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ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTS OF PARENT INVOLVEMENT ON THE READING ACHIEVEMENT AND READING ENGAGEMENT OF STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN A BALANCED READING CURRICULUM

LeDonna M. York

University of Nebraska, 2006

Advisor: Dr. Karen L. Hayes

This study evaluated the reading achievement scores and reading engagement outcomes of second grade students, in an urban magnet center, whose parents were randomly selected to participate in active parent involvement training (APIT; \( n = 13 \)) sessions compared to information based parent involvement training (IBPIT; \( n = 6 \)) sessions. Results of the pretest posttest two group comparative study examined (a) reading achievement scores as measured by (i) Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills 6th edition (DIBELS;) and (ii) Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE;) and (b) reported reading engagement frequencies as measured by student (i) school absences, (ii) off-task behaviors, (iii) off-task disruptive behaviors and (c) parent perceptions as measured by the Parent As A Teacher (PAAT) questionnaire. Students whose parents participated in APIT and IBPIT were found to show significant gain in DIBELS oral reading fluency scores, and parents who participated in APIT and IBPIT felt empowered to
teach their children at the end of the study. Therefore, students whose parents participated in APIT and IBPIT would be expected to experience continued growth in reading achievement and reading engagement, when parents are intentionally invited to participate in the education of their child.
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CHAPTER 1
Introduction

In the history of education, few topics have sparked such public debate as the impact of the home environment on the teaching of reading. Because reading is at the heart of every child's learning, it has been a principle educational focus for more than a century. According to Flannery and Jehlen (2005) it is time to change the focus from defining the problem of teaching children to read, to doing something about it, which includes greater parental involvement.

The most fundamental responsibility of schools is teaching students to read. There are numerous daily tasks that make it challenging for many families to be systematically involved in the process of teaching their child to read. For example, a 16-hour workday, the responsibilities of being a wife or a single parent makes this involvement an even more challenging task (Comer, 2005; Jimenez, 2001; Wagner, Spiker, & Linn, 2002). Due to the overwhelming demands placed on families today, much of the responsibility for improving reading proficiency has fallen on the shoulders of the classroom teacher.

The most common approach given toward struggling at-risk youth by many educators feels like a "treatment to do nothing" strategy (Hill, 1989) with little to no results. Henderson and Mapp (2002) stated that this laissez-faire strategy assumes that it is the responsibility of the school
district to take care of the 40 million children in the United States between the ages of 4 and 13, of whom 40 to 50 percent are defined as struggling readers. This group can be identified as youth with average intelligence but lacking the motivation to study and attend school with a good attitude, which is viewed as an important home variable for children's success in school (Henderson & Mapp, 2002).

Research has indicated that parental involvement in a child's learning to read is critical (Thompson, Alexander, & Entwisle, 1988). In schools where teachers reported high levels of outreach to parents, test scores grew at a rate 40 percent greater than in schools where teachers reported low levels of outreach (Henderson & Mapp, 2002). Outreach is described as a creative process that teachers use to communicate with families; more than a phone call or written communication.

The purpose of this study is to determine the effects of active parent involvement training (APIT) compared to information based parent involvement training (IBPIT) on second grade students reading achievement and reading engagement.

Literature about the Problem

The amount of research and study surrounding both parental involvement in the educational process and the most effective methods of teaching reading are substantial. Due to what the literature refers to as reading wars, many
parents do not understand reading paradigms such as the phonics, and/or whole language approaches. Despite their interest and desire to help, parents often remain confused about reading instruction (Carbo, 1996; Jones, 1996; "Phonics," 1998).

Bardwell and Kolostade (1997) suggest the answer to this confusion for parents would be to carefully prepare parent workshops, designed to address questions about this well-known confusion. Bartolome's (1994) research also reveals that early intervention is the most effective strategy for helping youth who are struggling readers.

Many young children enter kindergarten with poorly developed oral language skills that are thought to negatively affect their ability to learn to read. The vocabulary and syntactic knowledge of children from low-income homes lag considerably behind their more economically advantaged peers. Students from middle-income homes often have vocabularies three times greater than that of low-income students. These language development issues can be addressed, at least in part, through parent training in the use of story books at home (Hart & Risley, 1995).

Longitudinal studies have proposed that parent involvement in the teaching of reading process has also been historically well established and has brought about positive results (Bricklin, 1991). Bricklin found that family influences have had large impact on children's self concept.
and learning. The researchers stated that family variables such as marital discord and parental mental health problems have been correlated with the incidence of emotional factors associated with reading. Bricklin further argues that family communication, language development and the formation of attitudes toward school and achievement are of greatest concern when considering the development of “self as learner” (p. 206) and the promotion of “self as reader” (p. 212).

It appears logical that parents can be taught through parent programs how to interact with their child in order to increase the child’s positive feelings as a reader and to provide language experiences to children in at-risk families that are congruent with economically advantaged families. However, the notion of teaching parents how to support successful early literacy development must be researched systematically using a proper research design and accurate and specific measures (Cowen, 2001; Jeynes, 2005; Payne, 1996).

Purpose Statement

This study addressed the literature on the importance of working with families in an urban setting, who have few economic advantages. The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of parental participation in active parent involvement training (APIT) sessions compared to parental participation in information based parent...
involvement training (IBPIT) sessions on second grade 
students reading achievement and reading engagement.

This study utilized an experimental design, randomly 
assigning parents to either the APIT and IBPIT sessions. 
APIT sessions were designed to foster and support weekly 
parent and child reading activities with active school 
administration support. IBPIT sessions were designed to 
foster and support weekly parent and child reading 
activities with information based school administration 
support. While parents participated in IBPIT and APIT 
sessions their second grade students participated in 
balanced reading curriculum activities (Fitzgerald, 1999; 
McIntyre & Pressley, 1996; Spiegel, 1994; Swanson, 1999) at 
school. All participating children were assessed in terms of 
their reading achievement and their reading engagement.

Theoretical Perspective

While educational inequities have been addressed, 
(Brown vs. Board of Educ., 1954), educational academic 
achievement cannot be legislated (No Child Left Behind Act- 
NCLB; 2001). The federal mandate to address academic 
achievement, (NCLB) further creates an achievement gap 
between those who achieve and those who do not. Rothstein 
(2004) argues that efforts to close the achievement gap that 
focus on school policies, while ignoring socio-economic 
status (SES) characteristics that influence student 
learning, will fail. Parents or primary caregivers are most
influential in a child's early years (Thompson et al., 1988; Peechia, 2002).

Comer (1986) supported the theory of including parents in their child's education. He also denoted the importance of the home environment as a nurturing atmosphere for children. More recent studies (Fairbanks, 2003; Nail, 2001; Peechia, 2002; Sy, 2002; Williams, 2003) have suggested that parental involvement is a key component for improving student achievement. Single-parent households, more mothers at work, more children living at or below the poverty level, increase in abusive use of drugs and alcohol, are all societal elements that potentially can disrupt the home and interfere with children's learning to read (Comer, 1986).

Strickland and Shanahan (2004) compiled research that determined that oral language development, a precursor of learning to read, is facilitated 1) when children have many opportunities to use language in interactions with adults, both one-on-one and in small groups, 2) when they frequently engage in extended conversations with adults, and 3) when they listen to and respond to stories told and read to them. These activities enable the student to describe events, build background knowledge, and extend their vocabulary.

Research supports the importance of oral language as a precursor to students acquiring proficient reading skills (Hart & Risley, 1995). Strickland and Shanahan (2004) provided six factors that contribute to oral language
competency: 1) listen and respond to music, stories and discussions; 2) listen for various purposes: enjoyment, understanding, following directions, engaging in dialogue with others, and to listen for patterns in language; 3) engage in oral language activities that are linguistically, cognitively, and verbally stimulating; 4) observe adults writing as the adults say the words aloud; 5) observe and follow along as adults track print from left to right while reading aloud; and 6) independently browse through books from front to back and draw and write independently.

Reading Process. Because this study was designed to provide parents with opportunities to directly teach and positively influence their children's reading skill development, an historical overview of the reading process and a discussion of the path of normal reading acquisition are necessary.

There are two widely used models of reading acquisition. Strategy Instruction (SI) emphasizes meaning-based or top-down cognitive paradigm processes (Goodman & Goodman, 1979; Smith, 1971; Swanson, 1999). Effective SI instruction emphasizes graphic organizers to provide mental scaffolding on which to build new understanding. SI also emphasizes connection of what a student already knows and the material to be learned. This is done by utilizing hands
on materials such as who, what, where, when, why wheels or maps for pre-writing brainstorming activities and story maps to improve reading comprehension performance on questions related to identifying characters, setting problems and major events.

By contrast to the top-down models there are bottom-up models or Direct Instruction (DI) behavioral paradigm processes. DI emphasizes the development of decoding and spelling processes (LaBerge & Samuels, 1974; Liberman, 1989, Swanson, 1999). DI focuses on isolated sub-skills including sound units, such as letter sounds, such as rat-sat-bat, and phonological awareness units, such as beats of select consonant-vowel-consonant words, S-I-T S(clap)-I (clap)-T(clap). With this model it is important for a student to achieve automaticity in the decoding process, thus freeing the conscious mind to spend more time on processing text meaning than on identifying the words themselves. When children can reflect on these sound elements in words, they are on their way to unlocking the mystery of the alphabetic system (Lyon, 1995).

For the purposes of this study Comer’s (2005) theory suggests that student engagement and student achievement will advance when parents are partners in teaching their students to read.
Assumptions

The assumption of this study was that when parents are provided a structured means to be actively involved in the teaching of their child to read, students will be engaged in the process and reading motivation will increase. Moreover, several studies indicate that parental involvement in the learning process increases student engagement (Fairbanks, 2003; Mitchell, 2002; Nail, 2001; Peechia, 2002; Sy, 2002; Williams, 2003).

Delimitations of the Study

This study was delimited to a sample of second grade families in one metropolitan, urban school district. APIT and IBPIT parent involvement groups took place weekly for four months, from September, 2005, to January, 2006. A final delimitation was potential intermittent parent attendance at the APIT sessions and assumed correct use of the provided materials in the IBPIT sessions.

Limitations of the Study

There were limitations to this study in terms of generalizability. First, the sample was heterogeneous in terms of parent gender, education level, socioeconomic status and location of home residence. However, all of the participants were from predominantly working, lower-middle socioeconomic backgrounds. Target accrual for the study was 20 parents, with or without partners, in the APIT sessions.
and their second grade student(s) and, 20 parents, with or without partners, in the IBPIT sessions and their second grade student(s). This study was also limited in terms of generalizability due to the small sample size. Forty second grade families were invited to participate and were randomly assigned to either the Active or the Information based training session. The final number of parent and student participants was influenced by high parent mobility that resulted in student transfers.

Definition of Terms

APIT. APIT is an independent variable in this study. APIT is the participation of the parent or guardian of 20 second-grade students who were taught using the Nebraska Reading First, balanced reading curriculum. The parents were randomly assigned to the school sessions and along with their student met once a week for four months, starting September, 2005, through January, 2006. Each session was one hour in length. APIT sessions were facilitated by a session leader (the assistant principal of the urban magnet center and principal investigator) and focused on reading fluency and reading comprehension practices that reflected the Nebraska Reading First, balanced reading curriculum that students used every day in school.
Balanced reading curriculum. Balanced Reading Curriculum, a study constant, is defined as a model that integrates features of both the Direct Instruction and the Strategy Instruction, that is, a combination of whole language and phonics approaches (Carbo, 1996; Fitzgerald, 1999; McIntyre & Pressley, 1996; Swanson, 1999).

Comprehension. An essential component defined as the ability to understand and gain meaning from the written word (Vaughn & Linan-Thompson, 2004).

Fluency. An essential component defined as the capability to read text accurately and quickly (Vaughn & Linan-Thompson, 2004; Swanson, 1999).

IBPIT. IBPIT was an independent variable in this study. IBBPIT was the participation of the parent or guardian of 20 second-grade students who participated in the Nebraska Reading First, balanced reading curriculum. Parents were randomly assigned to the home sessions along with their student, met once a week for four months, starting September, 2005 through January, 2006. Each session was one hour in length. All information about reading support and all reading material were provided to each parent leader by the facilitator. Home sessions were facilitated by parent leaders (each student's parent(s)) and focused on reading fluency and reading comprehension practices that reflected the Nebraska Reading First, balanced reading curriculum that students used everyday in school.
In essence, the IBPIT parents were provided the same information as the APIT parents. The difference was the location where the sessions occurred (home versus school) and whether there was a school facilitator or not (APIT or IBPIT).

Nebraska Reading First. Nebraska Reading First was a reading program formed by the Congress and the United States Department of Education. The program identified research based strategies to help children learn to read. The five essential elements that were identified as important in preventing reading failure included: 1) phonemic awareness, 2) phonics, 3) vocabulary, 4) comprehension, and 5) fluency. All participating students' classroom teachers participated in monthly, research based balanced reading instruction, from a scripted format lead by the school district reading offices and a building reading teacher. The Nebraska Department of Education reading evaluators observed all second grade teachers once every other month, throughout the term of the research project. The building principal and reading coach observed weekly. The weekly observations were discussed with the classroom teacher to ensure consistent implementation of the balanced reading curriculum on a daily basis (NCLB, 2001).

Parent involvement. Parent involvement is defined as the participation of the parent or guardian-with or without
partners-in the school APIT sessions and the home IBPIT sessions.

Phonemic Awareness. The ability to hear, identify and manipulate individual sounds in spoken words (Swanson, 1999; Vaughn & Linan-Thompson, 2004).

Phonics. The relationship between letters and sounds (Swanson, 1999; Vaughn & Linan-Thompson, 2004).

Reading achievement. One dependent variable was the students reading achievement. The dependent measures of reading achievement were defined by students pretest and posttest performance on diagnostic assessments including, 1) the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills 6th edition (DIBELS; Good & Kaminski, 2003); and 2) a reading fluency assessment, Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE; Cassidy, Samuels & Williams, 2001). DIBELS and GRADE are used nationally as diagnostic assessments.

Reading engagement. The second dependent variable was students reading engagement. Reading engagement was defined by the following objective measures: posttest data for 1) student school absences (SSA), 2) student school off-task behaviors (SSOTB) requiring removal from reading class and referral to the Positive Action Center; 3) student school disruptive behaviors (SSDB) during reading class requiring removal from class and referral to the administrative office; and 4) parent perceptions of their students reading
engagement (PPSRE) as measured by the Parent as a Teacher questionnaire (PAAT; Strom, 1995; Appendix E).

Vocabulary. The words students must know to communicate effectively (Swanson, 1999; Vaughn & Linan-Thompson, 2004).

Research Questions

To guide the inquiry, the following research questions were posed:

1. Did those students whose parents participated in APIT sessions, pretest compared to posttest reading achievement, result in statistically significant differences as measured by DIBELS for oral reading fluency?

2. Did those students whose parents participated in IBPIT sessions, pretest compared to posttest reading achievement, result in statistically significant differences as measured by DIBELS oral reading fluency?

3. Did those students whose parents participated in APIT or IBPIT sessions, posttest compared to posttest reading achievement, result in statistically significant differences as measured by DIBELS oral reading fluency?

4. Did those students whose parents participated in APIT sessions, pretest compared to posttest reading achievement, result in statistically significant differences as measured by GRADE (a) reading vocabulary, (b) reading comprehension, and (c) reading total standard scores?

5. Did those students whose parents participated in IBPIT sessions, pretest compared to posttest reading
achievement, result in statistically significant differences as measured by GRADE (a) reading vocabulary, (b) reading comprehension, and (c) reading total standard scores?

6. Did those students whose parents participated in APIT sessions have consistent GRADE posttest reading achievement for (a) reading vocabulary, (b) reading comprehension, and (c) reading total standard scores? Is there a statistically significant interaction between students reading achievement, whose parents participated in APIT sessions, GRADE (a) reading vocabulary, (b) reading comprehension, and (c) reading total standard scores?

7. Did those students whose parents participated in IBPIT sessions have consistent GRADE posttest reading achievement for (a) reading vocabulary, (b) reading comprehension, and (c) reading total standard scores? Is there a statistically significant interaction between students reading achievement, whose parents participated in IBPIT sessions, GRADE (a) reading vocabulary, (b) reading comprehension, and (c) reading total standard scores?

8. Did those students whose parents participated in APIT sessions have comparable GRADE posttest reading achievement for (a) reading vocabulary, (b) reading comprehension, and (c) reading total standard scores
compared to those students whose parents participated in IBPIT sessions?

   a. Are students whose parents participated in APIT sessions, posttest GRADE reading vocabulary standard scores, statistically different from students whose parents participated in IBPIT sessions?

   b. Are students whose parents participated in APIT sessions, posttest GRADE reading comprehension standard scores, statistically different from students whose parents participated in IBPIT sessions?

   c. Are students whose parents participated in APIT sessions, posttest GRADE reading total standard scores, statistically different from students whose parents participated in IBPIT sessions?

9. Did those students whose parents participated in APIT and IBPIT sessions, posttest compared to posttest reading engagement frequencies, result in statistically significant differences as measured by reading engagement outcomes: (a) Student School Absence (SSA), (b) Student School Off-Task Behaviors (SSOTB), and (c) Student School Disruptive Behaviors (SSDB)?

10. Did those parents who participated in APIT and IBPIT sessions, posttest compared to posttest reading engagement subtest score frequencies for teaching/learning result in statistically significant differences as measured by the teaching/learning questions in the Parent Perceptions
of Student Reading Engagement (PPSRE) Parent As A Teacher (PAAT) questionnaire?

Significance of the Study

Early parent involvement is critical, more so in the urban school setting due to the increasing demands on the family. Hart and Risley (1995) concluded that after the age of 9, it is more difficult for a child to catch up if they have fallen behind in reading. The link between supportive parental involvement and children's literacy development is well established. True reading involves understanding. What children bring to a lesson, whether oral or written, influences the understanding they take away. The more limited a child's experiences, the more likely it is that he or she will have difficulty with reading.

Increased communication and conversation in the home environment can build background knowledge about the world and increase the amount of language and words being used on a daily basis. Listening and speaking provide children with a sense of words and sentences, build sensitivity for children to acquire phonological awareness and phonics, and provide a means by which children can demonstrate their understanding of words and written material. The hope is that this study provides parents with an opportunity to be actively engaged in their child's reading development. A
further desire is for the study findings to contribute to parent involvement research, practice and policy.

The results of this study will assist parents and educators that are working toward a common goal--student engagement and student achievement--in not only reading, but the educational process in its entirety (Cross, 1981).

Finally, the findings of this study can assist in helping some parents to recognize that they are their child's first teacher and their child's success is not an option, but rather a necessity. The home is the natural place for learning to read.

This is particularly important with NCLB legislation (NCLB, 2001) making great demands with expectations for school districts to evaluate the need for structured parent participation programs to be a requirement within the early elementary grades. APIT and IBPIT were parent programs based on effective parent involvement research (Cross, 1981; Flannery & Jehlen, 2005; Hart and Risley, 1995; Knowles, 1998; Rothstein, 2004; Spear-Swerling & Sternberg, 1994; Strickland & Shanahan, 2004).

Outline of the Study

Chapter 2 reviews relevant literature. Chapter 3 describes the research design, methods and procedures that were used to gather and analyze the data of this study. Chapter 4 includes an analysis of the data, and Chapter 5 provides conclusions and discussion.
CHAPTER 2

Review of the Literature

This literature review provides a basis for the research questions. Such a literature review provides a framework for understanding how to structure parent involvement sessions based on: 1) effective parent involvement research, including adult learning theory; 2) an historical perspective of parental involvement in the learning environment; 3) an overview of parental involvement and reading; and 4) effective strategies to teach students to read.

**Effective Parent Involvement Research**

Researchers have reported mostly positive results when investigating the impact of parent involvement programs on children's reading achievement and reading engagement (Fairbanks, 2003; Mitchell, 2002; Nail, 2001; Peechia, 2002; Sy, 2002; Williams, 2003). However, a few studies have failed to use rigorous research methods and found little to no effect when parents were involved (Busco, 1991; Cornachione, 1999; Jeynes, 2005; Miller, 1995; Nesbit, 1993; Paige, 1992).

Parents and teachers working together can make a difference, when teachers and administrators believe that parents are doing the best they can, and parents know school personnel believe that (Clark, 2005).
There are some key components that should be considered when working with adults. The adult learning climate should not be authority-oriented, yet it should be informal and it should emphasize mutual respect and collaboration (Cross, 1981; Knowles, 1998). This implies that the facilitator should not assume the role of the expert in class, but emphasis should be placed on the fact that all participating members will play an important role in the learning process. The design of the class and the sequence of the information learned should depend on the adult learner. Programs may benefit from flexible meeting times and locations, addressing parents' multiple life roles, and providing the program to parents free of charge (Cross, 1981; Knowles, 1998).

Jimenez (2001) determined that the more resources a family can provide for their children, the more benefits a student has towards achieving a positive academic performance. Resources include experiences, parenting skills, daily communication, and knowledge about child development. Research has found that when parents are involved in parent training classes they experience improved knowledge of child development, improved sensitivity in parent-child relations, improved parental attitude toward child, and a decrease in child related stress (Cowen, 2001). Therefore, if schools can provide opportunity or resources for parents to participate in structured parent programs
with their children, reading achievement and reading engagement will be positively impacted.

The Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement (CIERA) conducted a national study of effective schools and accomplished teachers (Taylor, Pearson, Clark & Walpole, 1999). Seventy Grade 1-3 teachers from 14 schools participated. The participating teachers were observed for an hour of reading instruction each month from December through April. Additionally, the teachers were asked to keep a weekly time log of instructional activities in reading/language arts for a week in February and for a week in May, and to complete a questionnaire on school and classroom practices related to reading. In each classroom data were collected for two low and two average achieving readers in the fall and in the spring. In order to secure an index of overall school effectiveness, a composite score, based upon the overall school mean for students' gains on the individually administered reading measures and the school's average on whatever standardized test was used for Grade 3 students. Several variables were derived from the study to explain the differences between more and less effective schools. However, two variables were identified as the most effective in improving student reading achievement, level of home communication and student engagement.

The findings determined that there is a strong relationship found between school effectiveness and teacher
communication with parents, which is even stronger when examined as a building level phenomenon (Taylor et al., 1999). The results indicated that the children in most effective schools spent more time in independent reading (28 minutes per day) than children in least effective schools (19 minutes per day). Teachers in most effective schools mentioned time for students to read authentic texts as a factor contributing to their success. More so, teachers in most effective schools compared with the teachers in moderately and least effective schools, communicated more frequently with parents in one form or another: calls home, written communication, sending home traveling folders and participation in parent workshops. Rothstein (2004) suggested that the definition of schooling should be expanded to include crucial out of school hours in which families and communities are sole influences, and this alone will increase reading achievement.

Flannery and Jehlen (2005) define ways to "hook" parents: 1) don't waste a minute, 2) use the summer months as a time for learning for parents and children, 3) allow parents to attend parenting classes as students "catch up" on reading and math skills, 4) interact with the community, 5) parents cannot be expected to always come back to the school for evening meetings; instead teachers could hold meetings at the large apartment complex where many parents
live, and 6) be irresistible, teachers take parents, who
might not have children's books, on school sponsored
shopping trips to Barnes and Noble and participate in a
"lunch and learn" program, where families and teachers can
share a meal with one another.

Olofson and Niedersoe (1999) stated that parents who
said their children showed a very low interest in books and
story reading before age 5 had weak reading skills in Grade
4. The research literature is compelling, telling educators
to involve parents, so that children may be more successful
readers and learners in our schools and homes. Focused,
scientifically based reading research forms the basis of
parent involvement (Comer, 1986).

Parent Involvement in the Learning Environment

Parent involvement in education is not new. Early
American parents provided their children with knowledge and
skills necessary for survival. Parents also enriched their
children's lives by telling them important family stories.
Parents often also hired tutors to come into their homes and
teach their children.

During the 1700's parents controlled their children's
education (Greenberg, 1989). As time passed, schooling
became more and more centralized in small schools with
decreasing parent control (Comer, 1986). Eventually, direct parental contributions to their children’s day-to-day learning were not seen as important by emerging school systems (Comer, 1986; Greenberg, 1989). It was assumed that children should receive academic instruction predominantly from their teachers, who are experts in the field of education. This approach remained fairly consistent throughout the 1960’s (Smith, 1971).

According to Shapero and Forbes (1981), throughout the 1970’s educators became increasingly aware of the importance of early childhood skill development and the role that parents play as a child’s first teacher. This return to understanding the importance of parents as teachers resulted in schools establishing parent-training programs. With these changes, parents could, once again, become partners in the educational process (Comer, 1986; Cornachione, 1999; Cowen, 2001; Snow, Burns & Griffin, 1998).

Snow et al., (1998) found that “the seeds of literacy” (p. 23) are planted before children enter school. Parents played a critical role in the literacy development of their children. Knowledge about letters and sounds, print and pictures, words and sentences were a prerequisite for learning to read.

Studies indicated that parents supplied the experiences to build this basic knowledge early. However, now parents
are able to rely on preschool, day care, or kindergarten programs to bridge the early learning gap (Jeynes, 2005).

_**Parent Involvement and Reading**_

Researchers and professional organizations have synthesized research on learning to read (Lyon, 1995; Snow et al., 1998), effective school reform programs (Herman, 1999), and effective classroom practices for the primary grades (Taylor et al., 1999). Longitudinal studies have provided evidence that early interest in reading influenced subsequent achievement. Weinberger (1996) found that children who were experiencing reading difficulty by age 7 were less likely to have had a favorite book at age 3; and such children were read to less frequently by their parents, at age 5.

Even though the responsibility for improving reading proficiency falls on the shoulders of the classroom teacher, research continues to indicate the importance of parent involvement in developing a child’s ability to learn to read (Comer, 2005; Cowen, 2001; Hart & Risley, 1995). In schools where teachers report high levels of outreach to parents, student performance on district assessment scores have increased at a rate 40 percent greater than in schools where teachers reported low levels of outreach (Henderson & Mapp, 2002).

Early parental involvement has been critical to students learning to read. Parents in the home environment
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are a student's first teacher. The language experiences in the home environment have an impact on a student's ability to learn to read (Hart & Risley, 1995). After conducting a longitudinal study, researchers concluded that after second grade, if standard instruction did not eliminate language differences, a critical variable in children's early reading success, it would be difficult for a child to catch up if they have fallen behind in reading (Hart & Risley, 1995). In their study, Hart & Risley documented the development of vocabulary and the importance of emerging language in reading development. Their study was designed to discover the influence of home environments on how children learn language and the impact this had on their language preparation for their entrance into school. Low socio-economic status (SES) was found to widen the achievement gap of children's performance in school through the age of 9 (Hart & Risley, 1995).

Conducted over a 3-year period, the population studied consisted of children living in poverty, children born into middle-class homes and children with professional parents (Hart & Risley, 1995). Hart and Risley found that all of the children in their study had similar kinds of language experiences. For example, they all heard talk about: 1) persons and things; 2) relationships; 3) actions and feelings; and 4) past and future events. They all had interactions with others that provided 1) prompting; 2)
responses; 3) prohibition; and 4) affirmation. However, students who resided in the homes of professional families heard some things more often than children in poverty.

Results determined that children who resided in homes of professional class parents heard about 2,150 words per hour, a total of 30 million words in 3 years. The children who resided in homes of middle class parents heard about 1,250 words per hour, a total of 20 million words in 3 years. However, children who resided in homes that were living in poverty heard only about 620 words per hour, a total of 10 million words in three years (Hart & Risley, 1995). This longitudinal study further determined that frequency matters and that low SES children learned fewer words and acquired a vocabulary more slowly, which negatively impacts early reading skill development.

In an attempt to strengthen parent and child language interactions, for second and third grade students who faced difficulties reading, Ellis (1995) utilized a pretest/posttest experimental design to investigate the effects of a 12-week parent and child reading intervention program. Parents participated in weekly sessions that emphasized techniques to be used at home, such as: 1) relaxed reading, 2) paired reading, 3) discussion questions, and 4) praise and encouragement. The experimental group consisted of twenty parents who were randomly assigned to participate in the structured parent sessions. A subset of
eight children and eight parents were interviewed before and after participation in the program. Statistical analyses revealed significantly greater achievement in reading as measured by the number of errors on graded passages for the experimental group that participated in the structured parent reading sessions. Further results of this study indicated the need for parental involvement in the process of students learning to read, to improve students' reading achievement and reading self-concept.

Also working with struggling first grade students, Cole (1996) completed a study of parental participation in a parent literacy program. The results determined that there is a great need to provide opportunities to teach parents how to assist their children with literacy.

Nail (2001) also conducted a study to determine the effect of parent tutoring packages on academic achievement and parent tutoring behavior. A single subject research design was utilized with second graders experiencing failure in a basal reading program. After the introduction to the parent tutoring packages, parents were expected to display an increase in parental involvement and students were expected to show an increase in reading achievement. The findings indicated that participating students' average weekly test scores were higher after participation in the parent tutoring packages.
It may be that parents’ education level positively predicts children’s initial kindergarten achievement status, but more importantly, children’s initial achievement at the onset of their kindergarten year predicts their parents’ school participation and engagement in educational activities during the school year (Sy, 2002).

Peechia (2002) determined that it is essential for teachers and parents to work together and to form a partnership to ensure that children become successful readers. The focus was on the process, implementation, and benefits of creating a parental involvement program in a second grade classroom. Reading workshops were designed to instruct parents on strategies that could be used at home to support their child’s reading. As active participants in the reading workshops, parents became empowered to help their children become competent readers. The teachers and parents who participated in the reading workshops formed a partnership based on trust, which contributed to the success of the reading workshops and reading competence of the students. This study helped to determine the design of the parental involvement procedures used in this study.

To determine if a significant relationship existed, Fairbanks (2003) examined the relationship between parent involvement and academic achievement within the Ojibwe Indian population, according to Epstein’s (2001) six types of parental involvement by parents of fourth/fifth grade
students, and levels of academic achievement. Two sources of data were used to examine the relationship. The data analyses findings were as follows: 1) there are significant relationships between the extent of participation in two of Epstein's six types of parental involvement and levels of academic achievement by their children, and 2) there is a significant difference between the degree of involvement by parents of most successful students, and the degree of involvement by parents of least successful students. More recent studies have also supported the need for parents to be active participants in educating their child.

In a study to promote family literacy involvement, Williams (2003) using a mixed-method design explored and examined the reading attitudes and motivations for reading of second grade students who participated in a Reading Book Satchels (RBS) program. During a 16-week treatment period, students and their teachers were observed. The students' parents were interviewed. A questionnaire was completed by the parents that participated in the RBS program and by the parents who did not participate in the RBS program. The two groups completed a post questionnaire at the end of the study. An analyses of the data indicated that the reading attitudes and motivations for reading of second-grade students were influenced by parent involvement.

Reeves (2004) supports the need for parent involvement, noting that test scores are undeniably representative of the
effects of teaching, parent involvement, and student engagement.

Teaching Students to Read

Learning to read is a critical basic skill; yet there is no consensus on just how reading is learned (Bardwell & Kolostade, 1997). There are two widely used models of scientifically based instruction, direct instruction (DI) and strategy instruction (SI; Hill, Swain & Nero, 2003).

Direct Instruction. The Direct Instruction (DI) approach is characterized as a bottom-up behavioral paradigm that focuses on explicit skill building in reading, with an emphasis on sub-skills including sound, linguistic, and phonological units. Furthermore, the DI approach promotes small group instruction that is fast-paced, well sequenced, highly focused, and gives students numerous opportunities to respond and receive constructive feedback (Slavin, 1987).

The literature also refers to the DI approach as the traditional teaching technique or the phonics approach. The phonics approach investigates matching letters with sounds. The phonics approach was the dominant methodology in teaching reading well into the 20th century. However, a new paradigm shifted the focus to whole language, which is also referred to as strategy instruction in the reading literature (Bardwell & Kolostade, 1997; Grandgenett, Hill & Lloyd, 1995).
**Strategy Instruction.** The Strategy Instruction (SI) approach is characterized as a top-down cognitive paradigm processing with an emphasis on graphic organizers and a mental scaffolding to build new understanding. SI activities are hands on and emphasize connections between what the student already knows and the material to be learned (Grandgenett et al., 1995). The SI approach fosters academic growth and self-motivation by encouraging students to learn and discover at their own pace.

Moreover, recent literature on children’s early brain development indicates that improved memory and performance may be linked to activities and experiences that have a heightened emotional load, elaborate encoding, and information that serves a useful purpose in the child’s life (Schacter, 1996).

Brooks (2004) suggests that teaching students to read requires engagement coupled with student understanding. Teachers must not tell their students how to think; they must serve as the facilitators while teaching for meaning.

**Balanced Instruction.** What does a balanced approach to teaching reading really mean? Throughout all the literature-reading wars, “balance” is declared one of the hottest topics in reading education today (Cassidy & Cassidy, 1998-1999; Cassidy & Wenrich, 1998). Balanced instruction is a combination of SI and DI. SI provides an emphasis on the connections between what a student already knows and the new
material to be learned, coupled with DI which provides careful and explicit skill building in reading and phonics is what researchers define as balanced instruction (Lovett et al., 1994). Research results indicate that a combined DI/SI model or balanced curriculum yields the greatest results for potential benefits for students' reading improvement (Carbo, 1996; Cassidy & Cassidy, 1998-1999; Cassidy & Wenrich, 1998; McIntyre & Pressley, 1996; Swanson, 1999). Brooks (2004) indicates that students should transition from the basic skills from phonics to develop reasoning skills and critical thinking skills. It is evident that in many classrooms today, teachers are now implementing balanced approaches. Some are being asked to use balanced approaches by state departments of education or by administrators in their schools (McIntyre & Pressley, 1996).

McIntyre and Pressley (1996) suggest that balanced reading curriculum is really a practical approach about what kinds of reading knowledge children should develop and how knowledge can be attained.

Cooper and Hedges (1994) concluded that a coherent integration of SI and DI is what puts meaning at the heart of reading and will assist in providing effective reading instruction. According to Swanson (1999), this is most likely because both approaches, combined, utilized a step-by-step skill progression towards mastery, active
presentation styles for information, are well organized, and use visual prompts as well as demonstrations.

An understanding of the balanced approach to teaching reading, understanding of adult learning theory, and an overview of parent involvement in education can assist in providing effective instruction to parents (Spiegel, 1994).
CHAPTER 3
Methodology

This chapter outlines the independent variables, study constant, dependent variables and measures, research design, research questions, and data analysis that were used in the completion of this research study.

The purpose of this study is to determine the effects of Active Parent Involvement Training (APIT) compared to Information Based Parent Involvement Training (IBPIT) on second grade students reading achievement scores and reading engagement outcomes. The study is a quantitative pretest posttest experimental study. Parents were randomly assigned to either the APIT session or the IBPIT session independent variable arms.

Independent Variables

APIT and IBPIT served as the study independent variables. Parent involvement was defined as the participation of a parent or guardian in the APIT sessions or IBPIT sessions, with a commitment to use the training information to support and foster their child’s reading improvement.

APIT. Parents of 13 second-grade students who attended the urban magnet center participating in the Nebraska Reading First, balanced reading curriculum, were randomly assigned to the APIT school sessions. Parents and their students met once a week for four months starting September,
2005, through January, 2006. Each APIT school session was one hour in length. School sessions were facilitated by a session leader (the assistant principal of the urban magnet center and principal investigator) and focused on reading fluency and reading comprehension practices that reflect the Nebraska Reading First, balanced reading curriculum that students used every day in school.

APIT parents and their second grade children learned to engage in reading activities, using the following format at each APIT session (Flannery & Jehlen, 2005; Hart & Risley, 1995; Rothstein, 2004; Spear-Swerling & Sternberg, 1994; Strickland & Shanahan, 2004):

1) Students read to parents from independent level reading classroom material.

2) Students asked parents to answer reading comprehension questions from independent level reading classroom material.

3) Students read to parents from instructional level reading classroom material and parents provided correct word pronunciation for student word calling miscues, word omissions or word substitutions.

4) Students asked parents to answer reading comprehension questions from instructional level reading classroom material.

5) Parents read to students from provided reading classroom material.
6) Parents asked students to answer reading comprehension questions from provided reading classroom material.

7) Following each APIT session the parents, second grade children and APIT facilitator participated in a "Celebrate Reading Achievement" pizza party.

The overall goal was to build a partnership with parents, so they were empowered to be active members of their child’s education. The hope was that parents would finish each session with a wealth of information, including the importance of spending a small amount of time in "grand" conversation, frequently and daily with their child (Hart & Risley, 1995).

IBPIT. Parents of 6 second-grade students who attended the urban magnet center participating in the Nebraska Reading First, balanced reading curriculum, were randomly assigned to the IBPIT home sessions. Parents set aside one evening a week for four months starting September 2005 through January 2006 to instruct and support their students’ reading development. Each IBPIT home session was one hour in length. Home sessions were facilitated by each student’s parent and focused on reading decoding and reading comprehension practices that reflect the Nebraska Reading First balanced reading curriculum that students used every day in school.
The APIT session facilitator provided the IBPIT information packets and session format, which was identical to the APIT sessions with the exception that there was no trained facilitator.

IBPIT parents and their second grade children learned to engage in reading activities, using the following format, at each IBPIT session (Flannery & Jehlen, 2005; Hart & Risley, 1995; Rothstein, 2004; Spear-Swerling & Sternberg, 1994; Strickland & Shanahan, 2004):

1) Students read to parents from independent level reading classroom material.

2) Students asked parents to answer reading comprehension questions from independent level reading classroom material.

3) Students read to parents from instructional level reading classroom material and parents provided correct word pronunciation for student word calling miscues, word omissions or word substitutions.

4) Students asked parents to answer reading comprehension questions from instructional level reading classroom material.

5) Parents read to students from provided reading classroom material.

6) Parents asked students to answer reading comprehension questions from provided reading classroom material.
Following each IBPIT session was a "Celebrate Reading Achievement" pizza party. Parents received pizza coupons.

Study Constant

Nebraska Reading First balanced reading curriculum is a constant in this study. Beginning in the summer of 2004 the teachers of four second grade classrooms participated in summer training and district sponsored monthly follow-up throughout the school year. The training was provided by district reading coaches, state reading specialist, and district personnel. The training focused on scientific, research-based methods to teach reading using the balanced reading method. Checklists were completed and teachers were evaluated on a bi-monthly basis by an external evaluation team, which consisted of a district director of reading services, a reading coach, state evaluators, and a Reading First consultant. The urban magnet school principal observed each second grade teachers classrooms three times a week, utilizing a checklist to ensure consistency in implementation.

Dependent Variables and Measures

There were two dependent variables: 1) reading achievement scores, and 2) reading engagement outcomes. The dependent measures for reading achievement were 1) the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills, 6th
edition (DIBELS), and 2) the Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE).

**DIBELS.** Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills, 6th edition (DIBELS) is a standardized nationally norm-referenced reading diagnostic assessment. DIBELS subtest scores measure oral reading fluency. DIBELS provides a benchmark score that students must meet as an indicator of student growth in reading fluency. DIBELS was administered as a study pretest and a study posttest to determine student reading skill gain for both the APIT and IBPIT arms independently. DIBELS posttest scores were used to determine APIT compared to IBPIT intervention effectiveness and impact on student reading achievement scores.

**GRADE.** Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE) is a standardized nationally norm-referenced reading diagnostic assessment. For the purposes of this study, GRADE subtest scores measured a) vocabulary composite, b) comprehension composite, and c) total vocabulary and comprehension test standard scores. GRADE was administered as a study pretest and a study posttest to determine student reading skill gain for both the APIT and IBPIT arms independently. GRADE posttest scores were used...
to determine APIT compared to IBPIT intervention effectiveness and impact on student reading achievement scores.

The dependent measures for reading engagement outcomes were 1) student school absence (SSA), 2) student school off-task behaviors (SSOTB), requiring removal from class and referral to the Positive Action Center 3) student school disruptive behaviors (SSDB) during reading class, requiring removal from class and referral to the administrative office and 4) parent perceptions of their students reading engagement (PPSRE) as measured by the Parent as a Teacher Questionnaire (Strom, 1995; PAAT Appendix E).

Research Design

The pretest posttest two-group prospective experimental research design is displayed in the following notation:

Group 1 \( X_1 \), \( 0 \), \( X_1 \), \( X_2 \), \( 0 \), \( X_1 \),
Group 2 \( X_1 \), \( 0 \), \( X_1 \), \( X_2 \), \( 0 \), \( X_1 \),

Group 1 = randomly selected parents participating in APIT \( (n = 13) \)
Group 2 = randomly selected parents participating in IBPIT \( (n = 6) \)

\( X_i \) = all second-grade students participating in a model balanced reading curriculum before, during, and following their parents selection to APIT or IBPIT \( (n = 19) \) intervention arms
$X_2 =$ parent participation in APIT weekly in-school sessions led in person by the investigator designed to teach parents how to teach reading to their children and how to encourage children to read with in-home follow-up

$X_3 =$ parent participation in IBPIT weekly in-home information packets written by the investigator designed to teach parents how to teach reading to their children and how to encourage children to read with in-home follow-up

$O_1 =$ pretest 2nd grade (a) Diagnostic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) oral reading fluency scores (b) Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE) (i) reading vocabulary, (ii) reading comprehension, and (iii) reading total, and (c) student engagement outcomes (i) student school absence, (ii) student school off-task behavior, and (iii) student school disruptive behavior

$O_2 =$ posttest 2nd grade (a) Diagnostic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) oral reading fluency scores (b) Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE) (i) reading vocabulary, (ii) reading comprehension, and (iii) reading total, (c) student engagement outcomes (i) student school absence, (ii) student school off-task behavior, and (iii) student school disruptive behavior, and (d) Parent Perceptions of their Students Reading Engagement (PPSRE) as measured by the Parent as a Teacher Questionnaire (PAAT).
PAAT. The review of literature revealed several different surveys and questionnaires that had been utilized to measure parent involvement. Several of these instruments determined that there was very little or no transfer of parent participation to student achievement and/or engagement (Busco, 1991; Cornachione, 1999). Other research instruments were limited to only one specific area of parental involvement, based on parenting style (Miller, 1995; Nesbit, 1993). Still other research used instruments that focused on older children and that measured items that did not necessarily apply to parents of second graders (Paige, 1992).

Strom (1995) created "The Parent As A Teacher Inventory" (PAAT) which was intended to help parents of pre-school and primary grade children (ages 3-9) recognize their favorable qualities in five areas of parent development: creativity, frustration, control, play and teaching/learning. For the purposes of this study, parents responded to all the items pertaining to their qualities, interactions and attitudes in the teaching/learning of their child. The instrument is composed of 50 Likert items. Parents had the opportunity to read some statements about their child and respond by circling one of the following: Strong Yes, Yes, No, and Strong No. PAAT was utilized as a
posttest only measurement to evaluate how certain attitudes and behaviors modify in response to educational intervention.

Field-testing of the inventory was conducted by the Research Division of Tucson, Arizona Public Schools. A group of 124 low-income families of pre-school aged children were administered the PAAT before beginning a family development intervention program. Seven months later, when the instruction ended, the PAAT was completed again by 88 of the parents. They showed significant gains on all five subsets \((p < .05)\) as well as the total inventory \((p < .001)\), confirming PAAT's feasibility as an evaluation tool. Overall alpha coefficients for the pretest (.76) and posttest (.81) were high (Strom, 1995).

Construct and criterion validity studies have been conducted. In two different studies, the participants were enrolled in a home assistance project offered by the public schools. The first study completed by Johnson (1975) expressed the feelings of 60 Hispanic parents in Phoenix, Arizona. Johnson conducted observations of the participants' behavior during home visits. Results showed parent behaviors and expressions were consistent nearly 70 percent of the time.
The second study conducted by Panetta (1980) also used parent expressed versus observed behavior to determine validity. The entire sample was from low-income neighborhoods in Denver, Colorado. The respective levels of consonance between parental expression and observed behavior were 75 to 85 percent. Both indices confirmed that PAAT fulfills its purpose of helping parents of pre-school and primary grade children recognize the impact of their favorable qualities on the identified areas of parent development.

Research Questions

To guide the inquiry, the following research questions were posed:

Research Question #1. Did those students whose parents participated in APIT sessions, pretest compared to posttest reading achievement, result in statistically significant differences as measured by DIBELS for oral reading fluency?

Research Question #2. Did those students whose parents participated in IBPIT sessions, pretest compared to posttest reading achievement, result in statistically significant differences as measured by DIBELS oral reading fluency?

Research Question #3. Did those students whose parents participated in APIT or IBPIT sessions, posttest compared to posttest reading achievement, result in statistically
significant differences as measured by DIBELS oral reading fluency?

Research Question #4. Did those students whose parents participated in APIT sessions, pretest compared to posttest reading achievement, result in statistically significant differences as measured by GRADE (a) reading vocabulary, (b) reading comprehension, and (c) reading total standard scores?

Research Question #5. Did those students whose parents participated in IBPIT sessions, pretest compared to posttest reading achievement, result in statistically significant differences as measured by GRADE (a) reading vocabulary, (b) reading comprehension, and (c) reading total standard scores?

Research Question #6. Did those students whose parents participated in APIT sessions have consistent GRADE posttest reading achievement for (a) reading vocabulary, (b) reading comprehension, and (c) reading total standard scores?

a. Is there a statistically significant interaction between students reading achievement, whose parents participated in APIT sessions, GRADE (i) reading vocabulary, (ii) reading comprehension, and (iii) reading total standard scores?

Research Question #7. Did those students whose parents participated in IBPIT sessions have consistent GRADE posttest reading achievement for (a) reading vocabulary, (b)
reading comprehension, and (c) reading total standard scores?

a. Is there a statistically significant interaction between students reading achievement, whose parents participated in IBPIT sessions, GRADE (i) reading vocabulary, (ii) reading comprehension, and (iii) reading total standard scores?

Research Question #8. Did those students whose parents participated in APIT sessions have comparable GRADE posttest reading achievement for (a) reading vocabulary, (b) reading comprehension, and (c) reading total standard scores compared to those students whose parents participated in IBPIT sessions?

a. Are students whose parents participated in APIT sessions, posttest GRADE reading vocabulary standard scores, statistically different from students whose parents participated in IBPIT sessions?

b. Are students whose parents participated in APIT sessions, posttest GRADE reading comprehension standard scores, statistically different from students whose parents participated in IBPIT sessions?

c. Are students whose parents participated in APIT sessions, posttest GRADE reading total standard scores, statistically different from students whose parents participated in IBPIT sessions?

Research Question #9. Did those students whose parents participated in APIT and IBPIT sessions, posttest compared to posttest reading engagement frequencies, result in
statistically significant differences as measured by reading engagement outcomes: (a) SSA, (b) SSOTB, and (c) SSDB?

Research Question #10. Did those parents who participated in APIT and IBPIT sessions, posttest compared to posttest reading engagement subtest score frequencies for teaching/learning result in statistically significant differences as measured by the teaching/learning questions in the PPSRE PAAT?

Data Analysis

Research Question #1 utilized a dependent sample t test to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between pretest compared to posttest APIT DIBELS oral reading subtest scores. An alpha level of .05 was utilized to test the null hypothesis.

Research question #2 utilized a dependent sample t test to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between pretest compared to posttest IBPIT DIBELS oral reading subtest scores. An alpha level of .05 was utilized to test the null hypothesis.

Research Question #3 utilized an independent sample t test to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between posttest compared to posttest APIT and IBPIT DIBELS oral reading subtest scores. An alpha level of .05 was utilized to test the null hypothesis.

Research Question #4 utilized a dependent sample t tests to determine if there was a statistically significant
difference between APIT pretest compared to posttest GRADE subtests for (a) reading vocabulary, (b) reading comprehension, and (c) reading total standard scores. An alpha level of .05 was utilized to test the null hypothesis.

Research Question #5 utilized a dependent sample t test to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between IBPIIT pretest compared to posttest GRADE subtests for (a) reading vocabulary, (b) reading comprehension, and (c) reading total standard scores. An alpha level of .05 was utilized to test the null hypothesis.

Research Question #6 utilized a single classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to determine the main effect between the APIT posttest GRADE subtests. An F ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to test the null hypothesis.

Research Question #7 utilized a single classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to determine the main effect between the IBPIT posttest GRADE subtests. An F ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to test the null hypothesis.

Research Question #8 a, b, and c utilized an independent sample t test to determine if there is a statistically significant difference between APIT and IBPIT posttest GRADE subtest standard scores for (a) reading vocabulary, (b) reading comprehension, and (c) reading total
standard scores. An alpha level of .05 was utilized to test the null hypothesis.

Research Question #9 utilized a chi-square test of significance to compare observed versus expected posttest APIT compared to posttest IBPIT reading engagement frequencies for (a) SSA, (b) SSOTB, and (c) SSDB. An alpha level of .05 was utilized to test the null hypothesis for these frequencies.

Research Question #10 utilized an independent t test to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between posttest compared to posttest parent perceptions. An alpha level of .05 was utilized to test the null hypothesis.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This study addressed the importance of working with families in an urban setting, with few economic advantages. The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of parental participation in active parent involvement training (APIT) sessions compared to parental participation in information based parent involvement training (IBPIT) sessions on second grade students reading achievement and school engagement.

This study utilized a pretest posttest experimental design, randomly assigning parents to either of the APIT and IBPIT sessions. APIT sessions were designed to foster and support weekly parent and child reading activities with active school administration support. IBPIT sessions were designed to foster and support weekly parent and child reading activities with information based school administration support. All second grade students whose parents participated in APIT and IBPIT were taught using a "balanced reading curriculum" (Fitzgerald, 1999; McIntyre & Pressley, 1996; Spiegel, 1994; Swanson, 1999) at school. All participating children completed routinely collected reading assessments. Attendance, off-task behaviors, and disruptive behavior data were also routinely collected.

Research Question #1
Table 1 displays the demographic, financial, and education attainment levels of parent participants in APIT. The demographic financial, and education attainment levels of parent participants in IBPIT are found in Table 2. Table 3 displays the demographic and pretest posttest DIBELS oral reading fluency scores of individual students whose parents participated in APIT while the demographic and pretest posttest DIBELS oral reading fluency scores of individual students whose parents participated in IBPIT are found in Table 4. A comparison of pretest posttest oral reading fluency scores of students whose parents participated in APIT is found in Table 5. The first hypothesis was tested using the dependent t-test. As seen in Table 5 the hypothesis was rejected. The student pretest DIBELS oral reading fluency scores \( (M = 48.46, SD = 23.75) \) compared to the posttest DIBELS oral reading fluency scores \( (M = 71.23, SD = 28.48) \) were statistically different, \( t(12) = 8.66, p = .0001 \) (one-tailed), \( d = .87 \). The results indicate students DIBELS oral reading fluency scores reflect positive pretest posttest gain, however, the posttest mean score \( (M = 71.23, SD = 28.48) \) falls below 90, the benchmark score established to represent final oral reading fluency proficiency for these students.

Research Question #2

Table 6 displays the comparison of pretest posttest oral reading fluency scores of students whose parents
participated in IBPIT. The second hypothesis was tested using the dependent $t$-test. As seen in Table 6 the hypothesis was rejected. The student pretest DIBELS oral reading fluency scores ($M = 28.83, SD = 12.40$) compared to the posttest DIBELS oral reading fluency scores ($M = 49.33, SD = 14.46$) were statistically different, $t(5) = 7.51, p = .0003$ (one-tailed), $d = 1.52$. The results indicate students DIBELS oral reading fluency scores reflect positive pretest posttest gain, however, the pretest mean score ($M = 28.83, SD = 12.40$) falls below 40, the benchmark score established to represent beginning oral reading fluency proficiency for these students and the posttest mean score ($M = 49.33, SD = 14.46$) falls below 90, the benchmark score established to represent final oral reading fluency proficiency for these students.

Research Question #3

Table 7 displays the comparison of posttest oral reading fluency scores of students whose parents participated in APIT and IBPIT. The third hypothesis was tested using the independent $t$-test. As seen in Table 7 the hypothesis was rejected. The student posttest DIBELS oral reading fluency scores ($M = 71.23, SD = 28.48$) of students whose parents participated in APIT compared to the posttest DIBELS oral reading fluency scores ($M = 49.33, SD = 14.46$) of students whose parents participated in IBPIT were statistically different, $t(17) = 1.76, p = .05$ (one-tailed),
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$d = 1.02$. The results indicate that students whose parents participated in APIT had posttest DIBELS oral reading fluency scores significantly greater than students whose parents participated in IBPIT. Both posttest scores fall below 90, the benchmark score established to represent final oral reading fluency proficiency for these students.

**Research Question #4**

Table 8 displays the pretest posttest GRADE reading vocabulary, reading comprehension, and reading total scores of individual students whose parents participated in APIT. The pretest posttest GRADE reading vocabulary, reading comprehension, and reading total scores of individual students whose parents participated in IBPIT are found in Table 9. Table 10 displays the comparison of pretest posttest GRADE reading vocabulary, reading comprehension, and reading total scores of individual students whose parents participated in APIT. The fourth hypothesis was tested using the dependent $t$-test. As seen in Table 10 the hypothesis was not rejected for pretest GRADE (a) reading vocabulary scores ($M = 94.23$, $SD = 12.47$) compared to the posttest GRADE reading vocabulary scores ($M = 99.00$, $SD = 11.96$) which were not statistically different, $t(24) = 1.00$, $p = .16$ (one-tailed), $d = .39$. The results indicate students GRADE reading vocabulary scores reflect positive, although not significant, pretest posttest gain and a posttest standard score ($M = 99.00$, $SD = 11.96$) that falls within the
average range. Also as seen in Table 10 the hypothesis was not rejected for pretest GRADE (b) reading comprehension scores ($M = 88.31, SD = 15.01$) compared to the posttest GRADE reading comprehension scores ($M = 91.08, SD = 13.56$) which were not statistically different, $t(24) = 0.49, p = .31$ (one-tailed), $d = .19$. The results indicate students GRADE reading comprehension scores reflect positive, although not significant, pretest posttest gain and a posttest standard score ($M = 91.08, SD = 13.56$) that falls within the average range. Finally, as seen in Table 10 the hypothesis was not rejected for pretest GRADE (c) reading total scores ($M = 88.85, SD = 13.66$) compared to the posttest GRADE reading total scores ($M = 93.69, SD = 12.02$) which were not statistically different, $t(24) = 0.96, p = .17$ (one-tailed), $d = .37$. The results indicate students GRADE reading total scores reflect positive, although not significant, pretest posttest gain and a posttest standard score ($M = 93.69, SD = 12.02$) that falls within the average range.

Research Question #5

Table 11 displays the comparison of pretest posttest GRADE reading vocabulary, reading comprehension, and reading total scores of individual students whose parents participated in IBPIT. The fifth hypothesis was tested using the dependent $t$-test. As seen in Table 11 the hypothesis was not rejected for pretest GRADE (a) reading vocabulary scores.
(M = 85.17, SD = 8.54) compared to the posttest GRADE reading vocabulary scores (M = 90.17, SD = 5.46) which were not statistically different, t(5) = 1.29, p = .13 (one-tailed), d = .71. The results indicate students GRADE reading vocabulary scores reflect positive, although not significant, pretest posttest gain and a posttest standard score (M = 90.17, SD = 5.46) that falls within the average range. Also as seen in Table 11 the hypothesis was not rejected for pretest GRADE (b) reading comprehension scores (M = 91.50, SD = 29.83) compared to the posttest GRADE reading comprehension scores (M = 84.17, SD = 6.40) which were not statistically different, t(5) = -0.51, p = .32 (one-tailed), d = .40. The results indicate students GRADE reading comprehension scores reflect negative, although not significant, pretest posttest change and a posttest standard score (M = 84.17, SD = 6.40) that falls within the low average range. Finally, as seen in Table 11 the hypothesis was not rejected for pretest GRADE (c) reading total scores (M = 89.67, SD = 15.49) compared to the posttest GRADE reading total scores (M = 85.83, SD = 4.88) which were not statistically different, t(5) = -0.54, p = .31 (one-tailed), d = .54. The results indicate students GRADE reading comprehension scores reflect negative, although not significant, pretest posttest change and a posttest standard score (M = 85.83, SD = 4.88) that falls within the low average range.
Research Question #6

The sixth hypothesis was tested using a single factor ANOVA. As seen in Table 12 the hypothesis was not rejected. The results of analysis of variance for posttest GRADE reading vocabulary ($M = 99.00$, $SD = 11.96$), reading comprehension ($M = 91.08$, $SD = 13.56$), and reading total ($M = 93.69$, $SD = 12.02$) scores of students whose parents participated in APIT were congruent and the main effect of subtest achievement was not statistically significant, ($F(2, 36) = 1.35$, $p = .27$). Because $F$ did not reach a significance level no post hoc contrast analyses were conducted. Overall, these findings indicate that students whose parents participated in APIT had measured posttest reading vocabulary, reading comprehension, and reading total standard scores all measured within the average range.

Research Question #7

The seventh hypothesis was tested using a single factor ANOVA. As seen in Table 13 the hypothesis was not rejected. The results of analysis of variance for posttest GRADE reading vocabulary ($M = 90.17$, $SD = 5.46$), reading comprehension ($M = 84.17$, $SD = 6.40$), and reading total ($M = 85.83$, $SD = 4.88$) scores of students whose parents participated in IBPIT were congruent and the main effect of subtest achievement was not statistically significant, ($F(2, 15) = 1.83$, $p = .19$). Because $F$ did not reach a significance level no post hoc contrast analyses were conducted.
conducted. Overall, these findings indicate that students whose parents participated in IBPIT had measured posttest reading vocabulary, reading comprehension, and reading total standard scores all measured within the average, low average, and low average range respectively.

Research Question #8

Table 14 displays the comparison of posttest GRADE reading vocabulary, reading comprehension, and reading total scores of students whose parents participated in APIT and IBPIT. The eighth hypothesis was tested using the independent t-test. As seen in Table 14 the hypothesis was rejected for posttest GRADE (a) reading vocabulary ($M = 99.00$, $SD = 11.96$) compared to the posttest GRADE reading vocabulary ($M = 90.17$, $SD = 5.46$) scores which were statistically different, $t(17) = 1.70, p = .05$ (one-tailed), $d = 1.01$. The results indicate that students whose parents participated in APIT had posttest GRADE reading vocabulary scores greater than students whose parents participated in IBPIT. Also as seen in Table 14 the hypothesis was not rejected for posttest GRADE (b) reading comprehension ($M = 91.08$, $SD = 13.56$) compared to the posttest GRADE reading comprehension ($M = 84.17$, $SD = 6.40$) scores which were not statistically different, $t(17) = 1.17, p = .12$ (one-tailed), $d = .69$. The results indicate that students whose parents participated in APIT had posttest GRADE reading comprehension scores congruent with students whose parents
participated in IBPIT. Finally, as seen in Table 14 the hypothesis was not rejected for posttest GRADE (c) reading total \((M = 93.69, \ SD = 12.02)\) compared to the posttest GRADE reading total \((M = 85.83, \ SD = 4.88)\) scores which were not statistically different, \(t(17) = -1.52, p = .07\) (one-tailed), \(d = .93\). The results indicate that students whose parents participated in APIT had posttest GRADE reading total scores congruent with students whose parents participated in IBPIT.

Research Question #9

Engagement outcomes of students whose parents participated in active and information based parent involvement training are found in Table 15. The ninth hypothesis was tested using chi-square \((\chi^2)\). The result of \(\chi^2\) displayed in Table 15 was not statistically different so we cannot reject the hypothesis of no difference or congruence for student's engagement outcomes. Inspecting our frequency and percent findings in Table 15 we find that students whose parents participated in APIT produced observable behaviors (a) school absences (7, 33%), (b) off-task behaviors (14, 40%), and (c) disruptive behaviors (6, 38%) that were not greater than the totals produced by students whose parents participated in IBPIT (a) school absences (14, 67%), (b) off-task behaviors (21, 60%), and (c) disruptive behaviors (10, 63%).

Research Question #10
Table 16 displays the posttest Likert scale scores of parent’s perceptions of engagement in teaching and/learning. Table 17 displays the comparison of posttest posttest parent’s perceptions of engagement in teaching and/learning of parents who participated in APIT and IBPIT. The tenth hypothesis was tested using the independent $t$-test. As seen in Table 17 the hypothesis was not rejected. The parent posttest PAAT scores ($M = 3.07$, $SD = .21$) of parents who participated in APIT compared to the posttest PAAT scores ($M = 3.07$, $SD = .12$) of parents who participated in IBPIT were not statistically different, $t(17) = 0.03$, $p = .49$ (one-tailed), $d = .00$. The results indicate that parents who participated in APIT had posttest engagement in teaching and/learning mean scores identical to parents who participated in IBPIT. Both posttest scores fall just above the agree point on the four-point Likert scale.
Table 1
Demographic, Financial, and Education Attainment Levels of Individual Parent Participants in Active Parent Involvement Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Parent(s)</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>30,000+</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>50,000+</td>
<td>High School+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>30,000+</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>10,000+</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>50,000+</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>10,000+</td>
<td>High School-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>30,000+</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>10,000+</td>
<td>High School+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>30,000+</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>40,000+</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>10,000+</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>20,000+</td>
<td>High School+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>10,000-</td>
<td>High School-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Demographic, Financial, and Education Attainment Levels of Individual Parent Participants in Information Based Parent Involvement Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Parent(s)</th>
<th>Reported Income</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>20,000+</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>40,000+</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>10,000-</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>10,000-</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>10,000-</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>50,000+</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Demographic and DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency Scores of Individual Students whose Parents Participated in Active Parent Involvement Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity (a)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Black</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Black</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. White</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Black</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Black</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Black</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Note: Numbers correspond with Table 1.
Table 4

Demographic and DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency Scores of Individual Students whose Parents Participated in Information Based Parent Involvement Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Black</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Black</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. White</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Note: Numbers correspond with Table 2.
Table 5
Comparison of Pretest Posttest Oral Reading Fluency Scores of Students whose Parents Participated in Active Parent Involvement Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Pretest Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Posttest Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIBELS</td>
<td>48.46 (23.75)</td>
<td>71.23 (28.48)</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6
Comparison of Pretest Posttest Oral Reading Fluency Scores of Students whose Parents Participated in Information Based Parent Involvement Training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Of Data</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Pretest SD</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>Posttest SD</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIBELS</td>
<td>28.83 (12.40)</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.33 (14.46)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7
Comparison of Posttest Oral Reading Fluency Scores of Students whose Parents Participated in Active and Information Based Parent Involvement Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Of Data</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIBELS</td>
<td>71.23 (28.48)</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.33 (14.46)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Pretest Posttest GRADE Reading Vocabulary, Reading Comprehension, and Reading Total Scores of Individual Students whose Parents Participated in Active Parent Involvement Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocab</td>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Vocab</td>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Note: Numbers correspond with Table 1 and Table 3.
Table 9
Pretest Posttest GRADE Reading Vocabulary, Reading Comprehension, and Reading Total Scores of Individual Students whose Parents Participated in Information Based Parent Involvement Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocab</td>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Vocab</td>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Note: Numbers correspond with Table 2 and 4.
Table 10
Comparison of Pretest Posttest GRADE Reading Vocabulary, Reading Comprehension, and Reading Total Scores of Individual Students whose Parents Participated in Active Parent Involvement Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Data</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocab</td>
<td>94.23 (12.47)</td>
<td>99.00 (11.96)</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>88.31 (15.01)</td>
<td>91.08 (13.56)</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88.85 (13.66)</td>
<td>93.69 (12.02)</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11
Comparison of Pretest Posttest GRADE Reading Vocabulary, Reading Comprehension, and Reading Total Scores of Individual Students whose Parents Participated in Information Based Parent Involvement Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Of Data</th>
<th>Pretest Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Posttest Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocab</td>
<td>85.17 (8.54)</td>
<td>90.17 (5.46)</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>91.50 (29.83)</td>
<td>84.17 (6.40)</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89.67 (15.49)</td>
<td>85.83 (4.88)</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12
Results of Analysis of Variance for Posttest GRADE Reading Vocabulary, Reading Comprehension, and Reading Total Scores of Students whose Parents Participated in Active Parent Involvement Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>423.74</td>
<td>211.87</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>5657.69</td>
<td>157.16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.35 (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Vocabulary</td>
<td>99.00 (11.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Comprehension</td>
<td>91.08 (13.56)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Total</td>
<td>93.69 (12.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Note: *p*-value = 0.27 *ns.*

(b) Note: No post hoc analyses were conducted.
Table 13
Results of Analysis of Variance for Posttest GRADE Reading Vocabulary, Reading Comprehension, and Reading Total Scores of Students whose Parents Participated in Information Based Parent Involvement Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>115.11</td>
<td>57.56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>472.50</td>
<td>31.50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.83 (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Vocabulary</td>
<td>90.17</td>
<td>(5.46)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Comprehension</td>
<td>84.17</td>
<td>(6.40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Total</td>
<td>85.83</td>
<td>(4.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Note: p-value = 0.19 ns.
(b) Note: No post hoc analyses were conducted.
Table 14
Comparison of Posttest Posttest GRADE Reading Vocabulary, Reading Comprehension, and Reading Total Scores of Students whose Parents Participated in Active and Information Based Parent Involvement Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Of Data</th>
<th>Active Parent Involvement Training</th>
<th>Information Based Parent Involvement Training</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocab</td>
<td>Mean (SD) 99.00 (11.96)</td>
<td>Mean (SD) 90.17 (5.46)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>Mean (SD) 91.08 (13.56)</td>
<td>Mean (SD) 84.17 (6.40)</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean (SD) 93.69 (12.02)</td>
<td>Mean (SD) 85.83 (4.88)</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

Engagement Outcomes of Students whose Parents Participated in Active and Information Based Parent Involvement Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>X²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APIT</td>
<td>7 (33)</td>
<td>14 (40)</td>
<td>6 (38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBPIT</td>
<td>14 (67)</td>
<td>21 (60)</td>
<td>10 (62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>21 (100)</td>
<td>35 (100)</td>
<td>16 (100)</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Student School Absence; B = Student School Off-Task Behavior; C = Student School Disruptive Behavior

Note: p > .05 for Observed verses Expected cell frequencies with df = 2 and a tabled value = 5.99 for p < .05.
Table 16
Posttest Likert Scale Scores of Parents Perceptions of Engagement in Teaching/Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAAT Questionnaire Likert Scale Score</th>
<th>Information Based Parent Involvement Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Parent Involvement Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 3.2</td>
<td>1. 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 3.1</td>
<td>2. 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 3.2</td>
<td>3. 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 3.3</td>
<td>4. 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 2.7</td>
<td>5. 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 3.0</td>
<td>6. 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Note: Numbers correspond with Table 1.

(b) Note: Numbers correspond with Table 2.
Table 17
Comparison of Posttest Parent Likert Scale Perceptions of Teaching/Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Data</th>
<th>Active Parent Involvement Training</th>
<th>Information Based Parent Involvement Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.07 (.21)</td>
<td>3.07 (.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect Size</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5
Conclusions and Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of Active Parent Involvement Training (APIT) compared to Information Based Parent Involvement Training (IBPIT) on second grade students reading achievement scores and reading engagement outcomes. The findings of this study were consistent with the research that fosters the critical partnership necessary between parents and the school community to increase student reading achievement and student reading engagement.

Conclusions

The following conclusions may be drawn from the study for each of the ten research questions: Research Question #1: There was statistically significant pretest compared to posttest oral reading fluency gain, as measured by DIBELS, for students whose parents participated in APIT. Research Question #2: There was statistically significant pretest compared to posttest oral reading fluency gain, as measured by DIBELS, for students whose parents participated in IBPIT. Research Question #3: Posttest oral reading fluency scores, as measured by DIBELS, for students whose parents participated in APIT compared to IBPIT were statistically significantly greater for students whose parents participated in APIT. Research Question #4: There was
positive, although not statistically significant gain pretest compared to posttest reading achievement, as measured by the GRADE reading vocabulary, comprehension and total standard score, for students whose parents participated in APIT. Research Question #5: There was positive, although not statistically significant gain pretest compared to posttest reading achievement, as measured by the GRADE reading vocabulary standard score, for students whose parents participated in IBPIT. There was negative, although not statistically significant pretest compared to posttest reading achievement, as measured by the GRADE reading comprehension and total standard score, for students whose parents participated in IBPIT. Research Question #6: Posttest reading vocabulary, reading comprehension, and reading total scores, as measured by GRADE, for students whose parents participated in APIT, were measured within the average range and were congruent. Research Question #7: Posttest reading vocabulary, reading comprehension, and reading total scores, as measured by GRADE, for students whose parents participated in IBPIT, were measured within the average, low average and low range respectively and were congruent. Research Question #8: There was a statistically significant difference between posttest reading vocabulary scores, as measured by GRADE, for students whose parents participated in APIT compared to IBPIT. There was no statistically significant difference
between posttest reading comprehension and reading total scores, as measured by GRADE, for students whose parents participated in APIT compared to IBPIT. Research Question #9: Students, whose parents participated in APIT, produced observable (a) school absences, (b) off-task, and (c) disruptive behavior frequencies that were congruent with the totals produced by students whose parents participated in IBPIT. Research Question #10: Parents who participated in APIT have posttest engagement in teaching/learning mean scores, as measured by PAAT, that are identical to parents who participated in IBPIT. Both parent groups scores fell within the agree point, viewing themselves as empowered to teach their children at the end of the study.

Discussion

Parent involvement within the school setting continues to be a key component for improving student achievement and engagement (Thompson et al., 1988; Peechia, 2002). Research has shown that when schools provide opportunities and resources for parents to participate in structured parent programs with their children, student reading achievement and reading engagement will be positively impacted (Fairbanks, 2003; Jimenez, 2001; Mitchell, 2002; Nail, 2001; Peechia, 2002; Sy, 2002). The more resources provided to families, the more benefits a student has toward achieving positive academic performance (Jimenez, 2001).
Research studies have found that minority low-income parents are often underrepresented among the ranks of parents involved with the schools (Wagner et al., 2002). There are numerous reasons for this lack of time or energy. For example, many of these individuals experience, long work hours from one or multiple jobs, embarrassment or shyness about one's own academic level, lack of information about the structure of the school and accepted communication channels, perceived lack of welcome by teachers and administrators, and teachers' and administrators' perceived assumptions of parents' disinterest or inability to help with children's schooling (Jeynes, 2005; Mitchell, 2002; Smith, 1971; Thompson et al., 1988; Wagner et al., 2002).

Perhaps one of the most important findings of this study, however, is that parents of disadvantaged and minority children can and do make a positive contribution to their children's achievement in school. When parents are provided adequate training and encouragement their involvement can make a difference. This study dispels a popular myth by revealing that parents can make a difference regardless of their own educational attainment.
Indeed, disadvantaged children have the most to gain from parent involvement programs (Desimone, 1999).

Considering the importance of parent involvement, coupled with the daily challenges parents face, special care should be given to emphasize the parents as partners concept. This partnership must consider the discontinuities between teachers/administrators and the communities in which their schools are located. Many times school personnel tend to view urban school parents and their surrounding community disparagingly. This deficit model, as it has been called, is clearly detrimental to the development of positive attitudes about education and good working relationships between the community and the school (Henderson & Mapp, 2002).

This research demonstrates that parent involvement can have a positive affect on children's learning and supports the opinion that when parents are intentionally invited to participate in their children’s learning, reading achievement and reading engagement can be positively influenced.

The findings of this study demonstrate that the most effective forms of parent involvement are those that engage parents in working directly with their children on learning
activities. Programs that involve parents in reading with their children, supporting their work on homework assignments, or tutoring them using materials and instructions provided by school personnel, show particularly impressive results (Leler, 1983). The APIT facilitator served as a resource to the parents who participated in the active parent training. The students whose parents participated in APIT showed significant GRADE Vocabulary achievement gains in comparison to the students whose parents participated in IBPIT.

Parents believed that the APIT facilitator realized that they were giving their best effort, and this created an environment of trust (Comer, 1986). The literature reviewed suggests that parents' decision about becoming involved in their children's education is influenced by the trust they have with the teacher and school (Comer, 1986; Desimone, 1999). It should be noted that trust was the key ingredient to the success factor of partnering with parents. The researcher actively planned and modeled an informal setting which encouraged collaboration, (Knowles, 1998). This empowered parents to be the teacher in the weekly parent-child discussions. The researcher also made a conscious effort to serve as a resource to parent
participants creating an enduring relationship between the parent, child and the school environment (Epstein, 2001; Henderson & Mapp, 2002).

This study indicates that active parent involvement resulted in greater student achievement benefits. When parents received information through participation in IBPIT their students also made pretest posttest achievement gains. The good news, based on the findings of this study, is that when parents become more involved we can expect an increase in student achievement.

Parent-child weekly engagement activities were found to be beneficial. Research in this area indicates that parents generally want and need direction to participate with maximum effectiveness (Comer, 2005). The parent training can be varied, from sending home written directions with an instructional packet, to providing "make-and-take" workshops where parents construct, see demonstrations of, and practice using instructional games. Researchers have also found that the schools with the most successful parent involvement programs are those which offer a variety of ways that parents can participate (Comer, 2005; Henderson & Mapp, 2002). It is important to recognize that parents vary greatly in their willingness,
ability, and availability for involvement in school activities. Providing a continuum of options for parent participation is necessary. The correlation between supportive parental involvement and children’s literacy development is well established. Increased communication can enhance students' background knowledge and increase the amount of language being used on a daily basis (Hart & Risley, 1995). Many research studies have addressed the relationship between parent involvement and achievement and the effects of parent involvement on student engagement, self-concept, classroom behavior, and time spent on homework (Peechia, 2002; Vacca, 2006; Williams, 2003). Multiple research studies have found that parent involvement can have a positive influence on reading engagement and does in fact have a positive effect on student attitudes and social behavior (Hart & Risley, 1995; Peechia, 2002; Vacca, 2006; Williams, 2003).

This study supports the opinion that increased intensity of parent involvement has increased influence on students' achievement and student engagement. Active parent involvement is more beneficial than passive involvement, but passive forms of involvement are better than no involvement at all. However, direct parent involvement in
instruction seems to be the single most powerful approach for fostering achievement benefits. Active parent involvement appears to be more or equally effective in bringing about improvements in student engagement.

Although the main focus of this study was on the effects of parent involvement on student outcomes, it is certainly worth noting that research reveals many benefits for school systems and for parents themselves when parents become involved in their children's learning. School personnel benefit from the improved rapport that generally accompanies increased parent involvement. This rapport is often expressed in parents' increased willingness to support schools with their labor and resources during fundraising activities or special projects. And certainly, the many ways in which parent involvement benefits students' achievement, attitudes, and behavior have a positive impact on the school culture.

Improved parent attitudes toward the school and improved parent self-concepts may result when parents become involved in their children's learning. Parents often begin their participation doubting that their involvement can make much difference, and they are generally very gratified to discover the important contribution they are
able to make. Parental empowerment noted at the end of the study by parent response on the Parent As A Teacher Questionnaire, encourages the suggestion for further research to determine if this intervention continued for a longer period of time would truly encourage parents to become more involved in educating their children. It is important for school personnel and parents to be aware that parent involvement supports students' learning, behavior, and attitudes regardless of parents' income and educational level.

Administrators and school staff must remove their filters that distract them in their ability to show compassion and understanding to the challenges schools face when attempting to involve parents. They must maintain high expectations and create numerous opportunities to involve parents. The long-term implications of focused-research based parental involvement interventions have potential for assisting students in meeting and exceeding mastery levels in reading achievement and reading engagement (Comer, 1986). "A school system without parents at it's foundation, is just like a bucket with a hole in it" (Jackson, 2005; p. 3).
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APPENDIX A - Information letter to study participants
Dear Second Grade Parent(s)/Caregiver(s):

Congratulations on being an important part of your child's education, thus far! The following is an informational letter for me to complete a dissertation study.

I am currently a doctoral student at the University of Nebraska at Omaha and the Assistant Principal at Lothrop Magnet Center. It is my desire to conduct this study between the dates of August 2005 and January 2006. The research study that I am completing is titled, The Effects of Parental Involvement on the Reading Achievement of Students Participating in a Balanced Reading Curriculum. The purpose of this study is to determine the effects of active parent involvement training (APIT) compared to information based parent involvement training (IBPIT) on second grade students reading achievement and reading engagement.

All second grade students are taught using a balanced reading approach through participation in the Reading First Curriculum. Forty second-grade families may volunteer to participate. The forty participants will be randomly assigned to one of two groups-active parent involvement training (APIT) sessions or information based parent involvement training (IBPIT) sessions.

APIT parents will participate in evening parent reading classes, once a week from September to January, in the school setting to provide an opportunity for you and your child to participate in reading activities together. The participants will be requested to participate in parent sessions, facilitated by myself, once a week, and completion of a parent questionnaire at the last session.

IBPIT parents will participate in completing reading packets with their child once a week, in the home setting. The participants will be requested to participate in parent sessions, facilitated by the parent, once a week, and completion of a parent questionnaire at the last session.

In conclusion, this process could assist in giving direction to the Omaha Public School staff for future planning and is in support of the five district Aims for the school improvement process, specifically AIM 1, High Student Achievement and AIM 4, Partnerships-family involvement in the educational process, as outlined in the Omaha Public Schools Mission.

It takes a village to "educate" our children, therefore, your contribution to this research is greatly appreciated. Thank you for considering my request and I look forward to working with you and your student. Please contact me if you have questions about the study to be conducted via e-mail or phone.

Sincerely,

LeDonna M. White-York
University of Nebraska at Omaha-Doctoral Student
(402) 457-5704

lmwhite@mail.unomaha.edu
APPENDIX B - District Approval Letter
January 7, 2005

Mrs. LeDonna Marie White-York
2865 Newport Avenue
Omaha, NE 68112

Dear LeDonna:

The Research Review Committee has reviewed your research proposal that involves the collection of data from students, teachers, and administrators through processes such as the examination and/or collection of information from files or records, direct observation, focus groups, or individual interviews.

We believe your study has merit and permission is granted for you to proceed under the following conditions:

- The Principal of the school agrees to your study.
- Teachers in the affected building agree to your study.
- Parents of students in the study will complete a parent consent form "opt in."
- You will be willing to share results of your study with OPS.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

Deean Goezer
Instructional Research Administrator
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APPENDIX C - Institutional Review Board Approval Letter
September 16, 2005

LeDonna York
4827 Spaulding Street
Omaha, NE 68104

IRB#: 303-05-EX

TITLE OF PROTOCOL: The Effect of Parent Involvement on Reading Achievement and Reading Engagement of Students Participating in a Balanced Reading Curriculum

Dear Ms. York:

The IRB has reviewed your Exemption Form for Exempt Educational, Behavioral, and Social Science Research on the above-titled research project. According to the information provided, this project is exempt under 45 CFR 46:101b, category 2. You are therefore authorized to begin the research.

It is understood this project will be conducted in full accordance with all applicable sections of the IRB Guidelines. It is also understood that the IRB will be immediately notified of any proposed changes that may affect the exempt status of your research project.

Please be advised that the IRB has a maximum protocol approval period of three years from the original date of approval and release. If this study continues beyond the three year approval period, the project must be resubmitted in order to maintain an active approval status.

Sincerely,

Ernest D. Prentice, Ph.D.
Co-Chair, IRB
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APPENDIX D - Letter of Request- use of PAAT Questionnaire
January, 2006

Attn: Dr. Kauffman
Re: Permission for Rights of Use

Hello, my name is Dr. Karen Hayes. I serve as Chair for LeDonna White-York’s Dissertation Committee at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. The purpose of this letter is to request permission for LeDonna White-York to utilize the Parent As A Teacher (PAAT) Inventory in completion of her dissertation entitled, “The Effects of Parent Involvement on Reading Achievement and Reading Engagement of Students Participating in A Balanced Reading Curriculum.” We take full responsibility in the use, administration and proper acknowledgement of the publisher of this inventory.

The readers will be provided with proper acknowledgements in the reference section and a copy of written permission of use will be included in the appendix.

This inventory will be used as a posttest measure for 40 parents to respond after four months of participation in active parent involvement training (APIT) sessions or information based parent involvement training (IBPIT) sessions.

Please provide a written letter of approval stating that permission is granted to use this inventory with 40 parents that are participating in this study. If there are any questions, please feel free to contact me via e-mail at karenhayes@mail.unomaha.edu.

Thanking you in advance.

Sincerely,

Dr. Karen Hayes
Assistant Professor
Department of Educational Administration and Supervision
Kayser Hall 414
6001 Dodge Street
Omaha, Nebraska 68182-0162
karenhayes@mail.unomaha.edu
(402) 554-3240
Your name ___________________________ ID# (1-4) __________________

Your address ___________________________________________ Phone __________________

City ___________________________ State ____________ Zip Code __________________

The name of the child you are thinking about as you fill out this survey is ____________________________

(5) " What is the sex of this child? (1) Male ______ (2) Female ______

(6,7) What is the age of this child? ____________________________

(8) What is the category that best describes this child?
   (1) Normal ______ (4) Learning disabled ______
   (2) Mentally retarded ______ (5) Gifted and talented ______
   (3) Physically handicapped ______ (6) Other (Please specify) __________________________

(9) What is your relationship to this child?
   (1) Mother ______ (3) Grandmother ______
   (2) Father ______ (4) Grandfather ______
   (5) Other (Please specify) __________________________

(10) What is your marital status?
    (1) Married ______ (4) Never married ______
    (2) Separated ______ (5) Widowed ______
    (3) Divorced ______

(11) How much time do you spend playing and talking with this child each week?
    (1) Less than one hour ______ (3) Five to ten hours ______
    (2) One to five hours ______ (4) More than ten hours ______

(12) What is your employment status?
    (1) Working part time ______ (3) Unemployed ______
    (2) Working full time ______ (4) Retired ______

(13) What is your current annual household income?
    (1) Under $10,000 ______ (4) $30,000 to $40,000 ______
    (2) $10,000 to $20,000 ______ (5) $40,000 to $50,000 ______
    (3) $20,000 to $30,000 ______ (6) Over $50,000 ______

(14) What is your highest level completed in school?
    (1) 8th grade or less ______ (5) Some college ______
    (2) Some high school ______ (6) College degree ______
    (3) High school diploma ______ (7) Graduate school ______
    (4) Vocational training ______

(15) What is your ethnic group?
    (1) Caucasian ______ (4) Asian or Pacific Islander ______
    (2) African American ______ (5) Native American or Alaskan Native ______
    (3) Hispanic ______ (6) Other (Please specify) ______

(16) What is your sex? (1) Male ______ (2) Female ______

(17, 18) What is your age? ____________________________
Parent As A Teacher Inventory

Parent name ___________________________ ID# ______________________

Directions: You will be reading some statements about your child. For each statement, circle only one answer. If there is no doubt in your mind about the statement, circle either Strong Yes or Strong No. Otherwise, circle either Yes or No. Continue until you have answered all fifty statements. Take your time, this is not a test.

1. I get tired of all the questions my child asks.
   Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

2. My child should be able to make noise during play.
   Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

3. It is all right for my child to disagree with me.
   Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

4. My child needs to play with me.
   Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

5. Much of my child’s learning will take place before he or she enters school.
   Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

6. I like my child to make up stories.
   Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

7. It gets on my nerves when my child keeps asking me to watch him or her play.
   Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

8. I want my child to say more than I do when we talk.
   Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

9. Playing with my child makes me feel restless.
   Strong Yes Yes No Strong No
10. It is difficult for me to tell when my child has learned something.

   Strong Yes  Yes  No  Strong No

11. When my child doesn't know an answer, I ask the child to guess.

   Strong Yes  Yes  No  Strong No

12. I get tired of all the fears that my child talks about.

   Strong Yes  Yes  No  Strong No

13. There are some things I just don’t want my child to talk about.

   Strong Yes  Yes  No  Strong No

14. If I spend a lot of time playing with my child, he or she will disobey me more often.

   Strong Yes  Yes  No  Strong No

15. It is all right for my child to have a make-believe friend.

   Strong Yes  Yes  No  Strong No

16. I want my child to play with toys made for boys and toys made for girls.

   Strong Yes  Yes  No  Strong No

17. My child bothers me with questions when I am busy.

   Strong Yes  Yes  No  Strong No

18. I like my child to be quiet when adults are talking.

   Strong Yes  Yes  No  Strong No

19. I feel confident choosing new toys for my child.

   Strong Yes  Yes  No  Strong No

20. It is difficult for me to think of things to say to my child during play.

   Strong Yes  Yes  No  Strong No

21. When my child plays with toys, the pretending seems foolish.

   Strong Yes  Yes  No  Strong No
22. My child is punished for fighting during play.
  Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

23. While we play, my child should be the person in control.
  Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

24. Playing with my child improves the child's behavior.
  Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

25. When I play with my child I feel the need to talk like a child.
  Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

26. I want my child to have all of his or her questions answered.
  Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

27. It is all right for my child to get dirty while at play.
  Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

28. When at play with my child, I prefer games with rules rather than make-believe play.
  Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

29. My child learns new words when we play.
  Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

30. I feel able to give my child the proper preschool experience at home.
  Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

31. I get upset when my child tries to solve a simple problem in the wrong way.
  Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

32. It is all right for my child to interrupt me when we play together.
  Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

33. I feel play must be stopped when my child becomes angry at a playmate.
  Strong Yes Yes No Strong No
34. I try to praise my child a lot when we play.

    Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

35. My child’s personality learning occurs mostly from watching people.

    Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

36. It is all right for my child to spend a lot of time playing alone.

    Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

37. While at play, my child can take out as many toys as he or she wishes.

    Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

38. I provide chances for my child to make up his or her own mind about a lot of things.

    Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

39. It is difficult for me to stay interested when playing with my child.

    Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

40. I punish my child when he or she doesn’t learn.

    Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

41. My child wants to play too long at one time.

    Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

42. When my child shows off I ignore it.

    Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

43. I feel unhappy when I don’t know an answer to my child’s questions.

    Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

44. I imitate my child’s speech when we play so that the child understands.

    Strong Yes Yes No Strong No

45. It is easy for me to use toys when teaching my child.

    Strong Yes Yes No Strong No
46. I seldom tell my child his or her work is good or bad so that my child can be the judge.

STRONG YES    YES    NO    STRONG NO

47. I want my child to put the toys away before going to bed.

STRONG YES    YES    NO    STRONG NO

48. It is all right for my child to have secrets from me.

STRONG YES    YES    NO    STRONG NO

49. My child learns by playing with other children.

STRONG YES    YES    NO    STRONG NO

50. If we play whenever my child wants to, not much learning will take place.

STRONG YES    YES    NO    STRONG NO