtest from the Woodcock Johnson IV Tests of Achievement (Schrack, Mather, & McGrew, 2014). The first test items require children to identify letters, and later items ask children to read single words of increasing complexity. Approximately 70% of the test items are monomorphemic words, while 30% are multimorphemic. In order to be eligible for the present study, children were required to have a raw score of 14 or above, indicating that they could successfully name letters and identify at least four high frequency words such as *dog* or *the*. Twenty-eight children (15 monolinguals, 13 bilinguals) were excluded due to low word reading ability, leaving a final sample of $N = 350$.

Reading comprehension was assessed using the Woodcock-Johnson Passage Comprehension subtest (Schrank et al., 2014). This task measured comprehension of connected text. For beginning readers, the Passage Comprehension task is heavily supplemented by pictures, while more advanced items require children to read a sentence or passage and fill in a missing word. As prior research has suggested that word reading and reading comprehension may be best understood as a single construct prior to grade 3 (Lonigan & Burgess, 2017), the present study only examines word reading as our dependent variable of interest. Nevertheless, we present correlations with reading comprehension as well, given the well-documented association between morphological awareness and reading comprehension in more advanced readers.

Phonological awareness was assessed using the Elision subtest of the Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing (CTOPP-2; Wagner, Torgesen, Rashotte, & Pearson, 2013). Children are asked to pronounce a word while removing a phonetic unit. Among the first nine items, seven asked children to extract a morpho-syllable from a compound word (e.g., “Say *toothbrush* without saying *tooth*”), and two asked children to extract a syllable that was not meaningful (e.g., “Say *spider* without saying *spy*”). Items then progressed to the level of single phonemes (e.g., “Say *winter* without saying /t/”). Scaled scores on this phonology measure have a mean of 10; scaled scores between 8-12 fall within the typical developmental range.

We also conducted an extensive battery of *heritage language assessments* including phonological, morphological, and word reading skills. For the present study, which targets group differences in English word reading specifically, we present only children’s Spanish or Chinese vocabulary (L. M. Dunn et al., 1986; Lu & Liu, 1998). Please see Sun et al. (2021) for extensive details about the bilingual language assessments, participants’ literacy skill in each language, and evidence of direct transfer from children’s heritage language to English.

3. Results

3.1 Study 1: Associations Between Morphology and Reading

Descriptive Analyses

All 350 eligible children, ages 5-9, participated in Study 1. Twenty percent of this sample was enrolled in junior kindergarten or kindergarten ($N = 70$, $M_{\text{age}} = 6.03$), 39% was in 1st grade ($N = 137$, $M_{\text{age}} = 7.05$), 27% was in 2nd grade ($N = 93$, $M_{\text{age}} = 8.17$), and 14% was in

3rd grade ($N = 50$, $M_{\text{age}} = 8.92$). The sample included monolingual English speakers and dual first-language learners who spoke a language other than English at home. The breakdown of children's home language background by grade is provided in Supplemental Table 2.

Participants had high-average English language and literacy skills, with mean standard scores ranging from 104 to 112. Table 1 provides descriptive statistics as well as the Pearson correlations between each measure. Both derivational and compound awareness were significantly associated with literacy outcomes, with correlation coefficients ranging from .52 - .71 (Table 1). The strongest relationship was between derivational morphological awareness and reading comprehension, $r(326) = .71$, $p < .001$. Fisher r -to- z transformations revealed no meaningful difference in the strength of association between derivations and compounds to word reading ($z = 1.48$, $p = .069$); however, derivational awareness was more strongly associated with reading comprehension ($z = 1.76$, $p = .040$).

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations Between Language and Literacy Measures

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Range	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Age	7.39	1.06	5-9	-						
2. Vocabulary ^a	112.75	15.66	85-160	.64	-					
3. Phonological awareness ^b	11.26	2.71	3-20	.43	.42	-				
4. Single word reading ^a	110.58	16.49	66-145	.61	.52	.70	-			
5. Reading comprehension ^a	105.23	13.55	64-140	.61	.50	.65	.87	-		
6. Total ELMM ($N = 40$)	24.79	9.40	0-39	.65	.66	.59	.69	.71	-	
7. Early-acquired derivations	9.08	3.51	0-13	.61	.60	.66	.63	.66	.93	-
8. Early-acquired compounds	9.37	3.10	0-13	.56	.51	.50	.59	.60	.89	.76

Note. ^a Standard score with population mean of 100, $SD = 15$. ^b Scaled score with population mean of 10 (typical range: 8-12). Correlations were conducted with raw scores. All correlations are significant at the $p < 0.001$ level (2-tailed).

Validity of the Early Lexical Morphology Measure

To examine the dimensionality and internal consistency of the ELMM, we ran two confirmatory factor analyses in lavaan v0.6-9 (Rosseel, 2012) using a weighted least square mean and variance adjusted (WLSMV) estimator. The goal of these analyses was to compare a two-factor model, in which derivations and compound items loaded onto separate constructs, as opposed to a one-factor model with a single underlying morphological awareness construct. We entered binary data for each of the 40 ELMM items: participants received a 1 for a correct response, and a 0 for an incorrect response or after testing had been discontinued. The two-factor model yielded an excellent fit for our data ($\chi^2(739, N = 346) = 671.79$, $p = .963$, RMSEA estimate = .03,

CFI = .94, TLI = .94, SRMR = .05), and had a significantly better fit than the one-factor model, $\chi^2_{diff}(1) = 11.83, p < .001$. This suggests that derivational and compound morphological awareness may be best understood as two related but distinct cognitive abilities. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was .93, indicating good internal consistency.

Morphological Awareness from Kindergarten to 3rd Grade

We found that the ELMM task was accessible to 5-year-old kindergarteners as intended, sensitive to developmental differences in children ages 5-9, and reliable across all grade levels (K: = .89, 1st: = .90, 2nd: = .91, 3rd: = .78). A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) confirmed significant differences in performance by grade ($F(3, 344) = 82.25, p < .001$). Planned t -tests revealed a significant increase in performance between junior kindergarten or kindergarten ($M = 13.50, SD = 7.22$) and 1st grade ($M = 24.72, SD = 7.93$), corresponding to the onset of literacy instruction; $t(205) = 9.93, p < .001, d = 1.49$. After the start of schooling, children showed a steady developmental increase in performance (see Figure 1, Supplemental Table 3). Additional t -tests also revealed significant differences in children's total raw score between 1st and 2nd grade ($t(226) = 3.77, p = .001, d = 0.52$), as well as between 2nd and 3rd ($t(139) = 3.13, p = .002, d = 0.56$). All t -tests survive Bonferroni correction for 3 comparisons ($\alpha = .017$).

Figure 1

Bar graph depicting performance on morphological awareness task at each grade level. Derivations and Compounds: $N = 13$ items each with matched, early acquired morphemes; Full ELMM: $N = 40$ items. Vertical bars indicate standard deviations.

We also conducted paired *t*-tests to examine age-related changes in performance on derivational affixes as compared to compound morphology (Figure 1). For this analysis, we used 13 derived and 13 compound items, matched on age of acquisition (Kuperman et al., 2012) and frequency (Davies, 2008; MacWhinney, 2000). This choice allowed us to examine developmental differences in morphological competence with early-acquired roots and affixes. Because prior research suggests children's awareness of English lexical compounding may emerge earlier than skill with derivations (Clark, 1993), we hypothesized that our younger participants would demonstrate higher accuracy on compound items. Indeed, children's accuracy on compound items in their first year of schooling ($M = 6.34$, $SD = 2.73$) was significantly better than their accuracy on derived items ($M = 4.84$, $SD = 3.06$; $t(69) = 5.69$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.51$). This significant difference in accuracy on compound vs. derivational items was not apparent in later grades (all $ps > .05$).

Associations Between Morphology and Word Reading

We hypothesized that compound and derivational morphological awareness would make independent contributions to children's word reading ability. We therefore conducted a hierarchical regression to the relation between morphology and single word reading in the full sample of $N = 350$ participants (see Table 2). At step 1, we entered children's age, maternal educational attainment, and bilingual status (0 = monolingual, 1 = bilingual) as control variables. At step 2, we entered vocabulary knowledge and phonological awareness, two well-established predictors of word reading. At step 3, we entered children's derivational awareness scores out of 25, and their compound awareness scores out of 15. Twenty-two participants had missing data for at least one of the included variables, leaving a test sample of $N = 328$. Results showed that both derivational ($\beta = .23$, $t = 3.61$, $p < .001$) and compound ($\beta = .11$, $t = 2.01$, $p = .045$) morphological awareness were significant unique predictors, accounting for an additional 3.9% of the variance in word reading ($F(2,321) = 19.08$, $p < .001$). After adding derivational and compound morphology to the model, vocabulary was no longer significant. In sum, ELMM effectively captured developmental differences in morphological awareness in children ages 5-9, and revealed robust relationships between derivational morphology, compound morphology, and word reading from kindergarten through grade 3.

Table 2
Hierarchical Regression Predicting Single Word Reading

	β	t	p	R	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1				.617	.375	
Constant		-4.65	<.001			
Age	.62	13.90	<.001			
Bilingual status	.15	3.16	.019			
Maternal education	.14	3.25	.003			
Step 2				.798	.635	.255
Constant		-6.04	<.001			
Age	.30	6.51	<.001			
Bilingual status	.16	4.46	<.001			
Maternal education	.05	1.41	.121			
Vocabulary	.16	3.41	<.001			
Phonological awareness	.51	13.41	<.001			
Step 3				.821	.675	.039
Constant		-3.36	.001			
Age	.19	4.17	<.001			
Bilingual status	.19	5.56	<.001			
Maternal education	.04	1.18	.192			
Vocabulary	.07	1.45	.211			
Phonological awareness	.41	10.29	<.001			
Derivational MA	.23	3.61	<.001			
Compound MA	.11	2.01	.045			

Note. MA = morphological awareness. Final model explains significant unique variance in single word reading, $F(7, 321) = 95.15$, $p < .001$.

We then conducted a post-hoc analysis to examine the contributions of morphological awareness to literacy in kindergarteners and 1st graders ($N = 207$), and in 2nd and 3rd graders ($N = 143$) separately. Hierarchical regressions revealed that morphology made a similar unique contribution to single word reading in the younger grades ($\Delta R^2 = .045$, $p < .001$) as in the older grades ($\Delta R^2 = .041$, $p = .001$). With reduced power in these two smaller samples, derivational awareness emerged as a significant unique predictor of word reading in both analyses (younger: $\beta = .24$, $t = 2.72$, $p = .007$; older: $\beta = .21$, $t = 2.33$, $p = .021$), while compound awareness did not. Full regression tables for these analyses can be found in the Supplement, demonstrating a similar association between morphological awareness in beginning as well as more advanced readers.

3.2 Study 2: Bilingual Transfer Effects on Morphological Awareness and English Reading

The goal of Study 2 was to examine bilingual transfer effects on speakers of two structurally distinct languages. We first limited our inquiry to children who were heritage speakers of Spanish or Chinese and had not been exposed to additional languages. Sixty-nine Spanish-

English bilinguals and 80 Chinese-English bilinguals met these criteria. These bilingual participants all had at least one parent or primary caregiver who was a native speaker of either Spanish or Chinese, and had been exposed to their heritage language since birth. Nearly 18% of these children attended language immersion public schools (8 Spanish-English immersion, and 16 Chinese-English immersion), while the remaining participants attended English-only general education programs. An additional 34% received some formal literacy instruction in their heritage language through extracurricular activities, such as a Saturday language school (18 Spanish, and 28 Chinese). An additional 27 Spanish-speaking parents and 2 Chinese-speaking parents reported that they were teaching their child to read at home in the absence of formal heritage language literacy instruction. All bilingual children were fluent in English, with mean vocabulary standard scores of 106.87 ($SD = 14.69$). Notably, bilinguals also had heritage language vocabulary within the typical range despite growing up in English-dominant communities in the United States (Spanish $M = 108.60$, $SD = 16.20$; Chinese $M = 95.90$, $SD = 17.39$). Bilinguals thus had relatively high and balanced dual-language proficiency.

We then identified a subsample of English monolinguals with similar English language and literacy skill to our bilingual participants, and no sustained exposure to other languages. To disentangle possible effects due to language background versus differences in English vocabulary knowledge or reading skill (Hammer et al., 2014), we used the MatchIt package in R (Ho, Imai, King, & Stuart, 2011) to create three groups of English monolinguals, Spanish-English bilinguals, and Chinese-English bilinguals with similar covariate distributions of their English vocabulary and English word reading ability. The English monolingual and Chinese-English bilingual groups each had 69 participants, matched to the 69 eligible Spanish-English bilinguals, resulting in a total sample of $N = 207$.

Using these matched groups, we examined bilingual transfer in two ways. First, we compared differences in bilingual children's awareness of English morphological structures that were shared across their two languages (e.g., derivations for Spanish-English bilinguals, and compounds for Chinese-English bilinguals) versus those that were dissimilar. Second, we examined how cross-linguistic experiences with typologically distinct morphologies might influence the relations between English morphological awareness and English literacy.

Descriptive Analyses

Table 3 provides descriptive statistics of raw achievement scores across the three groups, and Table 4 provides the intercorrelations between language and literacy variables for each language group. To confirm that our three groups were well-matched, we conducted a one-way ANOVA which revealed no significant group differences in English vocabulary, phonological awareness, word reading, or morphological awareness. There were significant differences between the groups in age ($F(2, 204) = 5.27, p = .006$) and maternal education ($F(2, 195) = 6.02, p = .003$). Nevertheless, these subsamples of English monolinguals, Spanish-English bilinguals, and Chinese-English bilinguals performed equivalently on all measures of raw English language and literacy skill.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA Testing for Differences in English Language and Literacy Raw Scores Across Language Groups

	English monolinguals		Spanish-English bilinguals		Chinese-English bilinguals		<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Age	7.38	1.05	7.64	1.03	7.04	1.19	5.27	.006 **
Maternal education ^a	9.04	1.67	8.21	2.26	9.39	2.03	6.02	.003 **
English vocabulary	147.16	17.64	142.30	21.33	139.74	25.29	2.19	.114
Phonological awareness	22.88	6.51	22.71	7.72	22.32	6.86	0.11	.893
Derivational morphology	9.72	3.21	8.35	3.65	8.51	3.77	3.10	.047 *
Compound morphology	9.78	2.90	9.25	2.98	8.81	3.40	1.70	.185
Word reading	46.51	13.56	47.43	14.11	47.52	13.85	0.11	.892
Reading comprehension	25.79	7.61	24.08	7.25	25.67	7.21	1.13	.326
Spanish/Chinese vocabulary standard score	-	-	108.60	16.20	95.90	17.39	2.89	.091

Note. ^a Educational attainment scale: 8 = Completed bachelor's degree; 9 = Some graduate school; 10 = Completed master's degree. English language and literacy skills are all presented as raw scores for comparison across groups of slightly different ages.

Of note, however, are the different associations between language and literacy variables across language groups (Table 4). For instance, phonological awareness and word reading were more strongly correlated among Spanish-English bilinguals than the monolinguals ($z = 2.15, p = .016$), although there was no difference from the Chinese bilinguals ($z = 1.10, p = .136$). On the other hand, vocabulary and word reading were more weakly correlated among Spanish-English bilinguals than the other two groups ($z = 1.65, p = .050$). Also noteworthy are the correlations between the bilingual participants' heritage language vocabulary and their English literacy skills.

While Spanish vocabulary was significantly correlated with all English measures, Chinese vocabulary was only significantly associated with English compound awareness. The higher correlations between Spanish vocabulary and English measures likely reflects the closer relation between these two languages, and more frequent points of linguistic contact to facilitate transfer. In contrast, the correlations with Chinese vocabulary reflect a different transfer effect. Chinese vocabulary is more highly correlated with English skills associated with lexical or semantic knowledge (English vocabulary, reading comprehension, and compound morphological awareness). In contrast, word reading and derivational morphology have weaker associations, as these skills are not as easily transferable between English and Chinese.

Table 4*Intercorrelations Between Literacy Variables by Language Group*

	1	2	3	4	5	6
English monolinguals (<i>N</i> = 69)						
1. English vocabulary	-					
2. Phonological awareness	.50***	-				
3. Single word reading	.74***	.62***	-			
4. Reading comprehension	.71***	.71***	.91***	-		
5. Derivational morphology	.63***	.67***	.79***	.79***	-	
6. Compound morphology	.59***	.52***	.66***	.65***	.71***	-
Spanish-English bilinguals (<i>N</i> = 69)						
1. English vocabulary	-					
2. Phonological awareness	.47***	-				
3. Single word reading	.58***	.80***	-			
4. Reading comprehension	.72***	.67***	.85***	-		
5. Derivational morphology	.64***	.55***	.61***	.67***	-	
6. Compound morphology	.57***	.63***	.70***	.68***	.74***	-
7. Spanish vocabulary	.59***	.28**	.46***	.53***	.35**	.41**
Chinese-English bilinguals (<i>N</i> = 69)						
1. English vocabulary	-					
2. Phonological awareness	.51***	-				
3. Single word reading	.74***	.73***	-			
4. Reading comprehension	.72***	.63***	.86***	-		
5. Derivational morphology	.74***	.58***	.81***	.79***	-	
6. Compound morphology	.53***	.45***	.60***	.58***	.74***	-
7. Chinese vocabulary	.23 [†]	.18	.14	.22 [†]	.16	.26*

Note. [†] $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Performance on Derived vs. Compound Morphology

The first aim of Study 2 was to examine how children's bilingual experiences with distinct morphological structures might influence their morphological awareness in English. Guided by

theories of bilingual transfer, we compared Spanish-English and Chinese-English bilinguals' performance on derivational vs. compound items of the ELMM. This analysis specifically considered the subset of 26 early acquired items, which included 13 derived and 13 compound items with similar frequency and age of acquisition. We hypothesized that bilingualism would alter a child's general linguistic system, lexicon, and sensitivity to certain grain sizes, thereby influencing the reading process in English. Specifically, we predicted that Spanish-English bilingual children would show advantages in English derivational morphology, while Chinese-English bilingual children would show advantages in English compound morphology. However, independent sample *t*-tests revealed no differences between bilingual groups in terms of their accuracy on the matched subset of derived items (M Spanish = 8.35, M Chinese = 8.51, $t(136) = -0.25$, $p = .801$) or compound items (M Spanish = 9.25, M Chinese = 8.81, $t(136) = 0.80$, $p = .425$). Although both bilingual groups had significantly lower performance on derivational morphology than the monolingual group, they were not significantly different from one another (Figure 2). In other words, children's awareness of compound and derivational morphology did not vary as a function of their specific bilingual experiences with derivationally-rich Spanish or compound-rich Chinese.

Figure 2

Bar graph comparing English monolinguals, Spanish-English bilinguals, and Chinese-English bilinguals on their accuracy with early-acquired derived and compound ELMM items. Language groups have matched English vocabulary knowledge and word reading ability. Vertical bars indicate standard deviations.

Associations Between Derivational Awareness, Compound Awareness and English Literacy

The second aim of Study 2 was to examine possible bilingual differences in the relation between English morphological awareness and English literacy. Might bilingual experience with structurally distinct languages influence the roles of derivational and compound morphological awareness in English reading? We hypothesized that compound and derivational morphological awareness would differentially contribute to children's English reading as a function of their bilingual language backgrounds.

In parallel to Study 1, we conducted a multiple regression analysis to predict variance in English single word reading (Table 5). This model included language group (LG) as a factor with three levels (English monolingual, Spanish-English bilingual or Chinese-English bilingual), children's ELMM score on derivations, and their score on compounds. Age, maternal education, and English vocabulary were included as covariates. All predictors were *z*-scored, and interaction terms were computed using the language group factor and the *z*-scored Derivations and Compounds variables.

Regression results are presented in Table 5, using both Spanish- and Chinese-English bilinguals as a reference group for clarity. We found that age, maternal education, and English vocabulary were all significant predictors of word reading. There was a significant effect of language group, in which both Spanish bilinguals ($b = 0.25, t = 2.37, p = .019$) and Chinese bilinguals ($b = 0.38, t = 3.77, p < .001$) differed significantly from the English monolinguals, but not from one another. Furthermore, findings revealed significant main effects of derivational awareness and compound awareness, as well as significant interactions between language group and derivational vs. compound morphology.

To decompose the significant interactions between language group and derivational vs. compound morphology (Figure 3), we examined the simple slopes of the morphological awareness variables across the bilingual groups. For Spanish-English bilinguals, compound awareness was significantly associated with English word reading ($b = .48, t = 4.14, p < .001$), while derivational morphological awareness was not ($b = -.01, t = -0.10, p = .918$). In contrast, for Chinese-English bilinguals, derivational morphological awareness was significantly associated with word reading ($b = .37, t = 3.24, p = .001$) while compound awareness was not ($b = .07, t = 0.71, p = .481$). In other words, only compound morphology explained unique variance in Spanish-English bilinguals' word reading, while only derivational morphology explained unique variance in

Chinese-English bilinguals' word reading. The roles of derivational and compound morphology in monolingual English readers were similar to the Chinese-English bilinguals. English monolinguals had the steepest slope for derivational awareness ($b = .54$, $t = 4.69$, $p < .001$), although it was not significantly different from the Chinese-English bilinguals, while compound awareness was not significant ($b = .10$, $t = 0.90$, $p = .369$).

Table 5*Regression Predicting Word Reading from Morphology X Language Group Interaction*

Reference group: Spanish bilinguals					Reference group: Chinese bilinguals				
	β	t	p			β	t	p	
Constant	-1.75	-3.85	<.001	***	Constant	-1.62	-3.76	<.001	***
Age	0.24	4.05	<.001	***	Age	0.24	4.05	<.001	***
Maternal education	0.13	2.87	.005	**	Maternal education	0.13	2.87	.005	**
Vocabulary	0.19	2.86	.005	**	Vocabulary	0.19	2.86	.005	**
LG: Chinese	0.13	1.22	.224		LG: Spanish	-0.24	-1.22	.224	
LG: English	-0.25	-2.57	.019	*	LG: English	-0.38	-3.77	<.001	***
Derivations	-0.01	-0.10	.918		Derivations	0.37	3.24	.001	***
Compounds	0.48	4.14	<.001	***	Compounds	0.07	0.71	.481	
Chinese * Derivations	0.39	2.55	.011	*	Spanish * Derivations	-0.39	-2.55	.011	*
English * Derivations	0.55	3.53	.001	***	English * Derivations	0.17	1.08	.282	
Chinese * Compounds	-0.42	-2.70	.008	**	Spanish * Compounds	0.42	2.70	.008	**
English * Compounds	-0.39	-2.47	.014	*	English * Compounds	0.03	0.20	.846	

Note. LG = Language Group. $F(11, 191) = 38.27$, $p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.67$.

Figure 3

Line graph of interaction between language group (Spanish-English bilingual, Chinese-English bilingual, and English monolingual) and morphological awareness for each item type (derivational and compound morphology).

4. Discussion

The overarching goal of this inquiry was to examine the effects of early dual language experience on English morphological awareness and its relation to word reading in developing readers, ages 5-9. First, we observed a robust contribution of derivational and compound morphological awareness to word reading across a large, linguistically diverse sample. This observation was afforded by the novel experimenter-developed tool, the Early Lexical Morphology Measure (ELMM), which helped shed new light on the role of morphological awareness in phonologically-opaque languages such as English. Next, the findings revealed principled cross-linguistic influences of bilingualism on the relationship between children's morphological awareness and learning to read: bilinguals' proficiency with the type of morphology that was *less* characteristic of their home language explained greater variance in their English literacy.

The present findings showcase the powerful effects of dual language experience on literacy development, even in populations of bilinguals who have relatively high levels of proficiency in both of their languages. On the surface, two groups have similar levels of English reading skill. Yet our findings reveal underlying mechanistic differences in children's word processing related to their heritage language backgrounds. We therefore advance theoretical perspectives on literacy in monolingual and bilingual learners by clarifying the association between morphological awareness and early English literacy skill, as well as the cross-linguistic bilingual effects on this association.

4.1 Assessing Derived and Compound Morphological Awareness

Leveraging the body of knowledge on morphology development, we modified an existing measure to be maximally sensitive to children's emerging derivational and compound morphological awareness between kindergarten and 3rd grade. Our Early Lexical Morphology Measure was built upon the well-established Decomposition (Carlisle, 2000) or Extract the Base (Goodwin et al., 2012) task model (e.g., *Playful. Let's go outside and ___ [play]*). To ensure accessibility for our youngest participants, we modified morphemic, sentential, and lexical features of the task. Most notably, we included lexical compounding, an early-emerging component of English morphological awareness. We additionally modified derivational items from the Extract the Base measure (Goodwin et al., 2012) so that all items were based on child-friendly root words

(e.g., *noise*, *color* as opposed to *reduce*, *proceed*), and embedded these words at the end of short sentences to reduce working memory load. ELMM performance meaningfully captured variability in morphological competence across a wide age range: there was no floor effect in 5-year-old kindergarteners, and no ceiling effect in 9-year-old 3rd graders. To our knowledge, this is the first measure of lexical morphology appropriate across this age range. This represents an important methodological advancement in the field, as it captures the critical transition from “learning to read” to “reading to learn” in elementary school.

ELMM not only captured a steady increase in morphological awareness from kindergarten through 3rd grade; it also revealed developmental differences in children’s faculty with compound versus derivational morphology more specifically. In the first year of schooling, children were significantly better at extracting root morphemes from compound words (e.g., *rain* from *rainbow*), than from derived words (e.g., *quick* from *quickly*). This finding is closely aligned with recent work suggesting that young German readers are sensitive to compound lexical structure earlier than derivational prefixes or suffixes (Hasenäcker, Schröter, & Schroeder, 2017). By 1st grade, children in our study were able to extract root morphemes from derived and compound words equally well, and with evidence of further improvement in 2nd and 3rd grade. This dramatic change in derivational morphological awareness between kindergarten and 1st grade may be related to the documented association between derivational vocabulary knowledge and schooling experience (Anglin, 1993). This finding enhances our understanding of the developmental trajectory of morphological knowledge or awareness, and reinforces the value of assessing compound morphology at the onset of schooling. By using early-acquired root words, a broad range of morphological constructions, and compound morphology in addition to derivations, we gain a clearer picture of children’s morphological awareness and the nature of its contribution to early reading development.

4.2 Clarifying the Role of Morphology in Early English Reading

Although prior work has revealed an increasingly robust association between morphological awareness and word reading throughout elementary and middle school (Carlisle & Kearns, 2017; Roman, Kirby, Parrila, Wade-Woolley, & Deacon, 2009), the role of morphology in early English word reading has not been entirely clear. Among younger children, in kindergarten through 2nd grade, associations between morphological awareness and early English word reading

have been relatively inconsistent (Apel, Diehm, & Apel, 2013; Kruk & Bergman, 2013; Law & Ghesquière, 2017; Wolter, Wood, & D'zatko, 2009). For instance, using different tasks of morphological awareness, both Apel and colleagues (2013) and Law and Ghesquiere (2017) found that morphology was associated with concurrent word reading in kindergarten and 2nd grade, but not 1st grade.

The present study clarifies the associations between morphology and concurrent English literacy during this less certain developmental period, from the first year of formal schooling through grade 3. Both compound and derivational morphological awareness explained significant unique variance in children's word reading, above and beyond phonological awareness, vocabulary, and demographic variables. Importantly, this finding was consistent across grades and levels of reading ability. When we split our sample by grade, the ELMM task explained an additional 4.5% unique variance in word reading for children in kindergarten and 1st grade, as compared to 4.1% unique variance for the older 2nd-3rd graders. These findings reveal a robust contribution of morphology to early English word reading at the onset of schooling as well as in slightly more advanced readers. Our results also extend prior work that identified an existing but less consistent association between morphology and early literacy skill (Apel et al., 2013; Law & Ghesquière, 2017).

This result is closely aligned with both the Reading Systems Framework (Perfetti & Stafura, 2014) as well as Psycholinguistic Grain Size Theory (Ziegler & Goswami, 2005). First, the Reading Systems Framework posits that as morphology is integral to each word, it should play an important role in single word identification. Second, Psycholinguistic Grain Size Theory suggests that due to the opacity of English orthography and inconsistent sound-to-print mapping, English readers may need to rely on a larger grain size (e.g., morphemes rather than single phonemes) to identify words. We find strong evidence in support of these theoretical perspectives, revealing that morphological awareness contributes to single word reading, including in kindergarten and 1st grade beginning readers.

4.3 Morphology and English Word Reading in Spanish-English and Chinese-English Bilinguals

Performance on Derivational Versus Compound Morphology

We predicted that bilingual experiences with derivationally rich Spanish would enhance Spanish-English bilinguals' performance with English derivations (e.g., extracting *argue* from *argument*), compared to Chinese-English bilinguals (Ramírez, Chen, Geva, & Luo, 2011). Conversely, we predicted that experience with the compound structure of Chinese would enhance children's performance with English compounding (e.g., extracting *walk* from *sidewalk*). Interestingly, independent sample *t*-tests revealed no differences between Spanish-English and Chinese-English bilinguals' accuracy on derived or compound items. This null finding is likely the result of our experimental approach and participant groups. Prior research has revealed differences in compound versus derivational morphology in Spanish- and Chinese-speakers who were learning English (Ramírez et al., 2011); in contrast, our participants had high dual-language proficiency, including age-appropriate English vocabulary and literacy scores. Differences in English morphology may therefore exist between bilingual groups with lower English proficiency levels, but these were not observed in our high proficiency speakers.

Bilingual Effects on English Word Reading

We further predicted that bilingual experience may have a differential effect on how compound and derivational morphological awareness contribute to English reading for Spanish-English and Chinese-English bilingual learners. Specifically, we expected that Spanish-English bilinguals would show a stronger relation between derivational morphology and word reading, while Chinese-English bilinguals would demonstrate a stronger relation between compound morphology and word reading. Indeed, multiple regression revealed significant interactions between morphological item type (derivations vs. compounds) and language group (monolingual vs. Spanish-English bilingual vs. Chinese-English bilingual), supporting our overarching hypothesis that experience with structurally distinct languages would alter the relation between morphology and English word reading. Yet the direction of these bilingual effects was contrary to our prediction. Awareness of compound morphology explained significant variance in Spanish-English bilinguals' word reading, while derivational awareness did not. Conversely, awareness of derivational morphology explained significant variance in Chinese-English bilinguals' word

reading, while compound awareness did not. In other words, differences in English word reading skill among bilingual children was best explained by variation in the type of morphology that was dissimilar or *less* characteristic of a child's home language.

These findings are consistent with a usage-based hypothesis of language acquisition. The usage-based framework suggests that successful language learning requires that a learner has encountered sufficient examples of a specific linguistic form to be able to make broader generalizations (Ellis, 2002). While a beginning learner may rely heavily on aspects of a new language that can be transferred from their L1, a more advanced learner requires explicit instruction in the unique aspects of the second language that cannot be transferred. It is experience with less frequent structures – for instance, the structures that are unique to a single language and not shared across a bilingual's two languages – that are necessary to drive additional growth. For the highly proficient bilinguals in our present study, variance in English reading depends on children's proficiency with the features of English that cannot be gleaned from their home language.

In sum, our findings reveal linguistically principled bilingual effects on word reading in high proficiency bilinguals, and suggest that greater familiarity with linguistic features that are dissimilar across the children's two languages may bolster reading success. These findings both support and extend theories of bilingual language transfer (Chung et al., 2019). For bilingual children who are still acquiring their language of schooling (e.g., Ramírez et al., 2011), their established proficiency in L1 likely contributes to and scaffolds their emerging proficiency in L2. For bilinguals with advanced levels of dual language proficiency, additional gains are likely driven by greater attention to those elements of language that are maximally dissimilar across languages. The observed bilingual differences are thus consistent with the idea that bilinguals' two languages interact to influence literacy (Interdependence Continuum; Proctor et al., 2010), and will manifest continuously throughout development but differently at varying stages of reading proficiency, both as a function of dual language proficiency and cross-linguistic experiences (Interactive Transfer Framework; Chung et al., 2019).

4.4 Broader Implications and Future Directions

The present study demonstrates that linguistically diverse children may follow different paths to literacy success. In particular, bilingual children's path to successful literacy may vary as

a function of their specific home language. In support of this idea, we found different associations between children's English language and literacy skills across our three language groups. For instance, phonological awareness and word reading were more strongly correlated among Spanish-English bilinguals, while vocabulary and word reading were more strongly correlated among Chinese-English bilinguals. These findings extend prior work demonstrating greater reliance on sound-based processes for Spanish bilinguals (Kremin, Arredondo, Hsu, Satterfield, & Kovelman, 2016), as compared to greater reliance on meaning-based processes for Chinese bilinguals (Hsu, Ip, Arredondo, Tardif, & Kovelman, 2016). Our findings also beg the question: what other heritage language competencies are bilingual children bringing into the classroom to support their reading development? This is a critical area for continued study, as a growing body of research demonstrates that bilingual children's home language knowledge is a resource that benefits learning (Durgunoğlu, Segers, & Broek, 2017).

At an applied level, our findings add to the growing body of literature demonstrating the importance of morphological awareness for learning to read, and reinforce the idea that explicit morphological instruction may benefit young learners. Indeed, short morphological interventions have been linked with improved long-term reading outcomes (Lyster, Lervåg, & Hulme, 2016), and a meta-analysis suggests that morphological instruction may have the greatest impact for young learners (Goodwin & Ahn, 2013). The present study provides some preliminary insight into how this morphological instruction might be individualized across diverse learners. Our findings may help inform instruction by suggesting that proficient or balanced bilingual children may benefit from learning activities that bolster their sensitivity to less familiar English structures.

This manuscript has several caveats. Although our sample is ethnically, linguistically and geographically diverse, participants come from families of predominantly middle-to-high socioeconomic and education status. On one hand, this is a particularly important limitation given that bilingual learners in the United States often grow up in homes with a lower socioeconomic status, which has a well-documented impact on language development (Hoff et al., 2012). Indeed, both monolingual and bilingual participants in our sample have above-average English vocabulary knowledge, which may limit generalizability. On the other hand, this unique sample may serve to dissociate bilingual experiences from the confound of SES, providing insight into cross-linguistic influences on literacy. Our study also lacks an explicit measure of multimorphemic word reading. Although a major advantage of the current reading measures is their standardization, future

research may benefit from careful consideration of multimorphemic word or pseudoword reading tasks (e.g. Hasenaäcker et al., 2017).

This manuscript offers both theoretical and practical implications for understanding the role of morphology in reading development. First, our findings extend current theoretical perspectives on English reading acquisition by demonstrating that children's morphological awareness contributes to their literacy achievement as early as age 5. Furthermore, we reveal principled bilingual transfer effects on the association between children's morphological awareness and their word reading skill, advancing our understanding of bilingual literacy among children with early and systematic dual language exposure. Remarkably, our findings reveal mechanistic differences in the contribution of morphology to word reading, even among a sample of Spanish-English and Chinese-English bilingual children with equivalent and highly proficient English skill. These findings reinforce the notion that, even in the case of dual-first language learners in a monolingual schooling context, the bilingual mind cannot be understood as the sum of two monolinguals (Grosjean, 1989).

References

- Anglin, J. M. (1993). Vocabulary development: A morphological analysis. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 58(10), i–186. <https://doi.org/https://doi-org.proxy.lib.umich.edu/10.2307/1166112>
- Apel, K., Diehm, E., & Apel, L. (2013). Using multiple measures of morphological awareness to assess its relation to reading. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 33(1), 42–56. <https://doi.org/10.1097/TLD.0b013e318280f57b>
- Carlisle, J. F. (2000). Awareness of the structure and meaning of morphologically complex words: Impact on reading. *Reading and Writing*, 12(3), 169–190. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A>
- Carlisle, J. F., & Addison, S. C. (2005). Exploring the role of morphemes in word reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 40(4), 428–449. <https://doi.org/10.1598/rrq.40.4.3>
- Carlisle, J. F., & Kearns, D. M. (2017). Learning to read morphologically complex words. In R. K. Parrila, K. Cain, & D. L. Compton (Eds.), *Theories of Reading Development* (pp. 191–214). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/swll.15.11car>
- Chung, S. C., Chen, X., & Geva, E. (2019). Deconstructing and reconstructing cross-language transfer in bilingual reading development: An interactive framework. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 50, 149–161. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2018.01.003>
- Clark, E. V. (1993). *The Lexicon in Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511554377>
- Davies, M. (2008). *The corpus of contemporary American English (COCA): 400+ million words, 1990-present*. Retrieved from <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>
- Dunn, D. M. (2018). *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Fifth Edition (PPVT-5)*. Pearson Assessments.
- Dunn, L. M., & Dunn, D. M. (2007). *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Fourth Edition (PPVT-4)*. Pearson Assessments.
- Dunn, L. M., Padilla, E. R., Lugo, D. E., & Dunn, L. M. (1986). *Test de Vocabulario en Imágenes Peabody (TVIP)*. Circle Pines, MN: AGS Publishing.
- Durgunoğlu, A. Y., Segers, E., & Broek, P. V. D. (2017). An updated review of cross-language transfer and its educational implications. In E. Segers & P. V. D. Broek (Eds.), *Developmental perspectives in written language and literacy: In honor of Ludo Verhoeven* (pp. 167–182). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Ehri, L. C. (1995). Phases of development in learning to read words by sight. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 18(2), 116–125. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9817.1995.tb00077.x>
- Ehri, L. C. (2014). Orthographic mapping in the acquisition of sight word reading, spelling memory, and vocabulary learning. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 18(1), 5–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2013.819356>
- Ellis, N. C. (2002). Frequency effects in language processing: A review with implications for theories of implicit and explicit language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24(2), 143–188. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263102002024>
- Goodwin, A. P., & Ahn, S. (2013). A meta-analysis of morphological interventions in English: Effects on literacy outcomes for school-age children. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 17(4), 257–285. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2012.689791>
- Goodwin, A. P., Huggins, A. C., Carlo, M., Malabonga, V., Kenyon, D., Louguit, M., & August, D. (2012). Development and validation of Extract the Base: An English derivational morphology test for third through fifth grade monolingual students and Spanish-speaking English language learners. *Language Testing*, 29(2), 265–289. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532211419827>
- Grosjean, F. (1989). Neurolinguists, beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person. *Brain and Language*, 36(1), 3–15. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X\(89\)90048-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X(89)90048-5)
- Hammer, C. S., Hoff, E., Uchikoshi, Y., Gillanders, C., Castro, D. C., & Sandilos, L. E. (2014). The language and literacy development of young dual language learners: A critical review. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 29(4), 715–733. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2014.05.008>
- Hasenäcker, J., Schröter, P., & Schroeder, S. (2017). Investigating developmental trajectories of morphemes as reading units in German. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning Memory and Cognition*, 43(7), 1093–1108. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xlm0000353>
- Ho, D. E., Imai, K., King, G., & Stuart, E. A. (2011). MatchIt: Nonparametric preprocessing for parametric causal influence. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 42(8).
- Hoff, E., Core, C., Place, S., Rumiche, R., Señor, M., & Parra, M. (2012). Dual language exposure and early bilingual development. *Journal of Child Language*, 39(1), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000910000759>
- Hsu, L. S.-J., Ip, K. I., Arredondo, M. M., Tardif, T., & Kovelman, I. (2016). 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*, 1–17.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1246515>
- Ip, K. I., Hsu, L. S.-J., Arredondo, M. M., Tardif, T., & Kovelman, I. (2016). Brain bases of morphological processing in Chinese-English bilingual children. *Developmental Science*.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12449>
- Kremin, L. V., Arredondo, M. M., Hsu, L. S. J., Satterfield, T., & Kovelman, I. (2016). The effects of Spanish heritage language literacy on English reading for Spanish-English bilingual children in the US. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 5, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1239692>
- Kruk, R. S., & Bergman, K. (2013). The reciprocal relations between morphological processes and reading. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 114(1), 10–34.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2012.09.014>
- Kuo, L. J., & Anderson, R. C. (2006). Morphological awareness and learning to read: A cross-language perspective. *Educational Psychologist*, 41(3), 161–180.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep4103_3
- Kuperman, V., Stadthagen-Gonzalez, H., & Brysbaert, M. (2012). Age-of-acquisition ratings for 30,000 English words. *Behavioral Research Methods*, 44(4), 978–990.
<https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-012-0210-4>
- Law, J. M., & Ghesquière, P. (2017). Early development and predictors of morphological awareness: Disentangling the impact of decoding skills and phonological awareness. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 67, 47–59.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2017.05.003>
- Lin, D., Sun, H., & McBride, C. (2019). Morphological awareness predicts the growth rate of Chinese character reading. *Developmental Science*, 22(4), 1–12.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12793>
- Lonigan, C. J., & Burgess, S. R. (2017). Dimensionality of reading skills with elementary-school-age children. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 21(3), 239–253.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2017.1285918>
- Lu, L., & Liu, H. S. (1998). *The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised in Chinese*. Taipei,

Taiwan: Psychological Publishing.

- Lyster, S. A. H., Lervåg, A. O., & Hulme, C. (2016). Preschool morphological training produces long-term improvements in reading comprehension. *Reading and Writing*, 29(6), 1269–1288. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-016-9636-x>
- MacWhinney, B. (2000). *The CHILDES project: Tools for analyzing talk. 3rd edition*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Manolitsis, G., Grigorakis, I., & Georgiou, G. K. (2017). The longitudinal contribution of early morphological awareness skills to reading fluency and comprehension in Greek. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8(OCT), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01793>
- Marks, R. A., Satterfield, T., & Kovelman, I. (In press). Integrated multilingualism as revealed through bilingual reading development. In J. MacSwan (Ed.), *Language(s): Multilingualism and Its Consequences*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- McBride-Chang, C., Cho, J. R., Liu, H., Wagner, R. K., Shu, H., Zhou, A., ... Muse, A. (2005). Changing models across cultures: Associations of phonological awareness and morphological structure awareness with vocabulary and word recognition in second graders from Beijing, Hong Kong, Korea, and the United States. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 92(2), 140–160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2005.03.009>
- Oliveira, M., Levesque, K. C., Deacon, S. H., & da Mota, M. M. P. E. (2020). Evaluating models of how morphological awareness connects to reading comprehension: A study in Portuguese. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 43(2), 161–179. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.12296>
- Perfetti, C., & Stafura, J. (2014). Word knowledge in a theory of reading comprehension. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 18(1), 22–37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2013.827687>
- Petitto, L.-A. (2009). New discoveries from the bilingual brain and mind across the life span: Implications for education. *Mind, Brain, and Education*, 3(4), 185–197. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1751-228X.2009.01069.x>
- Proctor, C. P., August, D., Snow, C., Barr, C. D., & Proctor, P. (2010). The Interdependence Continuum: A Perspective on the Nature of Spanish-English Bilingual Reading Comprehension. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 33(1), 5–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235881003733209>
- Ramírez, G., Chen, X., Geva, E., & Luo, Y. (2011). Morphological awareness and word reading

- in English language learners: Evidence from Spanish- and Chinese-speaking children. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 32(3), 601–618. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716411000233>
- Roman, A. A., Kirby, J. R., Parrila, R. K., Wade-Woolley, L., & Deacon, S. H. (2009). Toward a comprehensive view of the skills involved in word reading in Grades 4, 6, and 8. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 102(1), 96–113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2008.01.004>
- Rosseel, Y. (2012). lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48(2), 1–36.
- Schrank, F. A., Mather, N., & McGrew, K. S. (2014). *Woodcock-Johnson IV Tests of Achievement*. Rolling Meadows, IL: Riverside.
- Suárez-Coalla, P., & Cuetos, F. (2013). The role of morphology in reading in Spanish-speaking children with dyslexia. *Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 16(51), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1017/sjp.2013.58>
- Sun, X., Zhang, K., Marks, R. A., Nickerson, N., Eggleston, R. L., Yu, C.-L., Chou, T.-L., Tardif, T., & Kovelman, I. (2021). What's in a word? Cross-linguistic influences on Spanish-English and Chinese-English bilingual children's word reading. *Child Development*, 00, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13666>
- Wagner, R. K., Torgesen, J. K., Rashotte, C. A., & Pearson, N. A. (2013). *CTOPP-2: Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing*. Pro-ed.
- Weber-Fox, C. M., & Neville, H. J. (1996). Maturational constraints on functional specializations for language processing - ERP and behavioral evidence in bilingual speakers. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 8(3), 231–256. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.1996.8.3.231>
- Wolter, J. A., Wood, A., & D'zatko, K. W. (2009). The influence of morphological awareness on the literacy development of first-grade children. *Language, Speech and Hearing Services in Schools*, 40, 286–298.
- Zhang, D., & Ke, S. (2020). The simple view of reading made complex by morphological decoding fluency in bilingual fourth-grade readers of English. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(2), 311–329. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.287>
- Ziegler, J. C., & Goswami, U. (2005). Reading acquisition, developmental dyslexia, and skilled reading across languages: a psycholinguistic grain size theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131(1), 3–29. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.131.1.3>

Ziegler, J. C., & Goswami, U. (2006). Becoming literate in different languages: Similar problems, different solutions. *Developmental Science*, 9(5), 429–436.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2006.00509.x>