Transfer of Learning Among Adult Stakeholders in Parent-Focussed Family Literacy Programs

William T. Fagan

2003

Family literacy programs are accepted as a given in the continuum of today's educational programs. The visibility of family literacy as a concept has led to the development of a wide range of programs. Most articles and presentations on family literacy programs that attempt to provide indices for their success, tend to do so through a description of the content of the program and the resulting impact on parents and/or children. This study approached the success factor by investigating the nature of the learning transfer that occurred from presenters of training* workshops to facilitators, from facilitators to parents, from parents/caregivers to their children, and finally from the children demonstrating their literacy learning.

Background

Denny Taylor (1983) is credited with initiating the use of the phrase "family literacy" which to her meant the social context of the home as a key factor in the literacy development of young children. If the meaning of this term is taken in its broadest sense, there is focus on "family" (rather than school or other educational institution) as a key stakeholder in promoting literacy, and on "literacy" which refers to activities that provide a basis for the acquisition of reading and writing and language skills.

One thing certain is that there has been no shortage of family literacy programs (Thomas, 1998, Mandel-Morrow, Tracy, & Maxwell, 1995). What is needed is a way to assess whether, and why family literacy programs are effective. Barton and Hamilton (1998) point out that literacy is not an individual happening but a social or community affair. Therefore people are affected or impacted by involvement in family literacy. A family literacy program tends to reflect a chain or ripple learning effect. Someone develops a program. Knowledge of this program is provided to facilitators. These in turn may work with parents who work with children or they may work directly

_____

*The word "training" occurs in many contexts throughout this paper. The term lends itself to communication simplicity in writing and is used for that reason. This term is used in the broad sense of providing supportive and collaborative learning experiences.

with parents and children, or with children only. Learning transfers from person to person in such a continuum. How to assess the nature of this impact is a challenge. At any point within the continuum, the learning transfer may break down; a program may not have the same effect in different situations with different stakeholders. But, as Taylor (1997) noted, unless transfer of learning is documented, little can be said about the value of literacy programs. Broad (1997) describes transfer of learning as "the effective and continuing application of knowledge and skills gained in learning activities" (p. 2). From a review of the literature on transfer of learning, Taylor (1998) singles out participants and time as two key elements in investigating transfer. He also notes that it is important to identify "what" is to be transferred.

An advantage for this study was that it was possible to identify the implementation of a single family literacy program in 26 sites. It is therefore, easy to describe the "what" that was expected to be transferred. The program, PRINTS (Parents' Roles Interacting with Teacher Support) (Fagan, & Cronin, 1998) is based on a model that was developed by Hannon and Nutbrown (1996). As Thomas and Skage (1998) point out, the definition of family literacy guiding a program can best be revealed through the program content. They refer to defining family literacy as a "daunting task" which "may be compared to trying to capture a wide landscape with a single camera shot" (p. 5). PRINTS is a very bold program in this regard for it attempts to provide the widest lens in including experiences that may foster early literacy development. The overall goal is to empower parents as supporters of their young children's literacy development. The age range to which it is directed is pre-age 1 to age 6. The program is comprehensive or holistic in nature and is based around five STEPS or contexts in which parents can take advantage of literacy opportunities to foster their children's literacy development: talk/oral language, play, books and book sharing, environmental print, and scribbling, drawing, writing. Within each of these STEPS, a parent/caregiver may take five ROLES: providing opportunity for sharing with children, providing recognition or positive feedback, interacting in effective ways, modelling literacy, and setting guidelines. In training parents, the facilitator encourages parent input to

develop the concepts or meaning for each STEP. Parents can learn 40 activities across the different STEPS, many of them through hands-on or direct learning. These activities cover a wide range of social and cognitive skills - from exposing children to nursery rhymes and rhythm, to providing a structure for storytelling, to observing literacy in action, to modelling concepts, to providing support for writing. There is provision for formative and summative evaluation by and for the parents. Facilitators provide training for parents over a minimum 12 week period with two-hour sessions per week. The first and last sessions are introductory and wrap-up, while the additional ten sessions consist of two sessions for each STEP. It is recommended (optional) that parents take a break after each STEP (every two sessions, beginning with the third), in order to have more time for implementing the program with their children. This would mean five additional weeks for an overall time of 17 weeks contact between facilitators and parents.

Facilitators receive their training in a 5-6 hour workshop by an author of the program or designate. Consequently, because of the shorter time period there is less time for involvement between facilitators and their workshop presenter than between parents and their facilitator which covers a 12 week period. Training sessions for facilitators of about six hours duration are also provided by a manual and video. As part of this training facilitators analyse materials and complete checkpoints on their learning.

The program is structured yet flexible. There is a set format for each session but there is provision for parent input. Parents have opportunities to discuss how activities may be best implemented with their children and may suggest modifications in light of their children's age and maturity. The parent facilitators have a Facilitator's Handbook containing all session plans, directions for engaging in activities, and evaluation measures. There is a Parent Video to illustrate activities suggested in the handbook. Facilitators can also use a Parent Handbook to support each session, which is given to the parents. The program was first developed for low-income parents and many of the

activities are cost-effective, being constructed from bristol board, sales flyers, magazines, and newspapers.

Objectives

The objectives of this study are:

1. To develop a framework for investigating the transfer of learning within the continuum of initiating and implementing a family literacy program.

2. To identify a number of learning transfer or juncture points at which transfer of learning may be studied.

3. To study the transfer of learning at these juncture points.

4. To analyse the results in terms of implications for implementing family literacy programs.

Subjects

As Taylor (1998) noted, participants are an important factor in any study on transfer of learning. Data on key participants (children, parents, facilitators) are given in Table 1. A fourth group, the authors and initial workshop presenters will be discussed within the article.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

The target groups within this study included 80 parents, their 80 children, and 11 facilitators. This sample was drawn from a larger group who had been participants within the program. Parents often had more than one pre-school child. The child closest to the age of beginning school at the time the parents were participants in the study, was considered the target child. The target participants attended programs at 15 sites with 11 facilitators, which means that some facilitators facilitated the program at more than one site. However, it was more likely that a facilitator facilitated the program more than one year at the same site. The time line for eligibility as subjects in the study covered six years, from the pilot phase of the family literacy program until the data

were collected. Because of the time span, it was possible to study the knowledge of children who had entered school.

Procedures and Methodology

Reverse Learning Effects

Learning effects can be identified in terms of the similarity between one segment of learning and subsequent learning. The learning sequences correspond to the involvement of the various participants. For example, the first learning transfer point in the sequence of the PRINTS Program occurred in the training workshops provided by the program author or designate to train facilitators to implement the program. The second learning transfer point occurred when facilitators implemented the program with parents. The third learning transfer point occurred when parents interacted with their children in sharing the results of their learning from the facilitators. A fourth point at which learning was demonstrated was the literacy knowledge of the children. Studying reverse effects meant starting with the fourth learning transfer point and trying to determine the learning similarity or possible enabling effect from each preceding point, to the first learning transfer point.

Fourth Learning Transfer Point: Assessing Children's Literacy Knowledge

Children's literacy knowledge was assessed in a number of ways. One consisted of an interview with the children who were asked the following questions: "Do you like doing things with reading and writing?" "What are some things you really like doing?"

A Literacy Attitude/Interest Inventory that was developed by the researcher was administered. This consisted of 20 items reflecting behaviours, half of which dealt with literacy activities, and half with other activities. The items were randomly arranged for order of presentation. Examples of items that focussed on literacy activities are:

My Mom/Dad gives me paper to mark on.

Mom/Dad reads a book to me before going to bed.

Examples of items that focussed on non-literacy items are:

Mom/Dad and I go to the store.

Mom/Dad gets me a toy for a present.

The children were asked to choose a happy face, a sad face, or a neutral face to show how they felt about the activity. A happy face was rated 3, a neutral face 2, and a sad face, 1.

A third assessment consisted of a rating by parents of their children's literacy behaviours which they checked on a 4-point scale (4 - Extremely noticeable, 3 - Very noticeable, 2 - Somewhat noticeable, 1 - Not noticeable). Sample items from this scale include:

READING

1. Child looks at books on his/her own	4	3	2	1
2. Child understands front and back of book	4	3	2	1
3. Child talks about the pictures in the book	4	3	2	1

WRITING

1. Child eagerly uses crayons, paper, etc.	4	3	2	1
2. Child makes marks that look like letters	4	3	2	1
3. Child prints letters in a row so that they look like words	4	3	2	1

An additional point of information about the child was obtained by asking parents the following question: "To what extent do you believe your child will be a reader/a good reader?

4-Definitely believe   3-Almost definitely believe   2-Partly believe   1-Not sure

A final source of information came from teachers of those children who had entered school. They rated the children on various literacy behaviours, and rated the children in terms of their belief of whether the child would be a reader, using the same scale as the parents used.

Third Learning Transfer Point: Parent Data

In order to determine parent/caregiver knowledge and the manner in which they interacted with their children, the following data gathering instruments were used: Open ended questionnaires which were completed during interviews with the parents and with the facilitators, ratings by the facilitators of the parents' knowledge at the end of the training workshop for parents, parents' rating of their literacy behaviours when interacting with their children, and informal questioning of the children in terms of their experiences in working with their parents on literacy tasks.

Second Learning Transfer Point: Facilitator Data

In order to determine facilitator knowledge and the manner in which facilitators interacted with parents/caregivers during the training sessions, the following data gathering instruments were used: Open ended questionnaires which were completed during interviews with the facilitators about their experiences, with the parents about their experiences with facilitators, and ratings by facilitators of their expertise in facilitating the PRINTS Program.

First Learning Transfer Point: Initial Training Workshop Data

To gather data on the effectiveness of the initial training workshop, data were obtained from the evaluation questionnaires which the facilitators completed at the end of the workshop, open ended questions asked facilitators about their training during the interview, facilitators' ratings of parts of the program that they felt were significant, and a review of the content and procedures of three workshops which had been audiotaped. When facilitators developed the knowledge they felt necessary to facilitate the program through means other than a workshop, such as the training manual and video, this was noted.

Tracing Reverse Learning Effects

The data of the children were analysed to provide an indication of their literacy learning. However, it was expected that the degree and nature of literacy learning would vary among children. In order to determine the transfer effects of learning of the parents on these, the children were divided into quartiles on the basis of their responses on the Attitude/Interest Survey (Literacy Behaviours) and their Parents' Ranking of their Reading and Writing Behaviours. The top 20 children who scored highest on both of these and the bottom 20 who scored lowest were identified. In order to trace reverse effects of learning, the parents of the children in the top and bottom quartiles were then identified and their data were analysed in terms of differences. Likewise, the facilitators who provided the training for the parents of the children from the top and bottom quartiles were identified and their data examined. While there were 20 children and 20 parents to a quartile, there were fewer facilitators. Five facilitators had provided programs for parents in the top quartile, while six facilitated the training for parents in the bottom quartile. The smaller number of facilitators may have been an advantage as it made for greater homogeneity for the influence of facilitators. Finally, the data pertaining to the initial training workshop were analysed as were other avenues through which the facilitators felt they developed the necessary facilitation knowledge.

Analysis of Interview/Questionnaire Responses

Interview questions were either responded to orally or in writing. In the case of the former, interviewers produced transcribed responses; in the case of the latter, interviewees said they preferred to answer the questions in writing. If there were follow-up questions or probings, these were written by the interviewers. All handwritten information was then coded into idea units which were then grouped under categorical statements.

Idea Units. An idea unit was defined as a head or key word with a descriptor. The head word was usually a noun and the descriptor could be a verb, adjective,

adverb or phrase modifier. Often it was easy to identify idea units as the information was often listed line by line by the interviewers or respondents and the information on each line represented an idea. Each idea was placed at the top of a sheet of paper. When the same idea occurred in the responses of other participants, a check mark was placed under it. Twenty percent of the responses were divided into idea units by three independent researchers. The percent of agreement among all three was 98.1.

Categorizing. When all responses had been divided into idea units the principal researcher read through all several times and identified a number of categories into which the idea units could be grouped. Then a listing of the categories was provided to two other researchers and they were asked to allocate 15 percent of the ideas into these categories. The percent of agreement among all three researchers was 92.8.

Results

Fourth Learning Transfer Point: Children's Literacy Knowledge (Overall Sample)
Literacy Attitude/Interest Inventory

The items were rated on a 3-point scale. The results are given in Table 2.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

There was not a big difference between the overall ratings on literacy versus non-literacy items. It is not unexpected that children of this age rated non-literacy items highly. It is perhaps interesting that the means for the literacy items were so high. The children had a positive attitude and interest in literacy related behaviours.

Do you like doing things with reading and writing?

All of the children agreed that they liked to do things with reading and writing.

What are some things you really like doing?

A total of 88 different responses (excluding similar or synonymous statements) were recorded. These were grouped into three categories. The categories and examples of statements within each category are given below.

1. Reading, and activities from the PRINTS Program definitely mentioned, and possibly social activities.

- read books with my Mom, do my letters in school, go to the office for my teacher when she writes a note, reading by myself and seeing if I know all the words and letters, making up stories, my favourite book to read alone is, *In a People House*, by Dr. Suess, play with my Alphabet House.
- make my name, make other names, make words, read to mom, play the I Spy game, play counting games with snakes and ladders, always mark on paper, look at print when we go to catch the bus..
- really like my Franklin Books, make puppets, draw houses, read my Book About Me, play Slippery Worm.

2. Reading definitely mentioned, and possibly social activities.

- Make a puppet, reading, write, colour, play with friends.
- Play with best friend, be a cop when I grow up, paint and draw with chalk, colour and read.
- Read, colour, dot to dot, pet dog, play with trucks, lie down when tired, hear stories in the nighttime, like The Five Little Pumpkins.
- read the words, read *Fifty Below Zero*, play with teddy bears, help mom pick strawberries.

3. Social-play activities only mentioned

- Play with my friends, go on bike
- Play with barbies, colouring, play with my friends
- Play outdoors, ride bike, watching TV

While all children answered "Yes" to the question "Do you like doing things with reading and writing?" when they were asked what things they liked doing, some of them did not include reading and writing activities as indicated by this last category. They may not have understood the terms "reading", "writing", or examples of such activities may not have come quickly to mind in response to the question.

<u>Rating by parents of their children's literacy behaviours</u>

The parents rated their children's reading and writing behaviours on a 4-point scale. The results are shown in Table 3.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

The means for reading and writing behaviours were similar. The rating of the behaviours suggests validity for the parents' observations since the rankings of the behaviours reflect progress from initial to more mature behaviours. The one behaviour that does not seem to follow this pattern is "Child uses pictures with his/her writing to tell a story. However, a check with some parents provided a simple explanation. Their understanding was that the child could write connected text independently and would then use pictures within this context. The rating for this item was consistent with the behaviour that received the lowest rating "Child writes his/her own story or message." Had the statement read: "Uses pictures to tell a story" it no doubt would have received a higher rating.

Parents' beliefs that the child will be a reader

The parents were asked to rate their children in terms of whether they would become (a) readers, (b) good readers, using the following scale:
4-Definitely believe   3-Almost definitely believe   2-Partly believe   1-Not sure
The mean rating for their belief in the child becoming a reader was 4.00; in other words, all parents believed that their child would become a reader. The parents were also asked to indicate their belief that the child will be a good reader, which resulted in a mean of 3.36. This too, is fairly high.

Rating by teachers of children's literacy behaviours

Teachers were asked to rate the children's reading and writing behaviour using the following scale: 4 - Extremely noticeable   3 - Very noticeable   2   -   Somewhat noticeable   1 - Not noticeable. The results are given in Table 4.

[Insert Table 4 about here]

Ratings are fairly high. These children were entering school with a high degree of literacy knowledge.

<u>Teachers' beliefs that the child will be a reader</u>

Using the scale: 4-Definitely believe   3-Almost definitely believe   2-Partly believe 1-Not sure, the teachers were asked to rate the children in terms of whether the teachers believed they would become readers. The overall rating was 3.05.

Identifying the Top and Bottom Quartiles of Children

[Insert Table 5 and 6 about here]

The scores of the top and bottom 20 children on the literacy items of the Attitude/Interest Survey resulted in means of 2.89 and 2.08, respectively which were significantly different at the .001 level (t = -14.586, df = 38). The same children were identified from the Parents' Ranking of Children's Reading and Writing Behaviours. The respective means were 3.77 and 2.56 for Reading, and 3.71 and 2.06 for Writing and were also significantly different at the .001 level (Reading Ranking:

t = -12.987, df = 38; Writing Ranking: t = -17.971, df = 38). Further analysis of the data showed that the children in the top quartile always scored higher on those reading and writing behaviours considered more mature. To further validate these groups, an analysis of the activities that the children said they enjoyed doing, showed that all children in the top quartile engaged in reading and/or writing activities including activities they had learned as part of the PRINTS Program, while none of the children in the bottom quartile mentioned activities from the PRINTS Program and rarely mentioned reading or writing activities. All children in the top quartile were rated by their parents as likely to become good readers.

The teachers' ratings further validated the top and bottom quartiles as different in terms of nature and degree of literacy development. The teachers rated the children

from the top quartile as more likely to engage in reading and writing behaviours. The last four tasks on their rating scale were more typical of children in the top quartile: Attempts to read, prints words that he/she knows, talks about books read at home, and asks questions about books. None of the children in the bottom quartile asked questions about books, while 75% of those in the top quartile did so. All children in the top quartile were rated as likely to become readers by their teachers.

Summary

Data indicated that children in the top and bottom quartiles differed significantly on their knowledge and involvement in reading and writing. These differences were highlighted in terms of what children said they liked doing in reading and writing, their attitude/interest scores on literacy items, and the ratings of parents on their involvement in reading, writing, and language activities. Parents had expectations for all children that they would become readers and for children in the top quartile that they would become good readers. Of those children in the top quartile who had entered school at the time of the data collection, the teachers generally believed they would become readers.

Third Learning Transfer Point: Parent Data

Facilitators' rating of parent literacy knowledge

One indication of the learning that parents acquired during the training program to facilitate their children's literacy learning was a rating by the facilitators of the overall positive effect of the training on parents. The results for the 80 parents were: Extremely positive: 36; Very positive: 22; Positive: 13; Somewhat positive: 9. There were no "No noticeable" ratings in the category. The overall rating of the training of parents of the children who performed in the top quartile was Extremely positive. None of the parents of the children in the bottom quartile fell into this category. However, it must be noted that facilitators were generally positive in regards to the training effects for all parents. A further rating by facilitators was their confidence in the parents' ability to engage in literacy experiences with their children as shared in the PRINTS program. Their ratings

were: Extremely confident: 28: Very confident: 24; Confident: 20; and Somewhat confident: 8. There were no parents who were rated as Not confident. Parents of children in the top quartile were rated as Extremely confident or Very confident. None of the parents of children from the bottom quartile were rated in the first category; however, two of the parents in the bottom quartile were rated as Very confident.

Parents' ranking of their own literacy behaviours

Parents were asked to rate their awareness of their own literacy behaviours as they interacted with their children using a 4-point scale, from Extremely noticeable, Very noticeable (3), Somewhat noticeable (2), and Not noticeable (1). These are given in Table 7.

[Insert Table 7 about here]

An overall effect of the training received by all parents was that they spent more time with their children on reading and writing activities, read to them more, and helped them with their reading when asked. However, the parents of children in the top quartile were more inclined to give positive feedback, try and find different reading material, talk about books read, give the child help in writing when asked, and use the library as a source of books. The latter two points need to be qualified. Some of the parents of children from the bottom quartile did not give help to their children in writing when asked, because many of the children did not engage in writing and therefore did not ask for help. Also, many parents, whether of children in the top or bottom quartiles, did not have easy access to a library to borrow books.

Open ended questionnaires with the parents and with the facilitator

When the parents' interview data were segmented into idea units and then grouped into categories, the categories described below, emerged. Each of the categories differentiated parents from the top and bottom quartiles on at least an 80-20

18

basis. That is, at least 80 percent of the parents of children in the top quartile provided responses for each category. While never more than 20 percent of parents of children in the bottom quartile provided responses for a category, it was also noted that no parent of children in the lowest quartile provided responses for more than three categories.

Category 1: Experiencing a Change in Attitude/Insight. Parents realized that either their insights and attitudes towards early literacy development had changed, or had been reinforced, and they knew what they knew about fostering early literacy development. For some parents, it was an "eye-opener"; they had just never thought in this way, but once introduced to information and possibilities, they immediately saw that it made sense, that it was "common sense". Some couldn't believe that they had not "figured this out" on their own. The single biggest impact was that parents became aware that children were never too young to engage in literacy learning activities. Many parents had been under the impression that age 4 was too young to engage children in literacy learning activities, even in a fun or play like manner. They became aware that a lot of learning can occur in fun and play activities. "Children learn more quickly and learn more if they enjoy what they do." "I had bought these alphabet cards and used to try and teach Karla the letters. But she wouldn't pay attention. Then when I made the Alphabet House (An activity from the PRINTS Program), all she wanted was to learn her letters - and she did."

They learned the importance of being active and not passive in interacting with children - "learning is not just parents telling and pointing. It is important that both child and parent get involved, not just the child". Many of the parents used the concepts of reading TO and WITH children which had been an important part in talking about reading during the training sessions. They learned how important it was not to push children but "to be patient and let the child take the lead". Through the evaluation activities in the PRINTS Program they became aware of the kinds of learning in which children could engage and were impressed with the level of knowledge children possessed or developed about literacy. They became more observant of what children

did, for example turning the pages of a book in the right direction. Other examples to illustrate parents' awareness of knowledge/ insight/ attitude are:

- *"When I recognized that this was an on-going part of my and my child's life and not just another project for a short time, I knew things would never be the same".*

- *"I knew that giving my child the necessary learning in literacy was special from other things and I made it a special time for my child and me".*

- *"You discover it works. You know you are doing something different because my daughter is learning much faster than my other children did at her age".*

- *"Sometimes I did things and felt they were right. But knowing the reasons why the activities are helpful for my child - made them a lot more meaningful for me".*

- *"I really understood that teaching can be packaged in so many different ways. A problem in school is that there is often only one way that teaching is packaged and some children may not be able to fit that package".*

- *"I really knew that I understood the activity. No one could fool me on how to do it. I knew I was doing it the right way and my child was the one who would benefit."*

Category 2: <u>Awareness of Conditions for Use.</u> Many of the school-driven family literacy programs consist of the school sending home books to be read which are then accounted for by keeping a tally of some sort. Parents often see this as "something to get done" and try and do it as soon as they can or wait until the last minute and are then reminded by the child who is aware of the deadline for getting information back to the teacher. Influenced by the PRINTS Program, parents came to realize that "all times are learning times". What they did was not driven by the expectations of someone else, nor their being required to report to someone else, but on their understanding that sharing and interaction times were good for the child and depending on the activity, there were a variety of venues in which learning could take place. Perhaps, the most cognizant statement exemplifying this from one parent was, "I never realized that outside my door was a learning field." Parents talked about such activities as putting a carton/tin on the counter that was being used as part of supper and using this as a learning experience for recognizing labels, or walking down the street with their child and

talking about the print on the bus stop or other display, or of playing a guessing game such as "I Spy" or reciting a nursery rhyme as they rode on the bus. The child's life's space, and not just the home, or a particular activity, such as reading a book or playing a word game, became the focus for learning. Sample comments illustrating Category 2 are:

- *"It is so easy to concentrate when you and your child are working at home."*

- *"I don't think anymore like I must remember to read with my child or whatever; I just fill in our time with whatever seems the most useful. Sometimes we'll just start a game and I have to do something else, but at least we get started and often my child just works or plays along on her own."*

- *"It's nice to feel that anytime is a good time. You can choose what you want to do when and you can go at your pace."*

- *"There is really no getting ready anymore. Of course we must have materials for games and that. But it could be at the kitchen table, at the coffee table, on the floor, or in the back garden."*

- *"What it does is always keep literacy on your mind. You must be always looking for ways to involve your child. After awhile the child starts to find times and you just go along with that."*

Category 3: Developing a Sense of Ownership. Much has been written about the importance of participants having a sense of ownership of the activities they participate in. Developing a sense of ownership is always not that easy, however. It involves a willingness and opportunity on the part of the initial owner to transfer that responsibility, and a willingness on the part of participants to accept it. The PRINTS Program fostered a sense of ownership in four ways. The parents were involved in developing the concepts for the five STEPS; they were given time to share what was happening in their and their children's "literacy" lives; they engaged in discussion on how activities might be modified for children of various ages and maturity levels; and they decided what activities they would engage in with their children, and when. Parents also knew that they could add activities that they were/became aware of from other sources.

Ownership is often used synonymously with such terms as "possession" and "control". But it was not these concepts that conceptualized this behaviour as explained by parents. There was a sense of respect for oneself and a respect of others for them. In other words, the parents were trusted; they were not told what to do and were not accountable to others for doing it. This, of course, led to positive self-concept development, self-esteem, and self-efficacy. Allied to this was a feeling of independence. When you are trusted, respected, feel good about yourself and what you are doing, there is a sense of independence - of "yes, I can do it." Some comments that typified a sense of ownership, are given below.

- *"I feel good about what I am doing."*

- *"I thought things (literacy activities) were set in stone. Now I can just judge what my child can do."*

- *"I appreciate having this program brought into our lives. I wish I knew this when my other children were younger."*

- *"It is not really a program you know. It is just a way of altering (re-shaping) your life in which you have control."*

- *"It is refreshing to know we are respected for what we know. When (the facilitator) said that we know more than anyone else how our child grows and develops I felt like clapping. Who does know more than the parent about a child?"*

Category 4: Understanding the Organization and Structure of the Program. This category exemplifies the truth of the statement that "the whole is greater than the sum of the parts." This category clearly differentiated parents who tended to provide an overall enriching experience for their children from those who did not. As indicated earlier, the PRINTS Program is organized around STEPS and ROLES. The STEPS parallel the various aspects of a child's life in which literacy development may occur. STEPS in the form of wooden blocks are an important part of the program and are built up session by session as they are addressed by the facilitators. ROLES suggest the parts that parents as players take with respect to fostering their children's literacy development. Various activities fit within the STEPS and for the implementation of

which, the parents took various ROLES. Parents who understood the larger framework were much more likely to interact with their children in a more insightful, supportive way, were likely to draw on related materials and experiences in moving the experience to conclusion, and were in more control in monitoring what a successful literacy experience would look like. Parents without this greater understanding saw the program not as a program but as a "lot of activities". These were then used with the children in a hit or miss manner. Sometimes it just happened they provided a meaningful experience in which there was closure to the children's learning; other times, it was merely being involved without strategy. This lack of understanding of the overall structure and organization of the PRINTS Program was sometimes exemplified by other literacy providers (community workers, school personnel) who were superficially aware of the PRINTS Program and felt they could "borrow" activities (in spite of copyright) to use in their settings without any understanding of the context for which they were developed and in which they were designed to have the greatest impact. Parents who understood the "whole" made comments like:

- *"I liked how it all went together, the sequence, routine, and flexibility."*

- *"I became aware that an activity is more than just going through the activity. As a parent I must take five ROLES if I am going to do the best for my child".*

- *"When ___ (the facilitator) first introduced STEPS, I did not know what she was talking about. Then as I saw her build each STEP, one after the other as we moved through the program, I knew that these meant something and activities are not just a jumble but relate to different parts of a child's life."*

- *"I had a job getting into the swing of roles first. I would just do like I always did - just start my child and go from there. Now I was saying to myself, 'Whoa! Are you doing this? Are you forgetting this?' You know I kept forgetting to give my child positive feedback - sorry isn't it. But now I know there is a bigger picture that I must keep seeing."*

- *"STEPS are not just a gimmick for understanding the program. They are the opportunities in my child's life for literacy related activities."*

- *"I could see and feel the STEPS as they showed how my child moved through different parts of life where literacy can be supported. Almost anything in life can be turned into a literacy learning experience. A walk around town is a real learning experience. 'Do you see that?'*

What does that say?' And of course, sometimes my child will say, Mom, do you see a T?'
You don't have to be at a desk to learn."

Category 5: Knowing How to Access and Utilize Materials and Resources. There is an old expression, "You can't make a silk purse out of a sow's ear." Likewise, you cannot make successful literacy learning experiences out of an impoverished source of materials, books, etc. Many of the communities/centres in which the program operated did not have access to school or public libraries. The participants were often low-income (social assistance) and did not have much money to purchase literacy materials. In one sense their actions contradicted the silk purse-sow's ear expression. The program focusses on utilizing low-cost materials, so that many word games, activities, prompts, cues, models, came from sales flyers, magazines, newspaper, wrappers, etc. A lot depended on the parents' creativity and ingenuity. As one parent exclaimed on one occasion, "I will never throw away a flyer again." Supplied with a kit of bristol board, glue, scotch tape, etc., they were able to make a vast array of interesting literacy activities. A recreational reading book was given to parents at the end of each session for their children. This was very significant for the parents. It was almost like a reward for attending the sessions. It was a book they would not likely have otherwise. It was a motivator for the children. In the case of low-income families, it was a bonus. As one parent said, "We get many handouts. Don't get me wrong. We really appreciate them as we must make ends meet. We have a few books that have been donated to our centre. But when I bring home a book from the PRINTS Program, a book that is brand new, that no one else used, and it is ____'s very own, you should see the look on her face." Parents bringing home materials (books or self-constructed activities) from the program became the connecting point between the program and children. The word PRINTS became a household word with the young children, and almost all parents told of their children asking as soon as they got home, "What did you bring from PRINTS?" Some comments by parents illustrating this category are:

- *"You know you can't get children excited on nothing. There must be interesting books and materials for them."*

- *"You must have sufficient materials and resources."*

- *"You become aware that you don't need high cost materials, that many materials are available in the home, for example, flyers."*

- *"You must make use of everything you can."*

- *"There is little sense in getting involved if you can't find books and other materials."*

Category 6: Developing Sensitivity to Children's Characteristics and Needs. The PRINTS Program provides opportunity for parents to share experiences in their and their children's lives. Many parents felt that they were alone in facing a particular problem or situation with regard to the learning of their children. They felt that they were involved in a situation that was unique to them, and they felt they were not doing a very good job. Some children were developing slower than expected, were not interested in literacy type activities, were inattentive, and did not seem to have very much knowledge about basic literacy/learning tasks. As parents later said, they felt ashamed that their children were not learning well. They had felt that they were inadequate as parents. Then as parents shared their experiences during the training sessions, the world of their children broadened. They saw their children not as isolates, but as members of a class exemplifying "children-ness" characteristics. They were no longer ashamed, upset or frustrated. They had a broader perspective on children and learning and often benefited from suggestions that other parents made on how to approach the situation. They were more confident and empowered to address the situation. Their comments reflected these feelings.

- *"I really thought I was the only one that this was a problem for."*

- *"It was such a load off my mind to know that other parents were also being frustrated with their children at times."*

- *"All of a sudden I understood my child a lot better. I wasn't a bad Mom. I just had to deal with a more challenging situation and patience and love will go a long way."*

- *"I felt so much better. ___ is only young yet. I will make sure I won't push. But I will be there for him."*

Informal questioning of the children

Children were informally questioned about the reading and writing experiences with their parents. Children who scored in the top quartile were more likely to contribute statements like: "Mommy tells me how well I am doing", "gives me a hug", "reads things I like", "really likes making things", "plays with pictures", "does things for me". Children from the bottom quartile often had no comments, or some general remarks like, "We do things."

Summary

The training of the parents of children in the top quartile was more inclined to be rated by facilitators as extremely positive and these parents felt very or extremely confident in supporting young children's literacy development. Overall, parents spent more time with their children on reading and writing activities, read to them more, and gave them help when asked. Parents of children in the top quartile were more likely to give positive feedback, try and find a variety of reading material, including using the public library, and talked about books more. These parents were also more inclined to develop greater insight into their children's literacy learning, become aware that literacy development can occur in any venue, develop a sense of ownership of their early literacy development involvement, understand the overall structure and organization of the PRINTS Program, know how to best access and use materials and resources, and develop a greater sensitivity to their children's characteristics and needs.

Second Learning Transfer Point: Facilitator Data

<u>Open ended questionnaires with the facilitators and with the parents</u>

An analysis of the data from the interviews with facilitators, and with parents reflecting on their training by the facilitators, led to the following categories. Facilitators who had trained parents of children in the top quartile ranked high on these behaviours. The same criteria applied as in devising categories for information about parents: At least 80% of those who were involved with parents of children in the top quartile provided the comments in each category, and less than 20% of those involved with parents of children in the bottom quartile, did so.

<u>Category 1: Developing and Encouraging a Positive Attitude on the Part of Parents About Literacy Development.</u> The most effective facilitators approached the program as an opportunity to provide for effective learning experiences for children - learning that would provide a foundation for the development of literacy skills. It was not just a sequence or a set of activities to be followed, but an attitude to be developed within parents so that learning would not just last for the 12 weeks of the program but would continue through the child's pre-school and even school-life. These facilitators used many examples, and took advantages of the sharing of parents to illustrate how children grow and develop and how a particular "learning setting" is not essential for this learning to take place. They believed that a knowledgeable parent can take advantage of any situation that comes along to provide meaningful learning for the child. These facilitators made the parents feel good about themselves and their experiences with their children by taking time to let parents share, by gladly accepting all comments, and by integrating the parents' comments into the sessions. They gave parents credit for the level of knowledge that the children already possessed and focussed on the positive circumstances of parents' and children's lives and not on a deficit perspective. They understood that parents were doing a lot and gave them time to share what they were doing. These facilitators supported and reinforced what parents were already doing, and then supplemented this by providing knowledge of other activities. These facilitators promoted the belief that literacy and learning are

about life experiences, and not about a narrow teaching situation. They explained the "Teacher Support" part of the title of the Program as providing richer life/learning experiences for the children prior to coming to school, which would provide more support for teachers in continuing this learning. The facilitators also promoted an attitude that it was not necessary to have expensive materials to promote early literacy. They showed that there was a range of low-cost materials available for helping children develop basic literacy skills. Comments by facilitators to support these categories include:

- *"Motivating parents to take the initiative for their children's literacy learning is a key issue."*

- *"It's like the old adage of giving someone a fish versus teaching someone to fish. Parents must be shown how and must understand that they can do it."*

- *"You don't need a lot of money to provide materials and resources for children's learning. Some bristol board, glue, crayons, magazines, flyers, etc., and lots of imagination can provide some very interesting and appealing learning resources."*

Category 2: Possessing a Supportive Facilitation Style. Parents felt influenced by the "style" of facilitation. Those who experienced a warm and positive facilitation style were more inclined to be parents of children in the top quartile. The PRINTS Program is usually implemented as a project. In many cases an agency/organization is able to obtain funds for the implementation - funds to provide for materials and resources, and an honorarium for the facilitator. The implementation could be divided into two types. One type which produced the most positive influence on parents consisted of facilitators who believed in what they were doing, who understood that the PRINTS Program was a comprehensive program that was meant to provide support and intervention in children's lives through their parents. The goal of providing a most rewarding experience for parents was their driving force. While they were guided by 12

sessions of two hours in duration, this did not constrain them. They monitored their involvement in terms of what they believed the parents were getting from it. One facilitator continued the program for 16 sessions because the parents wanted additional experiences. As indicated above, some facilitators finished the nightly session when parents were satisfied they had prepared what was necessary for the next learning experience with their children. In contrast, some facilitators saw the implementation of the program in the narrow sense of project and stuck rigidly to schedule. In a few cases the program was reduced from 12 weeks to 10 weeks which violates one of the basis principles of its intervention in terms of its time implementation of a 12 week minimum period. Some comments made by parents regarding facilitation style include:

- *"The facilitator modelled reading, by reading at the beginning of each session or invited parents to read a story".*

- *"The hands-on activities really helped me gain confidence in knowing the activity. If I could do it at the (community) centre, I knew I could do it at home."*

- *"The facilitator was friendly, easy-going, made you feel at ease".*

- *"There was a comfort level - there was freedom to share, interact, question, not feel rushed".*

- *"The facilitator was sensitive to the kinds of activities that would best work with the group".*

- *"The facilitator praised parents' efforts and make them feel special".*

- *"When (child) entered kindergarten, the facilitator contacted the teacher to help explain what she had learned.)*

Category 3: Promoting the Organization and Structure of the Program. The STEPS and ROLES provide the basis of the program. The training workshops for facilitators emphasize making actual steps out of wood (8 inch lengths of 2"x4"), labelling these and building them step by step as the parents move through the training sessions. The facilitators of parents of children in the top quartile always had the steps made; the facilitators of parents of children in the bottom quartile never had the STEPS in three dimensional form, although some had them drawn on cardboard or bristol

board. Activities of the facilitators of parents of children in the top quartile were always grouped around STEPS. When parents brought activities to share, the facilitator always related them to the appropriate STEP.

Likewise, the most effective facilitators emphasized the ROLES. An activity was not just doing something with the child. The parent needed to engage in certain kinds of behaviours, certain roles in order to make this an effective experience. Overall, the most effective facilitators understood the PRINTS Program as involving structure, sequence, routine, and flexibility. Their goal seemed to be to instill this kind of understanding in the parents, which not only provided them with expertise, but with ownership.

One implication of facilitators not providing for an overall understanding of the program in terms of STEPS and ROLES was that some parents withdrew from the program. These were often parents from middle-income brackets. They were already engaging in reading and other print activities with their children. When they missed understanding the PRINTS Program as taking advantage of all learning opportunities in a child's life through adopting certain roles, and saw it only as a lot of activities, they did not see any difference between it and what they were doing. Consequently, they missed a lot of valuable learning about adopting effective roles, monitoring their children's progress and their involvement, relating literacy development to life situations, and using low-cost resources as opportunities for learning. Comments by facilitators exemplifying this category, include:

- *"You know it is not just a matter of doing things hit or miss. Parents must understand their roles in helping their young children. You know it is not just a matter of the child doing this or that; the parents have to see the overall picture, all the ways they can become involved and give it their best."*

- *"It is the overall structure or organization of this program which gives it its power; those who only see it as activities are missing the point."*

Category 4: Developing Sense of Ownership in Parents. The most effective facilitators instilled a sense of ownership in the parents who participated in their

training sessions. It was not just a matter of informing parents about the program but of sharing it in a way that parents realized they had a role in their learning through providing input. Parents also understood that they were free to engage in activities when they wished, and to modify or supplement them as they saw fit. Comments by parents about the facilitators illustrate this category.

- *"It is so different from having someone talk at you. It's nice to feel that you are important in what is to be learned."*
- *"Making it sound like it is our (parents) program and we have key roles in how it works, makes it a lot more meaningful."*
- *"I knew my child could not do some of the things she suggested, but when I realized that I could change things or could use them when I thought my child was ready, I felt so much better."*
- *"As ___ (the facilitator) pointed out, the title says 'Parents' roles', not 'Facilitator's roles'. I knew then the program was about us and we had a key role it making it happen."*

Category 5: Providing Useful Knowledge and Skills. The facilitators of parents of children in the top quartile clearly understood what they wanted the parents to know: structure and content. They always put information in context. They reviewed and related information so that parents could see the connections between ideas presented at different times. They worked through the activities themselves before showing the parents how to get involved. They sought examples and illustrations so that they could provide a clear description or explanation. They always took time for the parents to engage in hands-on activities and made sure that parents really understood the best course of interaction. They used the parent video at the appropriate times to illustrate certain activities and allowed for questions and discussion on how the activity could be used by parents. Comments by parents are given below.

- *"I really felt I understood. You can't help others until you really understand it yourself."*

- *"I was given many good ideas to implement with my child even when we are 'out and about'"*.

- *"I was interested in the different activities for the children. But the two activities to help parents understand reading and writing were also helpful. I never realized that scribblings are the roots of writing, nor that just seeing others write could have an effect."*

- *"I acquired a lot of knowledge of what can be done to help a child develop basic literacy skills. Just little things that are big things really, like there is a best way to read a book with a child."*

Category 6: Providing Socialization/Support. Facilitators who had more experience (and were usually the facilitators of the top quartile group) tended to take a more leisurely and accepting role in providing time when parents could interact socially. After a busy day, often having to deal with concerns and frustrations, some parents did not arrive at the training sessions ready to "go to work". They wanted to bring closure to that part of their day before becoming involved in learning experience. They just wanted to talk, to have someone listen to them, to enjoy a tea or coffee. They did not want to be urged or pushed into a learning situation. Yet they were keen to help their children and as soon as they felt they had closed off their usual day they were ready to "dive in". The more effective facilitators sensed this and provided time which is all the parents wanted. This meant that facilitators could not appear rushed and eager to meet a time deadline. This type of socializing provided a time for parents to bond. Many of the learning activities involved partner or group work, so the social atmosphere was crucial for promoting effective learning.

Child care was sometimes an issue and facilitators dealt with this in different ways. For some, it was a matter of the parents being responsible and they usually had to rely on family members. When the training was offered during day hours through a community centre, some facilitators arranged for child care at the centre. In some instances, funding was secured for child care services so parents could avail of baby sitters. Some comments of facilitators regarding socialization or support included:

- *"I could not imagine not providing time for them to socialize. There were so many issues they wanted to talk about."*

- *"I have heard about readiness for learning but usually in terms of young children. Now I know what it means in connection with parents. When they have had a chance to talk about what is uppermost on their minds, then they are ready to talk about helping support their children's literacy development."*

- *"We all looked forward to our tea time break. You could learn so much about parents during these times."*

- *"Child care is a definite factor. The program is focussed on helping parents help young children. These are low-income parents. They need help with child care."*

Summary

      The more effective facilitators made a special effort to develop and encourage a positive attitude on the part of parents about literacy development; they fostered a sense of ownership in parents so that parents felt it was their responsibility and they were accountable to themselves for helping their children. They made time for parents to socialize and to get concerns and issues "out of their system." This kind of involvement also enhanced the notion of ownership for parents.

First Learning Transfer Point: Initial Training Workshop Data

      The first learning transfer point occurred when the facilitators participated in the necessary training to become facilitators for parent groups. This training was obtained in a number of ways: through workshops from the author/researcher, or other trained workshop presenter. Facilitators could become "self-trained" by using a Trainer's Manual and Trainer's Video which are available with the program. Finally, some facilitators, by using the facilitating materials (Facilitator Handbook, Parent Handbook, and Parent Video) tried to figure out how to facilitate the program for parents.

      It was clear from the data from the facilitators that the most effective training came from workshops by the author or another trained facilitator. Equally rated were training from a person who had been trained and had facilitated the program. Least

effective was trying to figure out how to facilitate the program on the basis of the facilitation materials.

However, it is not true that all facilitators who received their training from the author through workshops were the most effective facilitators. One facilitator who had attained training in this way was not judged a most effective facilitator when one traces the sequence effect of learning from parent to facilitator. It is understandable that in any learning situation (whether a workshop for training facilitators of family literacy programs, or a grade five classroom), different participants obtain different knowledge from the learning occasion. This may be due to a number of intra-individual factors, such as interest, intended use of information, prior knowledge, attention, etc. One way to determine the kinds of learning that participants obtained from a training workshop was to analyse evaluation/feedback questionnaires that were completed at the end of the workshops. Data available from 47 questionnaires of people who had completed the training workshops were analysed. The key questions for this purpose were: (1) List at least two important learnings that you gained from the PRINTS workshop, (2) How could the workshop be changed to better help you become a facilitator of the PRINTS Program, and (3) Comments.

The responses from question 1 could be grouped according to statements that have been shown above to characterize successful and less-successful facilitators. One group of participants (N = 32) focussed on understanding the organization of the program, on its being systematic yet flexible, on the important role of parents in fostering literacy development in the lives of their children, on valuing parent input, and helping parents recognize the "scope" of literacy development and the contexts they could take advantage of in fostering literacy for their children. Another, though much smaller group, (N = 8) provided responses on a more micro-level and indicated a variety of activities they could teach parents, or use themselves (or even a specific activity such as a game), interactions with children (which are basically activities), the goals of the program, which seemed to be understood at literal level, or focussing on stages of writing development. Four of the five facilitators of parents of children from

the top quartile came from the first group. Five of the six facilitators of parents of children of the bottom quartile came from the second group.

Additional information on the potential impact of the training workshop for facilitators was obtained by audio taping three workshops, transcribing the content and interactions and comparing these to the responses provided by the participants on the evaluation/feedback questionnaires. All three workshops were similar in content as they followed a scripted handbook. There was some variation in terms of discussion/explanation in terms of questions and comments. Comments that were pertinent in terms of input for training facilitators are as follows: (1) The workshop should be longer. Currently, it extends for about five hours. Some participants indicated that the amount of information to be covered necessitated at least another 2 to 3 hours. (2) All participants appreciated receiving the key materials which they would need to facilitate training sessions for parents: Facilitator Handbook, Parent Handbook, and Parent Video. (3) Not only did the participants receive materials, they were appreciative in being shown how to use them. The workshop is built around three key goals: Knowing the material, accessing the information efficiently, and sharing or facilitating the program with parents. (4) The Program is comprehensive in nature and focusses on all aspects of a child's life in which a parent can capitalize on experiences to foster literacy development. (5) Some facilitators wished to have more hands-on experiences during the workshop training in understanding how to share the model and activities with parents. They admitted that this was related to the length of the workshop and realized that doing this would require a longer time period.

Summary

Training for the facilitators was fairly homogeneous since the variety of opportunities for their training was limited. The four areas emphasized by the workshop presenter which were characteristic of the knowledge of the more effective facilitators were: belief in the importance of parent input, involving the parents in evaluating the effects of the program on themselves and their children, understanding

the overall structure of the program, and using the parent handbook effectively. Facilitators valued the training workshops for the materials they received and for being shown how to understand and use them. They liked the comprehensiveness of the program. They would have liked the training workshops to be longer which would also allow them more time in modelling activities and roles they would share with parents.

Positive Transfer and Mitigating Factors

The expected pattern of transfer of learning that effective behaviour on the part of one group of participants was preceded by effective behaviour of another significant stakeholder was verified. There was never an occasion when a participant farther down the learning transfer chain performed better than would have been predicted by the previous learning experiences. For example, if a facilitator did not provide an overall effective learning experience, then the parents exposed to this facilitator were also never rated as providing a most effective experience for the children. However, there were a few instances when facilitators (N =1) or parents (N=3) did not provide a best learning experience for parents/children in spite of their having experienced a positive learning situation themselves. There were also a few instances when some participants (facilitators or parents) were considered "outstanding" and seemed to extend or build on the training they had received. All parents praised the training which they had experienced but some felt they could have been more effective in supporting their children's literacy development. A number of mitigating factors provided an explanation for all the instances indicated above. Influential factors were: person characteristics, prior knowledge, child characteristics, time, extended family support, site where program offered, and number of parents per group. These may be considered internal to the participants (parent characteristics, children characteristics, prior knowledge), internal to the learning environment (time, extended family) or affecting it (site where program offered, number of parents in training session).

Category 1: Person Characteristics. Person characteristics that were more identifiable with exceptional success included a strong desire to help. This involved a "searching", always looking for ways to help, even when they were not sure what they were looking for; there was a determination. For parents, this eagerness to help the child was associated with the intention that the child was going to have a better chance than the parent had in doing well in school. For facilitators, it was a belief in helping the parent. There was a belief in what they felt to be a positive opportunity for support. Other people characteristics that positively reinforced literacy support were commitment, consistency, and expectation. Facilitators and parents were committed to following the program on a regular and consistent basis. They did not expect results from a hit-and-miss approach. They knew that good results come from serious investment of time and effort. Facilitators had high expectations that parents would provide a meaningful experience for their children, that children would do well and that the experiences would benefit them when they entered school.

One factor inherent in parents as participants was their level of literacy skills. This need not necessarily be a factor in limiting successful participation as the program is set up so that the Parent Handbook does not need to be used and parents learn by doing. Handout cues sheets with little or no print are given out to help parents remember the key concepts and steps. However, in some instances the parents with low-literacy skills felt intimidated by other parents who engaged in discussion about books and for whom reading and writing were taken in stride. These parents attended fewer sessions or sometimes dropped out before the facilitators had an opportunity to integrate them through a support system.

Category 2: Prior Knowledge. What a person brings to a learning experience will influence what the person gains from it. Perhaps, the most beneficial asset was an open-mind. Participants, who already had preconceived notions and were reluctant to change, would not learn as much from a new learning encounter. The target facilitators and parents were asked about their knowledge of PRINTS and of family literacy. None

of them were familiar with PRINTS. About one-half of the parents and all of the facilitators had heard of family literacy. Except for two facilitators, who had taken courses in early literacy and had read articles on the topic, facilitators only knew about it in a general way. One parent summarized it in this way, "What I knew, I just knew from my feelings; I couldn't really explain what I knew until I had taken the program."

Category 3: Child Characteristics. Some parents who were well-intentioned and highly competent in implementing the program with their children were challenged by their children's characteristics. Children not interested in anything that resembled the activities in the PRINTS Program, or children who were inattentive or hyperactive were the major challenges that parents faced. There is no doubt that parents with the most positive and supportive attributes would provide the most productive learning situation for these children. While children with these characteristics did not always enhance the degree of learning from the shared literacy experiences with their parents, they were fortunate to have parents who possessed the knowledge and characteristics to support them in their learning as much as was possible. Nevertheless, the children's characteristics interrupted the expected learning effect.

Category 4: Time. Sufficient time is always an ally. Working parents are understandably busy. One is inclined to think that parents on social assistance have lots of time, that time is never an issue. Many parents on social assistance had very busy lives. They often helped other family members particularly elderly parents. They engaged in many volunteer activities, both at the school (for school-age children) and in the community. A shopping experience was longer for them than people without cars as they had to ride the bus or wait for the assistance of a friend. Even shopping itself could take longer. They could just not go along aisles taking brand names off shelves for their shopping carts; they had to search out the "no-name", or lower cost items. All parents had to re-organize their day, or at least re-think their day if they were to place a priority on working with their pre-school child/ren on literacy development. Parents

who made this commitment and followed through on it, were those who provided an enriching and productive literacy building experience for their child/ren. Some facilitators were also rushed for time and had to finish their sessions with parents at the precise time, so that some learning did not get shared with parents. In some instances the program was implemented too close to school closing for the summer or even during the summer when facilitators had other commitments and could not spend sufficient time for a most positive learning experience for parents.

Category 5: Extended Family/Support. An important factor in affecting the success of a family literacy program was the involvement of others in interacting with the child in literacy building activities. While a particular parent (usually the mother) had been trained, this parent became quite adept at directing and guiding others as surrogates when that parent was unable to be involved with the child. The number and range of personnel, which the key parent involved were amazing. These included siblings of the child (brothers and sisters), grandparents, cousins, aunts, uncles, friends, neighbours, and baby sitters. Perhaps, a very interesting finding was that two parents did not seem to provide a more significant experience than one parent (whether a single parent family or one parent of a two-parent family). An analysis of children's scores and parent ratings from single parent families, and two-parent families in which the father was not considered to take a major role, did not show any disadvantage for the child of the single parent family compared to a two parent family with both parents involved. It seemed that as long as the child had one key parent-figure with whom he/she could identify as the partner in literacy type activities then the child had the support necessary in developing a basis for literacy.

Category 6: Site Where Program Offered. There were usually two venues: a community centre or other site within the community (such as the public health office), or a school or educational setting. Parents seemed more relaxed and secure when the training was in a building which they knew and were comfortable with, which in most

cases was a community site. At a community centre, the parents had more control over when the building was opened. It was a non-school based atmosphere and reflected the thrust of the program which focussed on home-learning; there was a kitchen and they felt comfortable in making tea or coffee. They knew where things were kept and took responsibility for putting the place in order after the program. The school/educational building was not seen as theirs. They were visitors and took their places. Sometimes, if a classroom site was used, there were no facilities for tea or coffee and the environment was conducive to a more "student-like" atmosphere. They were not sure of what they could touch and where they could move. In a few cases when kindergarten teachers were the facilitators, they tried to make the school venue as inviting and supportive as possible. They were the hosts and tried to make their guests feel welcome and comfortable.

Category 7: Number of Parent Participants. The maximum number of participants recommended by parents for a successful training experience was ten, plus or minus 2. However, facilitators felt that when there were eight or more, a co-facilitator was an important asset. Not only could they share preparation time, but if one were not able to be present for a particular session, there was always someone who could take over. Also when parents worked with hands-on activities, there was an extra person to give individual help. One site had 24 participants which must have been impossible to facilitate and provide hands-on experiences for parents.

Summary of Findings

The overall purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of transfer of learning on the success of a family literacy program. Four learning transfer points were identified: from presenters of training workshops to facilitators, from facilitators to parents, from parents/caregivers to their children, and finally from the children demonstrating their literacy learning. Through various measures, the nature (and in some cases, the degree) of learning was identified. The target subjects included 80

children, 80 parents, and 11 facilitators, and the program developer and one other person who provided the training for facilitators. In order to determine the effectiveness of the transfer of learning, the children were divided into top and bottom quartiles based on their literacy learning and through a process referred to as "reverse learning effects" the parents of both groups and the facilitators of these parents were studied in terms of the nature of the learning they demonstrated.

Children in the top quartile engaged in a variety of literacy behaviours, including reading and writing tasks, and tasks that were part of the family literacy program (PRINTS - Parents' Roles Interacting with Teacher Support). Those in the bottom quartile were more likely to engage in social-play activities. Both groups of children differed in terms of their attitudes towards literacy related activities, and in their parents' ratings of the kinds of literacy behaviours in which they participated. The parents' ratings showed the top quartile children were more likely to engage in more mature reading and writing behaviours. While all parents believed that their children would become readers, the parents of the top quartile children believed they would become good readers. The teachers of children who had entered school were more likely to believe in the future reading success of the top quartile children.

The parents of the top quartile children were generally rated by the workshop facilitators as being more positively affected by the training, and they expressed more confidence in them to support the literacy development of their children. Parent ratings of their own literacy behaviours in relation to their children show a different pattern of interaction between both groups. The parents of top quartile children were more inclined to give positive feedback to their children, try and find a variety of reading material, talk about books read, give the children help with writing when asked, and use the public library as a source of reading material. These parents were more inclined to give responses that showed (a) greater knowledge and insight and positive attitude, (b) a greater awareness of the broad range of contexts in which the literacy development of their children could be fostered, (c) a greater sense of ownership of their roles as facilitators for their children, (d) greater knowledge and insight into the

overall structure and organization of the program, (e) they were more likely to access a variety of resources, and (f) they were more cognizant of the value of having opportunity within the training sessions on the program to share knowledge and experiences about their children and their children's learning.

The facilitators of the parents of children in the top quartile were more likely to accept parent input in developing key concepts during the parent training, were more flexible and more sensitive in attending to parents' learning needs. They promoted an understanding of the overall structure of the program, made more use of the Parent Handbook, the Parent Video, and were more inclined to involve parents in hands-on activities in developing the necessary knowledge and skills to interact with their children. These facilitators perceived the parents as the users and owners of the knowledge and skills being developed and they directed their information, explanation, and interaction to that end.

Training for facilitators via workshops was more effective than self-training through using a training video and manual, or through studying the facilitation materials (Facilitator's Handbook, Parent Handbook, Parent Video). The learning impact on the facilitators paralleled the kinds of knowledge that seemed to have a ripple effect from facilitators to parents: understanding the broad based life venue for facilitating children's literacy development, and the importance of empowering parents as key stakeholders in managing their time, knowledge, and skills to support the literacy development of their children. Receipt of the necessary materials for facilitating the program was considered a valuable asset by the facilitators.

While a strong pattern emerged as a continuum of learning transfer from the initial training workshop to the knowledge displayed by the children, it would be misleading to conclude that this continuum of learning transfer can be neatly controlled. A number of factors were identified which magnified or lessened the transfer effects. These factors included parent and child characteristics, prior knowledge, extended family support, time, site location of training, and number of participants in a training session.

Discussion

The results show a strong similarity between the kinds of knowledge promoted, internalized, and utilized along a continuum of literacy intervention. The results further support the analogy that a chain is only as strong as its weakest link. A number of broad based issues that emanate from, and/or provide interpretation for the results. These include: Achievement, Parent-Child Literacy Behaviours, Family Literacy-Home Literacy, Broad Perspective/Attitude Change, Facilitator Style, and Multifactor Influence. These are discussed below in terms of other research.

<u>Achievement</u>

What does achievement mean in a family early literacy program? What is the overall goal of such a program? Is it meant to have the children learn specific knowledge that schools expect at the time of school entrance? Is it meant to foster a home/community context that is supportive of the child's literacy learning?

Some studies of family literacy programs measure specific knowledge outcomes. Many such studies are described by Mandel-Morrow, Tracey, and Maxwell (1995). For example, they describe the Even Start program which showed significant improvement for the Even Start children on the Preschool Inventory, a formal test of preschool abilities, but not on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test or the Emergent Literacy Test. Some studies, such as one by Jacob (1984) have focussed, not so much on specific knowledge or skill, but on literacy activities of children during play and the role of these activities in their development of social and literacy behaviours. Fagan (2001) has pointed out that in family literacy, literacy as behaviour predominates, compared to school literacy, where instruction in reading and writing skills as a basis for literacy is the focus. Barton and Hamilton (1998) have documented various forms of literacy that are authentic in the home. It is also in the home that the literacy behaviours of young children are authentic. Family literacy programs may best be evaluated in terms of the literacy behaviour in which children and parents engage. Assessment of specific reading and writing knowledge via tests may be best left to the school domain.

Parent-Child Literacy Behaviours

The success of a family literacy program is best understood in the resulting literacy behaviours in the home/community. Anderson and Stokes (1984) note that while all families come into contact with print, it is the behaviours of parents and others which determine the nature and duration of this interaction. Ferdman (1990) goes beyond this to suggest that it is the parents who construct a literacy occasion, regardless of whether or not it is print based. A similar point is made by Sénéchal et al (1998) who state that " . . . home literacy experiences should not be considered a unitary construct" (p. 111). Therefore, to describe literacy behaviour in the home, one must understand what the parent defines as literacy behaviour. Hoare (1997) explains that the educational (literacy) process is global rather than specific. It entails socialization or the internalization of social norms and values. It is not "giving" specific literacy information and skills to the child; rather, it is an expression of the accepted, the valued, and the functional by adults, from which the child chooses and accepts. It is part of the process of acculturation through which parents/adults guide and monitor the involvement and learning of the young in inheriting a common repertory of ideas and symbols of which the most important aspect is literacy.

O'Sullivan and Howe (1999) who conducted a longitudinal study with young children from low-income families discovered that it is the children's involvement in literacy behaviours which is the significant factor in affecting parents' beliefs about their children's literacy competence. This was even more important than the presence of literacy materials and artifacts in the home. O'Sullivan and Howe further noted that early intervention through the school did not change the pattern of failure for these children who had not experienced a home enriched with literacy behaviours.

Family Literacy - Home Literacy

Family literacy is usually equated with home literacy, with parents engaging children in various literacy development activities. In fact, some family literacy programs involve a facilitator going to the parents' home to show the parent how to provide support for children's literacy learning. This study suggests that family literacy

is not site specific; it may occur wherever members of the family may be found - in the grocery store, on a bus, etc. Barton and Hamilton (1998) documented many instances of parents engaged in literacy tasks both inside and outside the home.

Early literacy behaviour seems to be best supported through a family-community-cultural context in which there is a reciprocal relation between parents and children, based on literacy activity and involvement. One study which approached family early literacy from a social constructivist theoretical framework was conducted by Leseman and deJong (1998). They were critical of a reductionist view of family early literacy which focussed on attributes such as socioeconomic status, race, or ethnicity, or even specific components of the literacy act, such as story reading. They viewed family early literacy within a multifaceted construct and identified such factors as literacy opportunity, instruction quality of parents, consensus and cooperation between participants, the social-emotional quality and satisfaction of the interactions, and the confidence of the adults. The Leseman and deJong study was very similar to the study described here in terms of its globality and comprehensiveness. Consequently, involvement as an indication of success must be analysed across a wide spectrum or contexts of a child's life.

Broad Perspective/Attitude Change

A key question is how stakeholders (parents, guardians, facilitators, etc.) in family literacy, develop a broad perspective of early literacy within a multifaceted construct. It may be partly due to the influence of mentors (workshop presenters to facilitators, facilitators to parents), to experience and inclination (a feeling as to what makes sense), to observation of, and interaction with young children, and to the preparedness of the participants to accept new learning.

Datnow and Castellano (2000) studied the implementation of a literacy intervention program. Based on the extent to which the program was implemented as intended, they identified four groups of teachers who ranged from strong supporters to vehemently against. Those who became strong supporters understood the program as

a totality or overriding framework, with goals, actions, outcomes, etc. They realized that changes could be made but in a way that retained fidelity to the program; changes reflected manipulations within the program framework. The two mid-groups of teachers understood the program in terms of positives and negatives. They focussed on pieces that appealed or did not appeal to them and did not focus on the overriding structure. Burns (1993) pointed out that learning and transfer of knowledge often does not occur because learners have mastered the routines but not the underlying concepts (framework). Rather than constructing scenarios or scripts (Schank and Abelson, 1977), they tend to think in specifics independent of the context. Those who vehemently opposed the implementation of the program did so on ideological grounds. It violated or contradicted dearly held beliefs and they were prepared to fight rather than accept the ideas proposed.

Those, who are open to ideas and who find themselves inclined towards the ideas presented, will more than likely understand and implement the program as intended. Those who vehemently oppose may be difficult to convince. In the case of family literacy workshops, since the participants are usually volunteers, it is likely that potential family literacy providers with strongly opposing beliefs will withdraw when they recognize the orientation of the training does not coincide with theirs. The group in the middle (identified by Datnow and Castellano) present a challenge. They are open to acceptance; for these the nature of the workshop training (whether for facilitators or parents), is crucial. Elmore and Sykes (1992), and Snyder, Bolin and Zumwalt (1992) showed that innovations are seldom implemented exactly as developers intend them to be. Words, the basis of communication, represent the tip of experience. Without that experiential base, words are likely to be misinterpreted and misunderstood. The facilitator who hears "STEPS" in the case of the PRINTS Program but does not understand that STEPS conceptualizes all facets of a child life for literacy development, but instead equates it with a group of activities, may convey to parents the significance of specific activities without providing the insight as to how activities can be identified

and framed by life context, so that opportunities for literacy activities may be better recognized and utilized.

Smith (1983a) noted that moving from a state of ignorance (unknowing) to a state of knowing entails keeping the mind alive, always considering alternatives, seeing the big picture, the overall framework or the forest for the trees. Auerbach (1989) points out that this kind of learning will not occur within a transmission of knowledge model. An essential medium in the required form of learning is questioning. Padraig Pearse, an Irish leader and poet, wrote that questioning is the obligation of the intellect (Llywelyn, 1998). A shift in thinking that reflects a holistic perspective may be best developed in a manner espoused by Freire (1985), whereby assumptions, values, beliefs, and perceptions are examined, alternative interpretations considered, and a reinterpretation of one's own behaviour occurs. Shifts in thinking that are significant in shaping one's thoughts and actions are referred to as paradigm shift by Kuhn (1973), and perspective transformation by Mezirow (1991). The process one undergoes to generate such shifts in thinking is referred to as conscientization by Freire (1985). This process would include monitoring or metacognition (Walczuk, 2000). Participants in learning situations (workshops), whether facilitators or parents, need to be able to share, question, examine, and relate information to their own lives. Datnow and Castellano (2000) note that teachers need to "own" the process of change which is interpreted against their lives. This, also, would apply to family literacy practitioners.

Related to how change occurs through learning, one must also consider the context or what is to be learned. Smith (1983b) reminds us that there is no evidence that a child ever learned to read because of a program; however, there is considerable research that children have learned to read without programs (Clark, 1976; Torrey, 1969). While PRINTS is referred to as a program, it does not involve memorizing techniques or routines. It involves understanding a construct within which parents have leeway in fostering their children's literacy learning. It fact, the activities are not just presented as games or scripted actions, but as experiences to be constructed within a framework of five roles that guide the actions of the adult participants. Shepard

(2000) states that understanding a concept within a larger framework is more likely to lead to the transfer of knowledge in new situations.

<u>Facilitation Style</u>

Learning how to implement a family literacy program occurs through facilitation, whether from the initial workshop for facilitators, or from the parent facilitation sessions. The impact of facilitation style on parents in a family literacy training program was emphasized in a study by Grimes and Davies (1997). They concluded that the "reciprocal relationship between parents and professionals (facilitators) is a complex and challenging task for which there are few common guidelines" (p.1). The level of language used, the nature of expectations, the clarity of description and explanation, and the time allotted for parent input, and the meaningfulness of the facilitator's responses were key factors in the parents' learning. When the above factors tended towards the negative, they "served to perpetuate the common perception of . . . 'expert' and 'non-expert' roles" (p.10). Norton and Campbell (1998) also stress the importance of participatory engagement in helping the group frame experiences so that they feel they have a meaningful role in shaping learning outcomes.

An important factor in fostering participatory involvement is realizing the interrelationships between cognition and affect (Vygotsky, 1978). Wood, Bruner, and Ross (1976) also emphasize the significance of the affective dimension in learning, which they maintain can be separated into two parallel and simultaneously occurring dimensions: the intrapsychological and the interrelational. Participants in a learning environment (workshops) genuinely feel when they are welcomed, accepted, supported and cared about. Noddings (1984) argues that the co-construction of knowledge in an inter-personal setting closely resembles a caring encounter, which she equates with a moral relation between two or more people. Goldstein (1999) explains that in any caring encounter, receptivity is of crucial importance; it is a way of taking on the other's reality as possibility and feeling impelled to act on behalf of the other" (p. 656). Guided by this receptivity, facilitators are more likely to conceptualize the learning setting as

providing a time for parents when they set genuine goals, engage in meaningful outcomes, and are satisfied and confident participants. The sessions are participant directed rather than facilitator driven. The trainer/facilitator is there for the participants, rather than vice versa. A quote from Noddings (1984) in which the words "teachers" and "students" may be used very broadly, is most apropos: "The teacher is necessarily one-caring if she is to be the teacher and not simply a textbook like source from which the student may or may not learn" (p. 70).

Janes and Kermani (2001) point out that a successful learning program is not just training; there are other functions of such programs, such as therapy. Parents, expect to feel valued and whether they choose to engage in a discussion on current events affecting their lives in their neighbourhood, or whether they engage in a hands-on task in making a child's game, both must be seen as valued because they are important to them. Facilitators in this study noted that it was essential that time be provided for parents to interact socially. Tice (2000) notes that "parity in which each person's contribution to an interaction is equally valued, (is) a link between trust building and program collaboration" (p. 144). Parents made it quite clear in the present study that they were more likely to learn in a setting in which they felt valued, which they were more likely to describe it as warm and caring.

Multifactor Influence

Determining the success of a family literacy program cannot be based on any single factor. The content of the program is certainly one factor. The comprehensiveness of the PRINTS Program in providing activities across all aspects of a child's life contributed to its perceived usefulness and was influential in helping parents develop a broad perspective of literacy within a framework of STEPS (contexts) and ROLES. Overriding the actual content of a family literacy program, as specified on paper (or other medium), is the manner in which this is understood and operationalized. As this study shows, this does not occur at a single point but across a number of points at which the learning transferred. If there is a breakdown (misunderstanding, insufficient knowledge) at any one point, then it will affect the implementation at the final point -

the learning experience constructed by the parent/guardian for the child unless this is compensated for in some way. There are still the intrapersonal and extra-personal factors that may influence how a program is implemented. Intrapersonal characteristics of parents, such as interest, determination, and motivation (Fagan, 2001), and child characteristics, such as interests and attention span, as identified in this study, are crucial in determining the success of a family literacy program. External factors such as home environment (Neuman and Celano, 2001; Roskos, 1997; O'Sullivan and Howe, 1999) as well as the site at which the training sessions for parents are held, also impact on the outcome. Tice (2000) supports the findings of this study regarding site choice. Her study investigated a family literacy program held in a housing project which "established a system of accountability. The community watches our development and we engage in the life (of the) community" (p. 143). The success of a family literacy program cannot be determined on simplistic grounds. This study has emphasized the complexity of such an undertaking and the necessity of considering a multifactored approach.

Conclusions and Implications

There is considerable agreement that the home/community is a significant determinant of children's early literacy development (Sticht and McDonald, 1989; Taylor, 1983; Taylor and Dorsey-Gaines, 1988; Teale and Sulzby, 1986). Without home/community support, children are likely to find themselves at a disadvantage on entering school (Adler and Fisher, 2001; Duke, 2000). Stanovich, West and Harrison (1995) make this point as follows: "Children gain familiarity and practice with exposure to print, creating a reciprocal and increasingly positive relation toward initial and developing reading acquisition. However, those children who lack exposure and experiences with print are less likely to become involved in reading-related activities, and less motivated to read, beginning the spiraling effect of the rich-get-richer, poor-get-poorer phenomenon" (p.24).

But all home/community environments are not conducive to young children's literacy development. Even when parents are eager to help, they often do not understand how they can do so (Delgado-Gaitan, 1992). In order to support this interest and intent on the part of parents, provision should be made to provide them with the knowledge and skills they need. A broad, rather than a narrow definition of family literacy should best guide this learning for parents. Auerbach (1989) believes that approaching family literacy from "school-like literacy activities" may negatively impact on the social-contextual demands of family life. "If, on the other hand, educators define family literacy more broadly to include a range of activities and practices that are integrated into the fabric of daily life, the social context becomes a rich resource that can inform rather than impede learning" (p. 166).

Underpinning all of this is the importance of the "what is" and "how" of family literacy programs. Purcell-Gates (1993) cautions: "to avoid throwing money at a 'problem', that is only dimly understood, the research base for family literacy programs must be seen as crucial and worthy of our attention and concern" (p. 671). This study is one attempt to provide a greater understanding of the implementation of family literacy programs. It is not an attempt to test one theory of transfer of learning against another (Greeno, 1997; Kirschner & Whitson. 1998). It does show that learning does transcend different personnel at different junctures or learning points in the implementation of a family literacy program, learning that cannot be overlooked in understanding the effects of family literacy programs.

References

Adler, M. A., & Fisher, C. A. (2001). Early reading programs in high-poverty schools: A case study of beating the odds. *The Reading Teacher*, *54* (6), 616-619.

Anderson, B., & Stokes, S. J. (1984). Social and institutional influences on the development and practice of literacy. In H. Goelman, A. A. Oberg, & F. Smith (Eds.), *Awakening to literacy (pp. 24-37).* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Auerbach, E. R. (1989). Toward a social-contextual approach to family literacy. *Harvard Educational Review*, *59* (2), 165-181.

Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (1998). Local literacies: Reading and writing in one community. London: Routledge, 1998

Broad, M. (1997). *Transferring learning to the workplace*. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.

Burns, M. (1993). *Mathematics: Assessing understanding*. White Plains, NY: Cuisenaire Company of America.

Clark, M. M. (1976). *Young fluent readers: What they can teach us*. London, England: Heinemann Educational Books.

Datnow, A., & Castellano, M. (2000). Teachers' responses to success for all: How beliefs, experiences, and adaptations shape implementation. *American Educational Research Journal*, *37* (3), pp.775-799.

Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1992). School matters on the Mexican-American home: Socializing children to education. *American Education Education Journal*, *29*, 495-516.

Duke, N. K. (2000). For the rich it's richer: Print experiences and environments offered to children in very low- and very high-socioeconomic status first-grade classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal*, *37* (2) 441-478.

Elmore, R., & Sykes, G. (1992). Curriculum policy. In P. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum (pp. 185-215)*. New York: Macmillan.

Fagan, W. T. (2000). Early literacy development: Circumventing the home-school gap. *Morning Watch, 24* (3-4). online,
www.mun.ca/~vo3jcc/morningwatch/morningw/htm

Fagan, W. T. (2001). Literacy: The academic and the political. Unpublished manuscript, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, NF.

Fagan, W.T., & Cronin, M. C. (1998). *Growing into literacy: PRINTS Program (Parents' Roles Interacting with Teacher Support)*. St. John's, NF: Memorial University Printing Services.

Ferdman, B. M. (1990). Literacy and cultural identity. *Harvard Educational Review*, *60* (2), 181-201.

Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.

Goldstein, L. S. (1999). The relational zone: The role of caring relationships in the co-construction of mind. *American Educational Research Journal*, *36* (3), 647-673.

Greeno, J. G. (1997). On claims that answer the wrong question. *Educational Researcher*, *26* (1), 5-17.

Grimes, J., & Davies, C. (March, 1997). Understanding partnerships with parents: Does the ORIM framework help? Paper presented at the American Education Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago.

Hannon, P., & Nutbrown, C. (April, 1996). Teachers' use of theoretical framework for preschool intervention with parents. Paper presented at the American Education Research Association Annual Meeting, New York.

Hoare. Q. (1997). Education: Programmes and people. In M. Hoyles (Ed.), *The politics of literacy (pp. 33-53)*. London, Eng.: Writers and Readers Publishing Cooperative, 1977.

Jacob, E. (1984). Learning literacy through play: Puerto Rican kindergarten children. In H. Goelman, A. A. Oberg, & F. Smith (Eds.), *Awakening to literacy (pp. 73-83)*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Janes, H. & Kermani, H. (2001). Caregiver's story reading to young children in family literacy programs: Pleasure or punishment? *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, *44* (5), 458-467.

Kirschner, D., & Whitson, J. (1998). Obstacles to understanding cognition as situated. *Educational Researcher*, *27* (8), 22-28.

Kuhn, T. S. (1973). *The structure of scientific revolution (3rd edition)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Leseman, P. P. M., & deJong, P. F. (1998). Home literacy: Opportunity, instruction, cooperation and social emotional quality predicting early reading achievement. *Reading Research Quarterl*y, *33* (3), 294-318.

Llywelyn, M. (1998). *1916: A Novel of the Irish Rebellion*. New York: Tom Doherty Associates.

Mandel-Morrow, L., Tracey, D.H., & Maxwell, C. M. (Eds.) (1995). *A survey of family literacy in the United States*. Newark, DL: International Reading Association.

Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Neumann, S., & Celano, D. (2001). Access to print in low-income and middle-income communities: An ecological study of four neighbourhoods. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *36* (1), 8-26.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Norton, M., & Campbell, P. (1988). *Learning for out health*. The Learning Centre Literacy Association, Edmonton, AB.

O'Sullivan, J., & Howe, M. (1999). *Overcoming poverty: Promoting literacy in children from low income families*. Thunder Bay, ON: Lakehead University. http://www.nald.ca/PROVINCE/ALT/CRL/Projects/Opoverty/cover.htm

Purcell-Gates, V. (1993). Issues for family literacy research: Voices from the trenches. *Language Arts*, *70*, 670-677.

Roskos, K. (March, 1997). An ecocultural view of early literacy learning. Paper presented at the American Education Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago.

Schank, R. C., & Abelson, R. P. *Scripts, plans, goals and understanding.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1977.

Sénéchal, M., LeFevre, J., Thomas, E. M., & Daley, D. E. (1998). Differential effects of home literacy experiences on the development of oral and written language. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *33* (1), 96-116.

Shepard, L. A. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher*, *29* (7), 4-14.

Smith, F. (1983a). The politics of ignorance. In F. Smith (Ed.), *Essays into literacy (pp. 1-11).* London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Smith, F. (1983b). The choice between teachers and programs (pp. 107-116). In F. Smith (Ed.), *Essays into literacy (pp. 1-11).* London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Snyder, J., Bolin, F., & Zumwalt, K. (1992). Curriculum implementation. In P. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum (pp. 402-435).* New York: Macmillan.

Stanovich, K. E., West, R., & Harrison, M. (1995). Knowledge growth and maintenance across the life span: The role of print exposure. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *31*, 811-826.

Sticht, T. G., &v McDonald, B. A. (1989). *Making the nation smarter: The intergenerational transfer of cognitive ability*. San Diego, CA: Applied Behavioral and Cognitive Sciences.

Taylor, D. (1983). *Family literacy*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Taylor, D. (Ed.) (1997). *Many literacies, many families: An international declaration of principles*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Taylor, D., & Dorsey-Gaines, C. (1988*). Growing up literate: Learning from inner-city families*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Taylor, M. (1998). *Partners in the transfer of learning: A resource manual for workplace instructors.* Ottawa, ON: University of Ottawa.

Teale, W., & Sulzby, E. (1986). *Emergent literacy: writing and reading*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Thomas. A. (Ed.). (1998). *Family literacy in Canada: Profiles of effective practices*. Welland, ON: éditions Soleil publishing, inc.

Thomas, A., & Skage, S. (1998). Overview of perspectives on family literacy: Research and practice. In A. Thomas (Ed*.), Family literacy in Canada: Profiles of effective practices (pp.5-24).* Welland, ON: éditions Soleil publishing inc.

Tice, C. J. (2000). Enhancing family literacy through collaboration: Program considerations. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, *44* (2), 138-151.

Torrey, J. W. (1969). Learning to read without a teacher: A case study. *Elementary English*, *46* (5), 550-556, 658.

Vygotsky, L (1978). *Mind and society: The development of higher mental pr*ocesses. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walczyk, J. J. (2000). The interplay between automatic and control processes in reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *35* (4), 554-566.

Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *17*, 89-100.

Table 1

Demographics of Subjects

Number of parents involved in program	200
Number of facilitators involved in program	20
Program sites	26
Average no. of parents per program	10
Range of parents per program	4-24
Number of children involved in program	280*
Age range	1-8
Number of target parents in study	80
Number of Males and Females	2-78
Number of target children in study	80

Level of children at the time of the PRINTS Program

Preschool (Age 3 and 4)	42
Kindergarten	30
Primary	6
Elementary	2
Boys:	38
Girls:	42

Level of children at time of data collection

Preschool (Age 3 and 4)	42
Kindergarten	18
Primary	20
Number of target facilitators in study	20

*Some parents had more than one preschool child.

Table 2

Literacy Attitude Inventory
    Literacy Items:

I have a new pencil to mark with.	2.80
My Mom/Dad gives me paper to mark on.	2.78
I get to look at books.	2.76
My Mom/Dad gives me paper to write on.	2.72
Mom/Dad reads a book to me before going to bed.	2.70
I get a book for my birthday.	2.67
I see lots of books in a store.	2.55
My Mom/Dad reads a book to me when I can't play outdoors.	2.46
I think about going to school.	2.38
I watch someone else reading.	2.36
Overall Mean:	2.62

    Non-Literacy Items:

I visit my friend.	2.98
I get a toy for a present.	2.93
I play outdoors with my friends.	2.93
My friend comes to visit.	2.90
I watch TV.	2.88
I get to go to the store.	2.79
I can use my crayons to colour.	2.76
My Mom/Dad calls me for supper.	2.67
Mom/Dad says it is time to go to bed.	2.38
I put away my toys.	2.36
Overall Mean:	2.75

Table 3
Parents' Ranking of Children's Reading and Writing Behaviours

READING

Child understands front and back of book	3.66
Child asks you to read to him/her	3.66
Child looks at books on his/her own	3.64
Child talks about the pictures in the book	3.60
Child recognizes that you read "words"	3.50
Child remembers lines from the story and says them just as you read the first word of the line	3.26
Child asks questions about what you are reading	3.24
Child makes up stories that sound like "book language"	3.22
Child attempts to read words in a left to right manner	3.06
Child relates a story to things in his/her life	3.02
Child points to words as he/she attempts to read	2.96
Child remembers words that have been skipped	2.90
Overall mean:	3.31

WRITING

Child makes marks that look like letters	3.65
Child eagerly uses crayons, paper, etc.	3.62
Child is interested in print found on signs, stores, etc.	3.38
Child prints letters in a row so that they look like words	3.34
Child asks someone to read what he/she "wrote"	3.16
Child asks how to spell words	3.12
Child uses pictures with his/her writing to tell a story	2.85
Child writes words he/she recognizes	2.76
Child asks someone to write a story or message for him/her	2.48
Child writes his/her own story or message	2.40
Overall mean:	3.07

Table 4

Teachers' Rating of Children's Reading and Writing Behaviours

Interested in bringing school material home	3.70
Participates in reading and writing activities in class	3.66
Interested in books	3.60
Engages in printing/drawing activities	3.52
Attempts to write	3.24
Feels secure in a reading/writing environment	3.20
Attempts to read	3.10
Prints words that he/she knows	3.00
Talks about books read at home	2.94
Asks questions about books	2.85
Overall Mean	3.28

Table 5
Literacy Attitude Inventory: Children in Top and Bottom Quartiles

	TQ	BQ
Literacy Items:		
I have a new pencil to mark with.	2.95	2.30
My Mom/Dad gives me paper to mark on.	2.95	2.30
I get to look at books.	2.95	2.20
My Mom/Dad gives me paper to write on.	2.90	2.15
Mom/Dad reads a book to me before going to bed.	2.85	2.00
I get a book for my birthday.	2.85	2.00
I see lots of books in a store.	2.85	1.90
My Mom/Dad reads a book to me when I can't play outdoors.	2.85	1.90
I think about going to school.	2.85	1.90
I watch someone else reading.	2.80	1.90
Overall Mean:	2.89	2.05

Table 6
Parents' Ranking of Reading and Writing Behaviours of Children in Top and Bottom Quartile

	TQ	BQ
READING		
Child understands front and back of book	3.90	2.85
Child asks you to read to him/her	3.90	2.80
Child looks at books on his/her own	3.85	2.80
Child talks about the pictures in the book	3.80	2.75
Child recognizes that you read "words"	3.80	2.75
Child remembers lines from the story and says them just as you read the first word of the line	3.75	2.65
Child asks questions about what you are reading	3.75	2.65
Child makes up stories that sound like "book language"	3.75	2.55
Child attempts to read words in a left to right manner	3.70	2.50
Child relates a story to things in his/her life	3.70	2.25
Child points to words as he/she attempts to read	3.60	2.20
Child remembers words that have been skipped	3.55	1.90
Overall mean:	3.75	2.55
WRITING		
Child makes marks that look like letters	4.00	2.55
Child eagerly uses crayons, paper, etc.	4.00	2.50
Child is interested in print found on signs, stores, etc.	3.80	2.40
Child prints letters in a row so that they look like words	3.75	2.35
Child asks someone to read what he/she "wrote"	3.75	2.35
Child asks how to spell words	3.60	2.20
Child uses pictures with his/her writing to tell a story	3.60	1.80
Child writes words he/she recognizes	3.55	1.75
Child asks someone to write a story or message for him/her	3.50	1.75
Child writes his/her own story or message	3.45	1.00
Overall mean:	3.70	2.06

Table 7

Parents' Rating of their Awareness of their Literacy Behaviours with their Children

	Top Q.	Bottom Q.
Spends more time with the child on reading/ writing activities	3.67	3.24
Gives positive feedback to the child in reading/ writing activities	3.67	2.44
Reads to the child more	3.65	3.12
Tries to find new (different) books for the child	3.65	2.65
Gives help to the child when he/she asks for it when "reading"	3.63	3.00
Talks about books read	3.53	2.72
Gives help to the child when he/she asks for it when "writing"	3.49	2.65
Uses the library to borrow books for the child	2.51	.88
Overall mean:	3.48	2.58

Table 8
Significance of Various Parts of the PRINTS Program for Facilitators

	Facilitators of Parents of Children	
	Top Quartile	Bottom Quartile
Developing concepts of the STEPS	4.96	3.85
Books distributed for children	4.92	4.85
Developing concepts of the ROLES	4.90	3.05
Hands-on learning of Activities	4.85	4.00
Parent input on what is happening in their children's lives	4.69	4.60
Explanation of Activities	4.23	4.20
Parent input in understanding concepts of family/early literacy	4.23	4.00
Parent involvement in evaluation	4.23	4.20
Parent Handbook	4.26	2.82
Use of Parent Video to illustrate Activities (The video was not available at the time for the majority of the facilitators. Only 6 responded.)	4.22	3.12
Overall Mean:	4.55	3.87