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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The national media campaigns that have turned our attention in the last decade to the problem of adult illiteracy could lead one to the conclusion that no such problem existed in America prior to the 1980s. In actuality, the value placed on education and literacy as the means of preserving democracy in America dates back over 200 years to 1786 when Thomas Jefferson wrote of "a crusade against ignorance, and establishing and improving the law for educating the common people" (Ravitch, 1983, p. 1).

Historically, when the United States has faced national economic and social difficulties, our concern for our undereducated adult population and their inability to make a gainful contribution to our society intensifies (DeArrudah, 1990). This was evident in 1945 when the illiteracy rate among draftees led to the first large-scale effort to develop literacy instruction materials by the military (Costa, 1988). During the 1960s, concerns over racial discrimination, equal educational opportunities, and poverty shifted our focus from the academically talented to the problems of the disadvantaged.

Education was viewed as the solution to these problems when President Johnson stated "The answer for all our nation's problems comes down to a single word. That word is education" (National Advisory Council on Adult
The Adult Education Act of 1966 authorized federal funds to be used for state administered programs that emphasized "the transmission of literacy and other basic skills as a means of increasing employability and enabling adults to function as productive members of society" (Costa, 1988, p. 16).

The back-to-back recessions of 1980 and 1982, the decline in manufacturing jobs in the United States, and the drop in the median family income after adjustments for inflation (Berlin and Sum, 1988) created an economic environment that was particularly difficult for the poor and middle class blue collar worker to survive. In 1983, the Adult Literacy Initiative was established under the Division of Adult Education of the United States Department of Education. "The initiative’s fourfold objective is to 1. generate national awareness, 2. promote public/private sector partnerships and encourage volunteerism, 3. provide technical and networking assistance, and 4. coordinate federal literacy activities within the Department of Education and with other departments and agencies" (Costa, 1988, p. 19).

Literacy and education are clearly prerequisites for the inquiry and reflection that is needed to preserve democracy. Increased occupational, family, community, personal, and educational demands created by the economic and social changes of the past decade have magnified our national awareness of our need for a literate society. We, as educators, policy makers, community leaders, and business leaders have come to realize the impact of
our national problem of illiteracy. The solution for this national dilemma has not yet been found. However, it remains the hope in the hearts of the educators who work with the families who are without the literacy skills that allow them to reach their potential through their acquisition and use of knowledge.

**Statement of the Problem**

According to Costa (1988) adult education is defined as instruction designed to meet the needs of adults past the age of compulsory school attendance who have either completed or interrupted their formal education and who have primary occupations other than being full-time students, alternatively, instruction and services for adults who 1. lack the basic educational skills needed to function effectively in society, 2. have not earned a high school diploma or General Education Development (GED) certificate, and 3. are not required to enroll in school.

(p. 147)

Adult educators who often teach classes at community colleges and community centers face numerous problems. These problems include a lack of full-time teaching staff, a limited understanding of instructional methodology for adult learners, difficulties with student retention, insufficient funding, and poor community status. In spite of these obstacles, adult educators are challenged with meeting the needs of adult students who are of varying abilities and who are confronted with the numerous out of school problems such as unemployment, lack of transportation, and inadequate child care provision that the undereducated adult must face.
During the mid 1980s, research on the benefits of parents and children learning together (Nickse, 1990) and the impact of parent involvement on families (Comer, 1986; Epstein, 1985) made policy makers, and adult and early childhood educators realize that the heart of the solution to the problem may exist in the involvement of families jointly in educational programs.

Additional support for educational programs which focus on the family unit comes from research on the effect of the home environment on school learning (Bloom, 1981, 1986; Dave, 1963; Dolan, 1992). Dave (1963) found that the home environment and the types of activities that parents do in their homes has a greater influence on school learning than the socio-economic status (SES) of parents.

Family literacy programs began to be examined as a possible answer to alleviating our national problem of intergenerational illiteracy. Programs have been organized to improve the literacy skills of educationally disadvantaged parents and children by bringing families together as a learning unit to share literacy experiences. Programs are based on the belief that children who come from homes in which parents read and write as well as where reading and writing are viewed as valuable experiences will have greater opportunities to develop literacy skills and will value reading and writing. Such programs provide comprehensive services that generally include adult education, parenting skills training for parents, joint parent/child learning activities, and planned preschool education, and/or planned educational activities for
elementary school children.

This approach to lessening the problem of illiteracy is relatively new with state efforts in Illinois beginning in fiscal year 1989 (Knell, Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center, Personal Communication, June 1992). Prior to the implementation of family literacy efforts in Illinois and in the United States, undereducated parents received adult education services primarily through community college programs. Funding for family literacy programs has, for the most part, been provided through short term federal, state, and private sector grants. Although the notion of family literacy programs appeals to theorists and practitioners, there is little research to support their success. Research is needed to support the effectiveness of these programs and to provide insight into possible program components that might be responsible for their success if funding is to continue.

The purpose of this study is twofold. First, the study will compare adult participants in family literacy programs with adult participants in a traditional adult education program in order to determine if there are differences between the two groups in the literacy achievement gains, retention rates, and home educational environments. Secondly, this study will examine home educational environments and achievement gains and retention rates in order to determine if a relationship exists between home factors and achievement and retention rates.

Through an investigation of family literacy programs the following
components most frequently emerged:

1. Adult Education

   A. Adult Basic Education (ABE) (as defined by the Adult Education Act of 1966) Education for persons whose inability to speak, read, or write the English language substantially impairs their ability to get or retain employment commensurate with their real abilities. Adult Basic Education is intended to raise the educational level of such persons in order to decrease their dependence on others, enable them to benefit from occupational training, increase their opportunities for more productive and profitable employment, and make them better able to meet their adult responsibilities (Costa, 1988, p. 147).

   B. General Educational Development (GED) Program  A program of instruction designed to prepare persons to take a high school equivalency examination (Costa, 1988, p. 149).

   C. English as a Second Language (ESL); English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)  A program designed to enable persons whose native language is other than English to study and develop English-language skills, including speaking, listening, reading, and writing (Costa, 1988, p. 149).

2. Preschool Education - Three and four year old children of program participants attend preschool classes and activities. Services may include activities for children from birth through age two. In some cases, activities are planned that include school aged children.

3. Parent Education - Activities that are designed to help parents become more knowledgeable and confident in their roles as parents. This is often accomplished through discussion groups and workshops that address specific concerns of parents.

4. Parent/Child Learning Activities - Joint activities for parents and
preschoolers that are designed to enhance the cognitive and affective skills of parents and children.

Traditional adult education programs differ from the adult education components that are contained in family literacy programs in that they do not contain the preschool education, parent education, and parent/child learning activity program components. Such programs are frequently offered through community colleges and focus on the educational needs of parents whereas, family literacy programs offer comprehensive approaches to alleviating the problem of family illiteracy by focusing on the needs of the parent and the child.

Family literacy programs and traditional adult basic education programs each offer strengths and are confronted with challenges (Nickse, 1990). Adult education has greater experience in assessing and teaching undereducated adults, but these types of programs lack expertise in working with children and in addressing the needs of parents. Family literacy programs have expertise in working with children and the ability to identify and involve parents through their children, however they are faced with the challenge of establishing and maintaining collaborative efforts with the adult education providers who are experienced in assessing and teaching undereducated adults.

**Background Information**

Disagreement on criteria that should be included in a definition of the term literacy is widespread (Costa, 1988; Hunter and Harman, 1979; National
Advisory Council on Adult Education, 1986). Hunter and Harman (1979) believe that definitions are relative to the levels and skills which are required of the specific individual. The social group of which the individual is a member affects these levels and skills. A differentiation is made between conventional literacy and functional literacy.

Within the general term literacy, we suggest the following distinctions:

1. **Conventional literacy**: the ability to read, write, and comprehend texts on familiar subjects and to understand whatever signs, labels, instructions, and directions are necessary to get along within one's environment.

2. **Functional literacy**: the possession of skills perceived as necessary by particular persons and groups to fulfill their own self-determined objectives as family and community members, citizens, consumers, job-holders, and members of social, religious, or other associations of their choosing. This includes the ability to obtain information they want and to use that information for their own and others' well-being, to satisfy the requirements they set for themselves as being important for their own lives; the ability to deal positively with demands made on them by society; and the ability to solve the problems they face in their daily lives.

   (Hunter and Harman, 1979, p.7-8)

As varying definitions exist for the term literacy, varying estimates exist of the numbers of adults in America who are illiterate (National Advisory Council on Adult Education, 1986). Estimates deviate according to the criteria which are used in defining what is meant by the word illiteracy. The criteria range from number of years of school that were completed, to level of reading
mastery, to minimum competency level, to ability to problem solve. Jonathan Kozol (1985) estimates in his popular book *Illiterate America* (1985) that 60 million people (over one third of the entire adult population) are functionally or conventionally illiterate.

The largest numbers of illiterate adults are white native-born Americans. In proportion to population, however, the figures are higher for blacks and Hispanics than for whites. Sixteen percent of white adults, 44 percent of blacks, and 56 percent of Hispanic citizens are functional or marginal illiterates. Figures for the younger generation of black adults are increasing. Forty-seven percent of all black seventeen-year-olds are functionally illiterate. The figure is expected to climb to 50 percent by 1990. (Kozol, 1985, p. 4-5)

Although this study will primarily be examining family literacy and educational literacy skills, it is acknowledged and accepted that these skills represent only part of what is included in literacy. According to Dr. Valerie Meyer (personal communication, April, 1986) of Southern Illinois University, (Edwardsville, Illinois) there are five aspects of literacy, all of which are dependent on the "core" skills of reading, writing, speaking, listening and computation. Dr. Meyer describes the five aspects as follows:

1. **Occupational Literacy** refers to core skills which enable one to obtain gainful employment and be able to use employment to advance economically.

2. **Family Literacy** suggests one is able to participate in a "meaningful" way as a member of a family unit. This might include tasks such as balancing one's checkbook, read books and articles relating to child rearing, understand materials dealing with family "problem solving" strategies, listen effectively to other family members, communicate verbally with one's husband/wife, siblings, children and other relatives.
3. **Community Literacy** refers to one's ability to function as a "good citizen" by attempting to be an informed voter, understanding the language of common contracts and dealing effectively with community service agencies.

4. **Educational Literacy** suggests that one is capable of reaching reasonable educational goals be these to obtain a high school diploma, to enroll in evening vocational course, to obtain a B.A. degree, or to participate in any other sort of organized, sequential learning activity.

5. **Personal Literacy** includes the previous four areas. It includes a statement made by Chall that "Literacy means being able to read enough not to get "ripped off" and it involves the concept of "reading and affect." It means being able to turn to a comforting good story, and the ability to use the printed word as a tool for personal growth/spiritual growth/enrichment. (Meyer, ND, used with permission)

Combinations and varying degrees of these literacy skills may exist in families.

The value of these literacy skills to an individual is influenced by the value of the skills to the social group to which the individual belongs. The social environment provides the setting for the concepts, language, and motivation of such skills to evolve (Sticht and McDonald, 1989). Value for such skills can be changed. Family literacy programs hope to offer an environment to support such change. The challenge and strength of family literacy programs lie in their ability to understand and use the social realities of communities and families as vehicles for teaching. Parents are empowered and motivated to remain in literacy programs and to succeed when the realities of the classroom are tied to the realities of their lives.

It is important to note that there are different models that exist for
family literacy programs. Programs offer different services (e.g. child care, transportation, meals) and different degrees of emphasis on the various program components (e.g. preschool classes, parent education, parent/child learning activities). The advantage of this type of program diversity is that it allows for individualization in order to meet family and community needs. The disadvantage of utilizing various models in federal, state, and local family literacy efforts is the difficulty that is encountered in the attempt to collect information and ideas about services which are most effective for various populations.

Nickse (1990) offers a conceptual model for classifying four types of family literacy programs along with the advantages and disadvantages of each type. Nickse's (1990) model provides a framework for understanding various types of programs. The following is a description of these program types:

**TYPE I: Direct Adults - Direct Children**

Parents and children are involved in structured activities on a regular, on-going, and frequent basis. Direct instruction (including preschool education, adult education, parent education, and parent/child learning activities) is generally included. This model is most appropriate for non-working parents of preschoolers. Transportation and child care is necessary and the site must be equipped to serve both parents and children.

**TYPE 2: Indirect Adults - Indirect Children**

Parents and children are involved in this model but services are less
formal than the previously mentioned model. Attendance is voluntary. Full-time staff is generally not required. Emphasis is on promoting literacy for enjoyment which may affect the attitudinal change of parents and children. This model does not directly teach literacy skills to families.

**TYPE 3: Direct Adults - Indirect Children**

Parents participate directly in the program and there are generally limited (if any) activities for children. These programs are supported by the belief that parents will become more literate and this will influence the literacy skills of their children.

**TYPE 4: Indirect Adults - Direct Children**

Children participate directly in the program (e.g. public school preschool classes) and parents may or may not participate. Materials are often sent home to parents for them to use at home.

(Nickse, 1990, p. 51-55)

**Summary of National and State Evaluations of Family Literacy Programs**

The field of Family Literacy is relatively new. A review of the literature did not produce any program evaluation documents written prior to 1987 with most documents dated from 1989 to 1991. Most reports have focused on providing descriptive information on programs (Darling, 1988; Darling and Hayes, 1989; Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center, 1990; Saginaw Public Schools, 1990; Seamon, 1991). Results of the effectiveness of the Kenan Family Literacy Model (Seamon, 1991) have shown that when teachers receive
training in proper implementation of the model, parents learn to support their children's education. Children then develop the skills that are necessary for success in school (Seamon, 1991). It should be noted that since there were no control or comparison groups used in studies of this model, it is difficult to predict the outcomes of the parents and the children had they not participated in the program.

A study by Kim (1987) of the PACE Program used a control group to compare parents in a Family Literacy Program with parents in an Adult Education control group. Difficulties were encountered due to the demographic differences of the two groups.

Currently, the Federal Department of Education is conducting a comprehensive evaluation of federally funded Even Start Family Literacy Programs across the United States. This evaluation, which is to be completed in 1993, will gather data on the 73 original programs that were funded in 1989. Case studies of 10 of these programs are being conducted. Comparison groups are being used in as many of these 10 projects as possible. It is hoped that 20 Even Start families and 20 comparison group families will be involved at each of the 10 locations (National Evaluation of the Even Start Family Literacy Program - First Year Report, United States Department of Education, 1991).

Research Questions

This study will focus on the reading and language gains, retention rates, and the home educational environments of adult participants in family literacy
programs and a community college adult education program within the same community.

The following questions will be addressed:

1. Do parents who participate in family literacy programs show greater achievement gains than parents who participate in traditional adult education programs?

2. Is the retention rate greater for those parents who participate in family literacy programs than for those who participate in traditional adult education programs?

3. Is there a difference between the responses of family literacy participants and traditional adult education participants to items on the home educational environmental questionnaire?

4. Is there a relationship between home educational environment scores and achievement gains?

5. Is there a relationship between home educational environment scores and student retention rates?

The examination of these questions should provide a greater understanding of the population in the study who enroll in family literacy programs and traditional adult education programs. Such information may provide knowledge into the extent that family literacy programs are reaching the population that they are designed to reach. It is also anticipated that an understanding of the relationship between the home educational environments
of adult education students and the achievement gains and the retention rates of adult education students will be achieved.

**Operational Definitions**

Throughout this study, various terms will be used as the variables of the study are discussed. The following are brief explanations of the terms as they are being used.

A. **Educationally disadvantaged adult** - "refers to persons 16 years and older who are not enrolled in school and have not completed secondary school." (Hunter and Harman, 1979, p.2)

B. **Undereducated adult** - refers to educationally disadvantaged adults but also includes adults who lack the necessary basic skills to function at the level at which they need to in any or all of the following areas, which include: occupational roles, family roles, community roles, educational roles, and personal roles.

C. **Literacy levels** - refers to the level of performance of participants on normed tests in the areas of reading, and language.

1. The Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) will be used to pre-test and post-test Adult Basic Education (ABE) and General Education Development (GED) student literacy levels in the area of reading (grade levels 1-12). This is a written test.

2. The Combined English Language Skills (CELSA)
will be used to test English-as-a-Second Language (ESL) students who have literacy skills in their native language. This is a written test.

3. The (Henderson-Moriarity ESL/Literacy Placement Test (HELP) will be used to test ESL students who have no literacy skills or beginning literacy skills in their native language. This is an oral and written test.

D. Home educational environment - refers to variables in the home environment that have been found to be relevant to educational achievement in school-aged children (Bloom, 1981, Dave, 1963). These variables will be measured through a questionnaire that requires that parents rate the presence of these variables in their home. The variables are described as follows:

1. Work habits of the children and parents
   A. The degree of structure, sharing, and punctuality in the home activities
   B. Emphasis on regularity in the use of time and space in the home
   C. Priority given to schoolwork, reading, and other educative activities over TV and other recreation

2. Academic guidance and support
   A. Frequent encouragement of the child for his or her schoolwork
   B. Parental knowledge of strengths and weaknesses in the child’s school learning and supportive help when it is really needed
C. Availability of a quiet place to study with appropriate books, reference materials, and other learning material

3. Stimulation to explore and discuss ideas and events
   A. Family interest in hobbies, games, and other activities which have educative value
   B. Family use and discussion of books, newspapers, magazines, and TV programs
   C. Frequent use of libraries, museums, and cultural activities by the family

4. Language development in the home
   A. Family concern and help for correct and effective language usage
   B. Opportunities for the enlargement of vocabulary and sentence patterns

5. Academic aspirations and expectations
   A. Parental knowledge of the child's current schoolwork and school activities
   B. Parental standards and expectations for the child's schoolwork
   C. Parental educational and vocational aspirations for the child

   (Bloom, 1981, p.94-101)

E. Retention (dropout rate) - refers to participants remaining in a program one semester during the 1992-93 school year.

Significance of the Study

There is both theoretical and practical value in studying the effect of family literacy and adult education on parents. On the theoretical side, this investigation hopes 1) to extend previous research findings that suggest that
parents are more likely to become involved in programs that are directly linked to the education of their children 2) to gain an understanding into differences in literacy levels, retention rates, and home educational environments that may exist between family literacy and adult education participants and 3) to gain insight into the relationship that may exist between home educational environment and the achievement gains and retention rates of adult education students.

The recent national interest in family literacy and the lack of research in the field justifies the importance of studies that, not only provide support for and understanding of programs that address the literacy needs and concerns of families, but also offer a framework for the development of programs and delivery of services, (Auerbach, 1989).

The practical significance of this study concerns itself with the considerable diversity that exists among family literacy programs throughout the state and the nation. Differences exist in backgrounds and qualifications of coordinators, amount and sources of funding, curricular components, and community collaboration and support. This diversity enables programs to establish, implement, and adapt services to comprehensively meet the needs of the student in his world. Services can be designed and implemented that are sensitive to the student’s community and culture. The difficulty with this diversity that exists is that practitioners are faced with the challenge of developing and maintaining programs without an understanding of what has
been successful or unsuccessful in other programs.

This study hopes to offer practitioners some insight and direction for program development and service delivery on the basis of what is learned from the programs and students who are participants in this project.

**Limitations of the Study**

This study, as any other study, is confronted with limitations that must be acknowledged. The study will be limited to using a sample from two family literacy programs and one adult education program. The programs will be similar in terms of the populations they serve and the services they provide. Using a smaller sample will mean that efforts will be concentrated on obtaining and presenting information on the population that the samples are drawn from so that comparative information that is presented will be supported by an understanding of the programs and individuals involved in the study. Several limitations arise from using this approach. First, limiting the number of programs involved in the study affects the sample size and the ability to generalize the findings from this study to other programs whose populations, services, and funds are different. Retention of students in such programs also becomes a concern. Since retention of adult education students is often poor (Heathington, Boser, and Salter, 1985), it is difficult to predict the size of the sample that will be available for post-testing.

Research in the area of teacher efficacy (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1988) supports the power of teacher effect on student achievement. It is beyond the
scope of this study to examine the philosophies of education of the teachers who are involved in the study, their backgrounds in Adult Education, and their interactions with students. Although these issues are not being addressed in this study, their influence on student achievement is a factor that may have a definite impact on the findings of this study.

A final limitation of this study pertains to its focus on collecting, analyzing and reporting information and data on the parent and not the child. Due to the length of time that this study will be conducted, a decision was made not to collect data on the children. This conclusion was drawn on the basis of the difficulty and often inaccuracy involved in the determination of gains made by preschoolers in the areas of cognitive language, motor, and social development on the basis of standardized instruments (National Association for the Education of Young Children and the National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education, 1990). Studies relying on standardized instruments to measure the gains of young children are most valid when they are longitudinal in nature. This allows gains to be measured and generalizations to be made regarding program outcomes on the basis of the children's development over a longer period of time.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Without a doubt, growing national interest and concern has been conveyed for the problem of illiteracy. Much of this concern is associated with economic changes. A high unemployment rate along with a workforce that lacks the basic skills that enables it to benefit from retraining programs designed to prepare workers to assume jobs that require higher level skills has focused the attention of Americans on illiterate adults. Along with our concern for our adult population, we also must acknowledge the fact that growing numbers of our youth are at risk of failing in school and are living in poverty. Recent political and media attention has magnified the attention of literate America on adult illiteracy. The fact that literacy skills are important and that programs to combat illiteracy are in existence is recognized by the literate majority. We as human beings tend to perceive problems and issues through our own experiences and situations. More simply put, "We do not see things as they are. We see things as we are" (Brown, 1988, p. 106).

This literature review supports this study by providing insight into the overlapping relationship between illiteracy, families, and social and economic
issues. Although the relationship is intricate, efforts to understand a problem that is far removed from the lives of literate Americans must begin by coming to understand illiterate Americans and their families as learning units.

The methods utilized in the literature review produced large amounts of material related to adult literacy education. Less plentiful in the literature was material that addressed the issue of family literacy. With the field being relatively new many of the reports were site specific and difficult to generalize to this study. Other literature covered a range of disciplines and confronted the researcher with the decision of which disciplines were most pertinent to this study. After what has been a thorough computer and manual search along with numerous meetings and telephone conversations with experts in the field, a decision was made regarding the organization of the literature review.

Two areas were investigated in this literature review: The first section of the literature review provides an understanding of the relationship between illiteracy and social and economic problems. The second section of the literature review examines the theoretical support for offering approaches to addressing the problem of illiteracy that support the family as a learning unit.

The Complex and Interconnected Relationship between Illiteracy, Society, and Families

Literate Americans have great faith in the belief that through education increased economic success and social status can be achieved. This belief that
is the result of experiences they have had and values that have been instilled in them permeates all aspects of their lives and is passed on to their children.

From literate America’s perspective, the answer, therefore, to the social and economic problems that exist must lie in education and literacy campaigns (Hunter and Harman, 1979). The fact that only 8% of Americans who are illiterate participate in adult education and literacy programs (Pugsley, 1990) is somewhat of a mystery to literate Americans.

We tend to view social problems and the answers to them from our own perspective. Illiteracy is no exception. Literacy is valued by literate persons for two purposes. First, it is viewed as a function which is needed in our print-oriented society and secondly it is viewed as needed in order to understand society and to gain "a 'positive self-concept' in a credential-conscious world" (Fingeret, 1982, p. 3). While the value placed on literacy by literate society is great, the stigma placed on illiteracy by the same society is equally great. According to Quigley, (1990) "historically illiteracy has been defined as an 'immense evil', and illiterates have been stereotyped as being unproductive, stupid, chronic failures, socially dependent and morally deficient" (cited in Beder, 1991, p. 67).

Fingeret (1982) found in her study of literacy as perceived by illiterate adults that although illiterate adults believe that it would be nice to know how to read and write, the issue is more complex than that. Our society places value on being independent. A degree of such independence is the result of
one’s ability to obtain employment, read books, write letters, and participate in other literacy related skills. Illiterate adults have family and community relationships that provide a certain degree of security. An individual’s role within the family and community is often defined by that individual’s level of literacy. For illiterate adults, obtaining literacy skills may require losing one’s place within the community. To resolve this conflict, illiterate adults may criticize literates saying they lack common sense or they may limit their contact with literate society. Those adults who do seek literacy assistance often find it difficult to give up their secure role within their family and community and thus discontinue receiving literacy instruction. The strong sense of community that has in a sense contributed to the creation of a negative image of the literate community is best described in excerpts from fieldnotes from Fingeret’s study:

...those family members who can read and write and who have a high school diploma have jobs. Hattie and her sister watch the children for them and do the errands that the others don’t have time to do because they are working. In the mornings, Hattie usually runs downtown to pay bills or do some shopping for herself and for the others... Her sister comes over and watches all the young children who aren’t in school yet. The two of them do whatever laundry has accumulated and clean the house and cook. Between them, the family members work it out: who brings in the money, who watches the children, who does the errands and pays the bills, who cooks and cleans... Hattie’s very clear that she doesn’t really ever think about learning to read or continuing her education. She’s very busy.

Excerpt from fieldnotes

Sadie describes another kind of division of labor:
If I can read and write and you cannot, then others will say, Sadie, will you read this for me or write this for me... But then, maybe I cannot read or write, but I can explain it better than she can, and she can read and write. Without reading and writing, you can sit and take it all in... Some people can pray better, some people can sing better, some people can understand and explain better, some people can read and write better - everybody has different talents.

Retired factory worker

(Fingeret, 1982, p. 6)

Illiteracy is a problem that is often interconnected with unemployment, poverty, ill-health, crime, and racial and ethnic minorities. In Childers and Post's book (1975) The Information Poor in America the knowledge and information needs of the disadvantaged are examined. Among the disadvantaged are the deaf, the blind, the undereducated and the poor and other groups who "by virtue of their social, economic, cultural, educational, physical, or ethnic condition could be expected to suffer more deprivation than the rest of society" (p. 11). Hunter and Harman's 1979 Report to the Ford Foundation entitled Adult Illiteracy in the United States addressed this issue when they described "the overlapping spheres of the disadvantaged" (p. 36). It is unrealistic to believe that by itself literacy will solve such serious social and economic problems that affect families. Social and economic reform is central to efforts to alleviate illiteracy. Hunter and Harman (1979) contend the following:

By the time they are adults, those who are caught in a complex of social and economic disadvantages suffer multiple impediments that cannot be removed by learning
to read or write. The value of literacy is enhanced for them only when it can be useful in the course of achieving their goals in a wide range of life-influencing areas: economic security, health care, greater power over decisions affecting their families, better schools for their children, community improvement, and the like. The process of meeting their more pressing social and economic needs will also broaden the context within which they can use their literacy skills.

(p. 108)

The relationship between illiteracy, society, and the economy is complex. To begin to understand this relationship we must examine the collective effects of social and economic change on illiteracy and families. In doing so: "We must dispel two myths: that literacy is the primary cause of progress; and that illiteracy is the cause of poverty and injustice" (Hunter and Harman, 1979, p.109).

The Economy

"The close association between poverty and risk holds for every component of risk - from premature birth to poor health and nutrition, from failure to develop warm, secure, trusting relationships early in life to child abuse, from family stress and chaos to failure to master school skills. Persistent and concentrated poverty virtually guarantee the presence of a vast collection of risk factors and their continuing destructive impact over time".

(Schorr, 1988, p. 29-30)

The "persistent and concentrated poverty" described by Schorr has been hard hitting to families affected by illiteracy. In fact, poverty and the problems associated with it will likely be magnified in the next decade unless we can
successfully break this cycle that includes at its heart the need for upgraded literacy skills. The Final Report of the Project on Adult Literacy entitled \textit{Jump Start, The Federal Role in Adult Literacy} states the following:

"There is no way in which the United States can remain competitive in a global economy, maintain its standard of living, and shoulder the burden of the retirement of the baby boom generation unless we mount a forceful national effort to help adults upgrade their basic skills in the very near future."

(Chisman, 1989, p. iii)

We must examine economic changes that have transpired over the last 20 years as well as economic and demographic changes that will shape the next decade in order to understand and address the needs of undereducated adults and their families.

\textbf{Key Developments in the United States Economy from 1947 to 1984}

The period between 1947 and 1973 was a twenty-six year period of prosperity for most Americans. World War II had ended and there were numerous jobs for unskilled workers in the manufacturing industry. During that period, large numbers of unskilled blacks moved from the rural south to the industrial midwest and northern states to obtain employment in the auto, steel, and rubber industries (Schorr, 1989). Between the period of 1947 and 1973 the annual median real income of American families "increased from $14,095 to $28,167, representing a doubling of their purchasing power" (Berlin and Sum, 1988, p. 3).

The year 1973 marked the beginning of a period of dramatic economic
changes. In Berlin and Sum’s Report (1988) *A More Perfect Union: Basic Skills, Poor Families and Our Economic Future* three developments were noted that impacted our economy. These developments were the first major oil price increase, the initial peak of the baby-boom generation’s entrance into the workforce, and an acceleration of inflation that began during the Vietnam War. Between 1973 and 1984 the median real family income fell 6 percent from $28,167 to $26,443 (Berlin and Sum, 1988). As wages fell so did the buying power of families and their standards of living. These lower wages along with a 9.6% unemployment rate in 1984 (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, cited in the United States Department of Commerce Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1991, p. 404) have had an especially devastating effect on undereducated adults who have been dislocated from manufacturing jobs in the auto, steel, rubber, and textile industries.

**The Social Impact of Falling Wages**

The falling of wages that began in 1973 and continued through 1984 initiated changes that drastically affected many American families. In order for Americans to maintain their standards of living many individuals found themselves postponing marriage, having fewer children, going into debt, and in two-parent families, both parents found themselves employed (Berlin and Sum, 1988). Although these strategies may have appeared to offer solutions to the problem of falling wages they had several limitations. First, these strategies
could only be used successfully by two-parent families. Secondly, they could only be used one time. Once individuals had postponed marriage and had fewer children, they could not use these strategies again to alleviate difficult economic times (Berlin and Sum, 1988). In addition, undereducated adults and those adults who were the least skilled found themselves least able to utilize these strategies.

Black families have been especially hard hit by the difficult economic times that began in the 1970's. Schorr (1989) summarizes the impact on black males as follows: "Even as legal barriers of racial discrimination came down, new technological barriers for the less skilled went up. By 1989, almost half of the 8.8 million black men of working age were out of work" (p. 19).

Berlin and Sum (1988) point out that of black male dropouts between the ages of twenty to twenty-four-year-olds 43 percent reported no earnings in 1984 as compared to the 14.2 percent who reported no earnings in 1973. According to the U.S. Bureau of the Census (cited in the United States Department of Commerce Statistical Abstract, 1991, p. 156) the percentage of black males who were not high school graduates was 20.3% in 1989. These figures have had and will continue to have a significant effect on black families and black communities. As employment prospects for black males have decreased the number of black families that are headed by women has increased. "The Center for the Study of Social Policy has projected that by the year 2000, in the absence of intervention, 70 percent of black families will be
headed by single women and fewer than 30 percent of black men will be employed" (cited in Schorr, 1989, p. 19).

As economic opportunities between 1973 and 1984 lessened for undereducated blacks, opportunities for twenty to twenty-four year old black college graduates increased 16.3%. On the basis of education and race, this represented the only group that showed an increase in earnings during that period (Berlin and Sum, 1989). As the earnings of college educated blacks increased many moved from inner city areas. Professor William J. Wilson believes this has created "one of the most important social transformations in recent U.S. history" and describes how this has impacted inner city neighborhoods so that they have become "a social milieu significantly different from the environment that existed in these communities several decades ago" (cited in Schorr, 1989, p. 19). The effect of a lack of adult models for children living in inner city communities that demonstrate that education is meaningful and employment is an alternate to welfare will be examined later in this literature review in the discussion of James Comer.

The Hispanic population has also felt the impact of these changed economic times. Between 1980 and 1988 the number of Hispanics in the United States has increased by 34%. By the year 2000 they are expected to account for 22% of the growth in the labor force (Koretz, 1989). Heavy immigration and a high rate of birth among Hispanics in the United States accounts for this growth (Koretz, 1989).
One-third of all Hispanics in the United States labor market are immigrants (Boyas and Trenda, 1985). The majority of immigrants have limited educations and few job skills. Unfortunately, these are "traits that tend to persist among their offspring . . . Nearly 40% of Hispanic youngsters drop out of high school, for example, compared with about 17% of blacks and 14% of whites" (Koretz, 1989, p.21).

The number of 20 to 24 year old Hispanic males who were able to support a family of three above the poverty level declined from 61% in 1973 to 35% in 1984 (Berlin and Sum, 1988). Adding to the impact of this decline is the fact that Hispanics are overrepresented in occupations projected to decline and underrepresented in occupational groups projected to grow rapidly (Occupational Outlook Quarterly, Winter 1991/91). "Therefore, the challenge is to emphasize the need for more education for Hispanics so that they can compete in the likely labor market of the next 15 years" (Occupational Outlook Quarterly, Winter 1991/92, p.44).

The Effect of the Decline in Manufacturing Jobs on Undereducated Adults

According to the United States Department of Labor and the United States Department of Education's (1988) joint publication entitled The Bottom Line: Basic Skills in the Workplace about 90 percent of new jobs through 1995 will be in service industries compared with only 8 percent in manufacturing. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (cited in the United States
between 1980 and 1988 the number of jobs in the steel industry decreased by 7.4%, in the metal industry by 4.8%, in the mining industry by 4.3%, and in the textile industry by 1.9%. It is projected that these industries will experience further decreases in the number of needed workers by the year 2000. In addition, the United States Department of Labor estimates that as we shift from being an industrial society to a technological/information society "75 percent of the unemployed lack the basic skills necessary to be trained for high-tech jobs" (cited in The National Advisory Council on Adult Education Report, 1986, p. 12). As jobs are going unfilled, adults are lacking the necessary literacy skills to obtain newly created jobs.

These changes have had a tremendous impact on families and communities. Jobs in manufacturing have typically enabled adults who lacked strong literacy skills and high school educations to earn enough money to support families. As these jobs decreased several things happened: First, as jobs were eliminated in manufacturing, younger workers who had less seniority were the group of workers who most likely lost their jobs. These were generally the employees who still had families to raise. Secondly, as older workers retired jobs were eliminated from the manufacturing industry through attrition. These jobs which once provided individuals who may have lacked strong literacy skills with an adequate means of supporting their families became unavailable (Berlin and Sum, 1988). The following excerpts from
Berlin and Sum (1988) express the significance of these changes on families and communities:

"In the early 1970’s nearly 60 percent of the young men who were twenty to twenty-four years old were able to earn enough to support a family of three above the poverty line; by 1984 only 42 percent could do this".  

(p. 13)

"We estimate that about one-half of the decline in marriage rates among high school dropouts and nearly 30 percent of the decline among high school graduates (no college) was due to the decline in their earnings".  

(p. 15)

"Without adequate earnings, men are less likely to marry, and women are less likely to marry men who cannot support them, even when they are the fathers of their children. The birth rates of teens and women twenty to twenty-four years old are not rising. In fact, overall birth rates among teens and young female adults have been declining since 1960. It is the share of all births to young women that occur out of wedlock that has risen since the 1960’s and not so incidentally, the greatest surge occurred in the last fifteen years".  

(p. 16)

It is an oversimplification of the problem of illiteracy if we believe that the solution to our problems of unemployment and illiteracy lies solely in our graduating more students from high school and raising the literacy levels of more adults. This misconception has led to unsuccessful literacy campaigns. Hunter and Harman (1979) caution that it is misleading to assume that anyone who becomes literate will be better off economically and will be better able to find employment. Sociologist Randall Collins describes the impact of the credential inflation that took place when the baby-boom surplus of workers
entered the workforce and created more workers than jobs:

"...that in the nineteenth century those at the bottom of the American social and economic heap were led to believe that if they were literate more opportunities would be available to them. As the number of those with educational credentials increased, however, so did the basic requirements for the same level of jobs" (cited in The National Advisory Council on Adult Education, 1986, p. 12).

Demographics, Employment, and Education in the Twenty-First Century

In addition to the economic changes that have transpired during the past twenty-six years, demographics tell us that we can anticipate additional changes that overlap with educational concerns and will impact families.

The Hudson Institutes Workforce 2000 Report (Johnston and Packer, 1987) analyzed key trends that are expected to affect the workplace in the upcoming years. The analysis projects the following:

1. For the first time in history the majority of new jobs will require post-secondary education
2. Jobs that are in the middle of the skill distribution today will be the least skilled occupations of the future
3. The decline in population growth will mean an older workforce, with the average age of workers increasing from 36 to 39 by the year 2000
4. 80 percent of new entrants into the workforce will be women, minorities, and immigrants
These changes will mean that traditionally less skilled groups and population groups that have been underutilized in the workforce (women, minorities, and immigrants) will be needed to fill available jobs. Women, blacks, and Hispanics have higher levels of illiteracy, higher levels of unemployment, and higher levels of poverty than white males (Berlin and Sum, 1988; Hunter and Harman, 1979; Kerka, 1989). Smaller growth in the labor force and fewer qualified workers will mean that the United States will be confronted with a growing mismatch between available workers and job skill requirements.

In addition to basic literacy skills that will be required for an increasing number of jobs; problem-solving skills, communication skills, and work habits such as reliability, perseverance, and self-discipline will be needed in the workforce. Home environments that are established and maintained by parents is where such skills are nurtured (Rich, 1988).

The Social and Cultural Context of Literacy

One of the difficulties of studying individuals who are considered to be disadvantaged is that we run the risk of reinforcing stereotypes (Auerbach, 1989; Beder, 1991; Fingeret, 1984; Hunter and Harman, 1979;). Two stereotypes of illiterates are described by Fingeret (1984). The first grew out of the 1960's War on Poverty which has influenced our perspective on literacy education where illiterate individuals were portrayed as embedded in a culture
of poverty (Lewis, cited in Fingeret, 1984). The middle-class culture was the norm and the emphasis was placed on imposing and instilling the middle-class culture on adult students in literacy programs. This deficit perspective places the blame for illiteracy on the individuals and portrays the disadvantaged as "poor planners, parents, housekeepers, friends, and spouses." (Fingeret, 1984, p. 17). In addition, they are described as having low self-esteem to lacking future orientation and the ability of thinking abstractly.

Fingeret describes another view of illiteracy that blames class discrimination and social structure inequities for failing to meet the needs of children who are not middle-class. Although this view places the blame on society it is another version of the deficit model. Bronfenbrenner (1984) describes this model as being "less condescending" and "more humane" than the "culture of poverty approach" described previously, however, both models require that adult students acknowledge that there is an inadequacy or deficiency in their lives in order to benefit from literacy instruction.

One of the problems with the deficit model is that it creates stigmas which negatively affect self-concepts and disempower individuals (Beder, 1991). The solution to the problem is not one dimensional. While the illiterate adult's culture and beliefs must be viewed from the individual's perspective, he also needs to develop a realization of the larger society. "When the problem is conceptualized as this kind of interaction between structural and cultural factors, the programmatic response combines developing critical awareness of
these social and political realities on the part of the illiterate adults (empowerment) and working together with them to bring about political and social change" (Fingeret, 1984, p. 18).

Elsa Auerbach's (1989) studies of immigrant and refugee families and literacy reveal that programs designed to address family literacy needs often operate under a new version of the deficit model which assumes that parents lack the skills to promote school success in their children. Studies (Chall and Snow, 1982; Snow, Barnes, Chandler, Goodman, and Hemphill, 1991; Taylor and Dorsey-Gains, 1988) of the literacy home environment practices of low-income and minority families found that a wide variety of literacy materials and activities took place in the homes that were studied.

James Coleman's (1991) social capital theory offers an explanation for the importance of parent and home factors for a child's school success even when the parents themselves have minimal education backgrounds and low socioeconomic status. Coleman defines social capital as the interactions and the relationships that occur between people; in this case between parents and children. Human capital is described as the knowledge, skills, and the educational backgrounds of the parents. Although research indicates that student achievement correlates with the educational background of the parents (Sticht and McDonald, 1989), the importance of social capital should not be underestimated.

Families rich in human capital and social capital represent
knowledgeable and well-educated parents who are interactive with their children. Families rich in human capital and deficient in social capital represent knowledgeable and well-educated parents who for a wide variety of reasons are not interactive with and supportive of their children. It seems that this type of family is becoming more prevalent in our society (Hart, 1988). Families rich in social capital but lacking human capital represent families with parents who may have limited educations but who make up for this deficiency in their interactions with their children. Finally, families who lack both human and social capital represent families with parents who have limited educations, who are often poor and disorganized, and who are not interactive with and supportive of their children.

Coleman reminds us that parents who are undereducated can provide interactive and supportive home educational environments for their children. We must be cautious and cognizant of stereotypes. Auerbach (1989) suggests that we "increase the social significance of literacy in family life by incorporating community cultural forms and social issues into the content of literacy activities" (p. 177). We must empower all individuals by valuing and respecting in families what they value and respect in themselves while developing an understanding of and a confidence in one’s ability to participate in the larger society.

The Interactive Effects of Risk Factors
There is a relationship between poverty, undereducation, unemployment, and being a member of a minority group. Adults who lack basic skills often tend to be unemployed and poor. There is a higher incidence among minority groups of those who are poor, unemployed, and undereducated (Berlin and Sum, 1988; Kerka, 1989). These factors are frequently intergenerational (National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education, 1988; Sticht and McDonald, 1989) creating a new generation of families who are confronted with the outcomes their parents faced.

Economic stagnation and high unemployment rates have been responsible for an increase in childhood poverty in the United States (Hodgkinson, 1989; Schorr, 1989). Children have replaced the elderly as the largest age group of poor in this country with 40 percent of the poor being children and 10 percent of the poor being elderly. It is alarming to think that 23 percent of young children in our country between the ages of 0-5 are living in poverty (Hodgkinson, 1989). With more children growing up in single parent homes and more unemployed young people this should not be surprising. Over half of today’s marriages are slated to end in divorce and 23 percent of children born today are born outside of marriage (Hodgkinson, 1989). With the average income of female headed households being only one third of that of married couples (Hodgkinson, 1989) it is apparent why childhood poverty has increased.

The National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education (1988)
believes that targeting resources and developing strategies to improve female literacy is critical to America's economic, social and political well-being. They cite the following findings to support their position:

1. There is a high correlation between women's low educational attainment and high levels of poverty. Women of color and women for whom English is a second language are more likely to be poor and have traditionally had little access to quality education.

2. The literacy levels of children are strongly linked to those of their parents, especially their mother. Millions of mothers have low literacy skills. The literacy needs of both the mother and the child must be addressed.

3. Greater numbers of women will be needed in the workforce to obtain jobs that require greater skills. Women will need the literacy skills to obtain such jobs. Illiteracy is linked to America's deepest social and economic problems which include unemployment, teenage pregnancy, and long term welfare dependency and poverty.

4. Young women with below average skills and below poverty incomes are five and a half times more likely to be teen parents than those with average or better basic skills and with above poverty incomes.

5. Three-fifths of all adults receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children have not completed high school. The average reading level of AFDC mothers between the ages of 17 and 21 is below sixth grade.

6. Individuals with less than a sixth grade education are four times more likely to need public assistance than those who have a ninth to eleventh grade education.

7. Seventy-five percent of female heads of households with less than a high school diploma are living in poverty compared with thirty-four percent of men in
the same situation.

8. Nearly forty percent of female single parents have eighth grade or less educations.

(National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education, 1988, p. 3-5).

Parental education and poverty are related and poverty and childhood risk factors are related.

It takes more than a single risk factor to create an adverse outcome for a child (Schorr, 1989). "Economic stress, lack of social support and other protective factors, a fragile, impaired, or immature parent, and sometimes a difficult infant can combine in the absence of outside help, to create an environment so bad that it prejudices the normal development of the child" (Schorr, 1989, p. 143).

All families raising children need support, be it from friends, families or organized support services. Economic pressures, poverty, and greater mobility have decreased the availability of informed supports in America (Schorr, 1989).

Urie Bronfenbrenner (1984) summarized major changes that have influenced the American family since World War II. These changes include an increase in the proportion of single-parent families, the entry of more mothers into the labor force, and the growing financial gap between poor families in the United States and the rest of the population. The fact that more families with children are experiencing the effects of poverty has the most far reaching effects.
The Appalachian Adult Education Center has identified four different groups of educationally disadvantaged adults. Each of these groups has different needs and requires different approaches and services. These four groups are described as follows:

**Group 1** consists of individuals who respond well to group activities as well as individualized instruction. Such adults are "secure" and "self-directed" and respond well to media recruitment campaigns.

**Group 2** consists of individuals who are less secure economically and personally. Such adults often have large families and have suffered difficulties with unemployment. Motivation for learning is high among members of this group, however, family and employment opportunities frequently interfere with schooling.

**Group 3** consists of individuals who have been sporadically employed in short term and low paying jobs. Individualized recruitment efforts and instruction is necessary to reach members of this group.

**Group 4** consists of the stationary poor, those who face numerous economic and social difficulties and who are
least accessible to services. Individuals in this group often suffer from a sense of hopelessness and helplessness.

There is little interaction between this group and mainstream society and although social and educational services may be available within their communities, few individuals take advantage of them due to their sense of isolation. In spite of this sense of isolation from mainstream society, mutual support, information exchange, and loyalty frequently exist among Group 4 members within a community.

(cited in Hunter and Harman, 1979)

Hunter and Harman (1979) have suggested that traditional adult education programs have been most effective in reaching members of Group I. Such individuals have seen evidence in their lives that their situations can be improved economically and socially through education. Their value for education motivates them to continue their education.

Adult education programs that are designed to meet the needs of the other three groups (especially the stationary poor) need to be more comprehensive in nature due to the interactive effects of risk factors that exist in the lives of these individuals and their families. The problem of illiteracy cannot be alleviated if it is viewed as a problem that can be addressed by one particular agency alone. Illiteracy affects families and its direct and indirect
effects are far reaching. "The seriousness and seeming intractability of educational and social problems in the nation compel new projects that blur traditional separations and the perceived boundaries of home, school, and workplace" (Nickse, 1990, p. 1). According to Schorr (1989):

"The programs that work best for children and families in high-risk environments typically offer comprehensive and intensive services . . . Interventions that are successful with high-risk populations all seem to have staffs with the time and skill to establish relationships based on human respect and trust".

(p.xxi)

Harold Hodgkinson (1989) has studied education at all levels and suggests that educators need to establish interagency cooperation with housing, health care, and transportation services within their community as they are all serving the same families. This approach is seen as the most effective, cost-effective and humane way to deliver services to families.

Jump Start, The Federal Role in Adult Literacy, a report sponsored by the Southport Institute for Policy Analysis whose purpose was to examine the federal government's role in promoting adult literacy, listed among its recommendations the creation of a Cabinet Council on Adult Literacy whose responsibilities should include to . . . "facilitate the integration of literacy efforts with programs to deliver other social services to individuals for whom literacy is only one of a complex of interrelated problems" (Chisman, 1989, p. 20). More specifically, it was advised that funding for Even Start, a program established by Congress in 1988 and administered by the Department of
Education should be increased substantially. The goal of Even Start is to promote "family literacy through programs that provide training to parents and their children" (Chisman, 1989, p. 32). Families who are eligible for Even Start must have a child between the ages of birth and seven, must reside in a Chapter I elementary school attendance area, and must have an adult who is in need of an adult basic education program (National U.S. Department of Education Evaluation of the Even Start Family Literacy Program, 1991).

David Harman (1987) offers the following recommendations regarding literacy education:

1. Programs must be developed to meet the needs, situations, and desires of the participants and communities they serve. Packaged curriculums and instructional approaches should be discouraged.

2. Programs should not be "one-shot" efforts. Literacy needs change and the focus should be on continual and life long learning.

3. Programs directed at socially and economically disadvantaged adults must be comprehensive and must focus on the needs of families.

Disadvantage has multiple causes and cannot be solved with simplistic solutions. Literacy is one aspect of disadvantage. Health care, economics, employment opportunities, community standards, and housing are equally important and often interconnected aspects of disadvantage. "Changed conditions bring about changed motivations, and motivation is an essential in the acquisition of literacy" (Harman, 1987, p. 95).
Theoretical Support for Family Literacy Programs

The field of Family Literacy is relatively new with efforts beginning in the State of Illinois in fiscal year 1989 through state funded Family Literacy Programs (Knell, Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center, Personal Communication, June, 1992) and efforts beginning at the national level in 1989 through federally funded Even Start Programs (National Evaluation of the Even Start Family Literacy Program - First Year Report, Department of Education, 1991).

There is little evidence to date to support the benefits of family literacy programs. Few programs are in existence and those programs that are tend to differ from location to location in terms of population, administration, instructional methodology, instructors, and funding. In addition, problems such as student retention, an inability to locate comparison groups that would allow for an evaluation of possible outcomes if family programs were not in existence, and a lack of research based programs have made it difficult to measure the benefits of programs that have been in existence. Currently, the Federal Department of Education is conducting a comprehensive evaluation of federally funded Even Start Programs across the United States. This evaluation, which is to be completed in 1993 will gather data on the 73 original Even Start Programs that were funded in 1989. Case studies of 10 of these programs are being conducted. Family Comparison groups are being used in as many of these 10 projects as possible. It is anticipated that 20 Even Start
families and 20 comparison group families will be involved at each location (National Evaluation of the Even Start Family Literacy Program - First Year Report, U.S. Department of Education, 1991).

Although there is little evidence to date to support the effectiveness of family literacy programs, there is ample research within related but diverse fields to support the need for such programs. The following section of this literature review will examine findings from related fields which offer programmatic support. Research on parent involvement, home environments, the effects of maternal levels of education on children, adult education, and emergent literacy will be reviewed.

**Parent Involvement**

Research on the benefits of school, family, and community linkages indicates that family involvement in a child's education is linked to healthy child development and to the academic and social success of children (Davies, 1989). In addition to benefits to the child,

"family involvement in education can contribute to the personal development and empowerment of the adults involved and can lead to an increased appreciation of their important roles, strengthened social networks, improved access to information and materials, a better sense of personal efficacy, and heightened motivation to continue their education".

(Davies, 1989, p. 2)

In a paper that was presented at the annual meeting of the American
Education Research Association in San Francisco, California in March, 1989, Davies described his findings about the relationship between low-income parents and schools, teacher attitudes about these families, and parent attitudes about teachers and schools. This information was obtained on the bases of 350 interviews with low income parents and teachers. The following is a summary of some of his findings:

1. Most low-income families have little contact with school and what communication there is generally is negative communication from teacher to parents when their child is in trouble in school.

2. Although most low income parents prefer not having to come to school because they are reminded of the difficulty they had in school, they will come to school when asked to come for a good reason.

3. Teachers and administrators often consider low-income parents hard-to-reach and believe that they do not value education, however, the parents do not consider themselves hard-to-reach.

Davies’ findings indicate that there is clearly a lack of understanding and poor communication between poor parents, teachers, and schools. David Seeley (1989) believes that it is the structure of American public education that keeps parents from participating in the education of their children, Seeley refers to what he calls the "delegation model" where parents feel they don’t need to be involved because the school has been delegated the job of educating their children. Seeley cites the need for what he calls a
collaborative model (Seeley, 1989) which empowers parents and teachers through community outreach, trust building, and mutual accountability. If school, family, and community linkages can positively affect children and parents then efforts must be made to address these issues.

Research that supports the critical influence of the family on the school achievement of children has been confirmed (Clark, 1983; Walberg, 1984). The curriculum of the home predicts school achievement to a far greater degree than socio-economic factors. James Comer (1984) has demonstrated that in order to improve urban schools, the social, emotional, and physical development of children must be addressed by schools in addition to their intellectual and academic development.

Comer describes economic and social changes that have taken place since World War II that have affected the support systems that once existed for poor black children. Prior to World War II, the United States was a less affluent nation where socio-economic and educational stratification was less significant. Families were less mobile, personal interaction with authority figures was greater, families within communities shared common values, and the school was a natural part of the social network of the community. "Thus the nature and organization of the pre-World War II society facilitated the mission of the school" (Comer, 1984, p. 329).

Comer believes that many low-income, minority children fail in school because they have not acquired the characteristics of inner direction and
control which were once learned from their families and communities. Schools and teachers frequently view the problem as that of the children lacking ability, however, Comer believes the problem is that of social underdevelopment rather than inability and that individual schools should be organized to create pre-World War II climates that reduce social stratification, conflict, and distrust between home and school. Schools should give a social message of love, belonging, and value.

Comer's model empowers parents by enlisting them in meaningful work and creating a sense of pride and ownership for the school and the community. The basis of Comer's model is the development of feelings of trust and mutual respect between families and schools and a conviction to the belief that a poor child's success or lack of success is dependent on the relationship between the school and his family (Comer, 1984). Comer's model has successfully been implemented in New Haven, Connecticut schools. The model contains the following four elements:

1. **A representative governance and management body** which coordinates the program at the building level. A committee of parents, teachers, administrators, support staff, and aides is responsible for identifying problems, possible solutions, and evaluating outcomes. Mutual trust and respect that develops between parents and faculty and staff promotes understanding and communication.

2. **A Parent Program** which involves parents in classroom, social, and
fund raising activities within the school creating feelings of ownership and pride in parents and promoting a sense of belonging and self-esteem in children.

3. **Support Staff or mental health team program** which provides additional support to children, parents, and teachers confronted with individual difficulties, enabling faculty and staff to spend less time on resolving conflicts and more time for planning and program implementation.

4. **A Staff and Curriculum Development Program** which was designed to give low-income children skills that children from well-educated families have acquired from their parents. Emphasis is on developing social skills and an appreciation and expression in the areas of politics and government, business and economics, health and nutrition, and spiritual and leisure time.

Joyce Epstein (cited in Brandt, 1989) emphasizes the importance of schools involving parents in the educating of their children. Twenty percent of parents are already successfully involved in their child’s education, 2 to 5% may have personal problems which may temporarily interfere with their involvement in their child’s education, and 75% of parents want to be more involved in their child’s education. According to Epstein (1984, 1985), when parents use educational activities at home to help their children, social class as a factor in learning is minimized.
Homes, Families and School Achievement

Research which supports the critical influence of the family on the school achievement of children has been confirmed (Bloom, 1981; Clark, 1983; Dave, 1963; Dolan, 1983; Marjoribanks, 1979; Walberg, 1984). Reginald Clark's (1983) study of 32 low income urban families found that family support for their child’s education was the variable that accounted for the academic achievement of the participants he studied. Walberg's (1984) findings indicated that "the curriculum of the home predicts academic learning twice as well as the socioeconomic status of the families" (p. 400).

Benjamin Bloom (1981, 1986) supports the need for programs which help parents to provide support and encouragement for their children’s education and achievement saying that the majority of research that has examined the relationship between home environments and learning has focused on socioeconomic factors (race or ethnic background, economic status, and parental occupational and educational backgrounds). Socioeconomic status has explained only 10% of the variance in school achievement. In addition, there is very little that can be done over a short period of time to alter socioeconomic factors.

Research conducted by Dave (1963) studied what families do in their homes rather than what they are (socioeconomic factors) as variables that account for the academic success of their children. Dave (1963) hypothesized that the home environment relevant to school achievement might be studied in
terms of the following process variables.

1. **Achievement Press**

   1a. Parental aspirations for the education of the child
   1b. Parents' own aspirations
   1c. Parents' interest in academic achievement
   1d. Social press for academic achievement
   1e. Standards of reward for educational attainment
   1f. Knowledge of the educational progress of the child
   1g. Preparation and planning for the attainment of educational goals

2. **Language Models**

   2a. Quality of the language usage of the parents
   2b. Opportunities for the enlargement and use of vocabulary and sentence patterns
   2c. Keenness of the parents for correct and effective language usage

3. **Academic Guidance**

   3a. Availability of guidance on matters relating to school work
   3b. Quality of guidance on matters relating to school work
   3c. Availability and use of materials and facilities related to school learning

4. **Activeness of the Family**

   4a. The extent and content of the indoor activities of the family
   4b. The extent and content of the outdoor activities during weekends and vacations
   4c. Use of TV and such other media
   4d. Use of books, periodical literature, library and such other facilities

5. **Intellectuality in the Home**
5a. Nature and quality of toys, games, and hobbies made available to the child
5b. Opportunities for thinking and imagination in daily activities

6. **Work Habits in the Family**

6a. Degree of structure and routing in the home management
6b. Preference for the educational activities over other pleasurable things

(Dave, 1963, p.38-39)

Dave broke these variables into specific home and family characteristics which were measured and rated on the basis of interviews and observational data. The correlation between home environment factors and fourth-grade achievement was found to be +.80 (Dave, 1963).

Dolan (1983) conducted a similar study to Dave’s with students from three grade levels (second, fourth, and sixth) and their parents. He found a strong positive relationship between home factors and student achievement. Dolan’s study differed from Dave’s in that all of the participants in his study were from similar family backgrounds (low socioeconomics) whereas Dave’s sample was drawn from a wide range of socioeconomic backgrounds. Dolan’s findings support the importance of home educational environments within a single level of socioeconomic status. His findings indicate that there is a wide range of variation in the home educational environments of low socioeconomic families and that "belief in a "culture of poverty" that is unable to provide meaningful support for school performance must be questioned" (Dolan, 1983, p. 93). In addition, Dolan’s (1992) evaluation of Project SELF HELP, a family
literacy program that served 24 parents and was located in two sites that are among the most economically disadvantaged schools in Baltimore, Maryland found that parents who dropped out of the program had lower scores on a home environment index than did parents who completed the program. Those parents who remained in the program for one year showed greater than two year achievement gains on the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT). The children of parents who remained in the program received better grades and teacher ratings of behavior than did the children of parents who dropped out of the program.

Research by Dave (1963) and Dolan (1983) has focused on home factors that correlate with academic achievement and which can be altered if there is a willingness on the part of parents to alter them. The importance of home factors and parental involvement in early childhood education programs is summarized by Bloom in his discussion of the gradual wearing off of the effects of early childhood programs during the primary grades when he says "parents are still the key in the learning of their children because they are likely to be a constant factor in their children's lives" (Bloom, 1981, p. 90). Many home factors can be altered if there is a desire in the family to alter them. Positive changes can improve a child's attitude and interest in school learning (Bloom, 1981).

Dorothy Rich, President of the Home and School Institute describes the importance of children "learning to learn" in their homes. In her popular book
Megaskills (1988) she discussed the importance of the basic values, attitudes, and behaviors (confidence, caring, motivation, teamwork, perseverance, responsibility, effort) that are learned in the home as the foundation of success. Rich (1985) offers the following guidelines for family and parent involvement in education.

1. Link parents' involvement directly to the learning of their own child.

2. Provide ways for families to teach academic skills at home.

3. Link the school's work to the community.

4. Provide for parent involvement at all levels of school.

"To ensure its acceptance, parent involvement must be viewed as a legitimate activity of the school, and reaching the family must be considered as important as reaching the child" (p. 80).

The Relationship between a Mother's Level of Education and the Outcomes of Her Children

Sticht and McDonald (1990) have studied the effect of the educational levels of mothers on their children from a developmental perspective. They have found that, as a general trend, the more highly educated the parents, the greater the child's educational success in the primary grades will be. Sticht and McDonald have reviewed studies of the effects of maternal education on
the different phases of childbearing and schooling of their children. Their findings are summarized as follows:

1. **Before pregnancy**, women who have higher levels of education tend to have better personal health care; higher economic productivity; lower fertility rates; and smaller families than women who are poorly educated.

"The number of children born to an individual mother has an influence on cognitive development. It has been shown that the highest cognitive achievement results for those children born first. Relationships of family size to cognitive development in early childhood indicate that, on average, later children tend to develop less well than first borns. Hence, one consequence of increasing female education may be to reduce fertility thereby increasing average preschool cognitive ability in families having fewer children".

(Sticht and McDonald, 1990, p. 5).

2. **During pregnancy and at birth**, women who have higher levels of education tend to have better prenatal health care; more full-term births; higher birthweight babies; and fewer learning disabilities than women who are poorly educated. Better prenatal care means healthier children and lower mortality rates.

"In the United States, it has been found that poorly educated mothers are more likely to suffer malnutrition, to smoke, and to abuse alcohol and drugs during pregnancy than more highly educated parents".

(Schorr, cited in Sticht, p.5)

3. **Before children attend school**, mothers who have higher levels of
education tend to have healthier children who have better
development of cognitive, language, and literacy skills and who
are better prepared for school work than poorly educated
mothers. Such children are read to and exposed to oral language
and literacy activities.

"Preschool cognitive development has strong effects on
achievement in academic skills in schools, and these effects
may persist into adulthood".

(Sticht and McDonald, 1990, p. 5)

When the performance of young adults (ages 21-25 years of age) on the
National Assessment of Educational Progress in Reading was compared to the
educational level of the mother (less than high school; high school graduate;
and education beyond high school) it was found that the higher the educational
level of the mother the higher the reading performance of the young adult.

4. **During the school years**, mothers who have higher levels of
education tend to participate to a greater degree in their child’s
schooling process, have better management over homework, be
better advocates for their child’s education, and to experience
higher academic achievement by their children than poorly
educated mothers. The educational level of mothers is especially
important for children during their school years when homework
assignments become more difficult and the mother’s knowledge
and understanding of homework and schools and her willingness
to become involved in her child's education may enhance her child's chances of succeeding in school.

Additional support that indicates that there is a relationship between a mother's level of schooling and the educational outcomes of her children has been found by Laosa (1982) who studied parent-child relationships as a mediating variable between level of parental schooling received and the cognitive development of children.

Laosa found that more highly educated Chicano mothers used more inquiry and praise and less modeling when conversing with their children. In addition, they read more to their children and had higher educational aspirations. Children of more highly educated Chicano mothers experienced greater continuity between home and school giving them a greater advantage in school than children of less educated Chicano mothers.

Adult Education

The Adult Education Act, which was signed into law by President Johnson on November 3, 1966 stated as its purpose:

to encourage and expand basic educational programs for adults to enable them to overcome English language limitations, to improve their basic education in preparation for occupational training and more profitable employment, and to become more productive and responsible citizens. (Adult Education Act, PL 89-750, cited in Costa, 1988, p. 78).
In 1978, the Adult Education Act was revised to include a more comprehensive purpose which is stated as follows:

to expand educational opportunities for adults and to encourage the establishment of programs of adult education that will:

--enable all adults to acquire basic skills necessary to function in society,
--enable adults who so desire to continue their education to at least the level of completion of secondary school, and
--make available to adults the means to secure training that will enable them to become more employable, productive and responsible citizens.


The Adult Education Act provided federal funding for adult education and increased national awareness of the need for educational programs for undereducated adults.

In spite of high rates of adult illiteracy adult basic education is one of the least developed areas of education (Harman, 1970). According to Pugsley (1990) from 1980 until the present, the number of full-time workers in the field of adult literacy has declined 48 percent and 94 percent of all adult literacy education teachers either work part-time or are volunteers. In addition, the average per pupil annual cost for the federal adult literacy program is only $160.00 (Beder, 1991).

Adult basic education programs have not experienced high levels of success in reaching the population which they are designed to serve. Only 8%
of the population is reached by such programs (Pugsley, 1990). Statistics on attendance and retention rates for ABE students who enroll in adult basic education are equally gloomy. Programs with as little as 50 percent retention rates consider themselves effective and although 20 students may be enrolled in a class it is not unlikely that on any given day only 2 or 3 students may be in attendance (Balmuth, 1986). Such information leads us to question the effectiveness of programs. Sticht and McDonald (1989) suggest that adult literacy education in our nation has not been effective due to the misidentification of adult literacy skills and the development of programs that are inappropriate for the life context of adults. Research supports the need to create learning environments that meet the needs of adult learners as a key element of a successful adult education program (Balmuth, 1988; Lewis, 1984; Solarzano, 1989).

Research on adult learners has found that adults possess certain characteristics that influence their learning and that should be considered in developing instructional programs (Knowles, 1980). In a review of the literature on adult learners (Kalamas, 1987; cited in Imel, 1988) the following generalizations were identified:

1. **Individuals Can Learn Throughout Their Lives.**
   One advantage adults have over children in their ability to learn is their broad range of experiences which provides a foundation for gaining additional knowledge.

2. **Adult Life Cycles Influence Learning.**
   Adult development proceeds through various life-cycle phases which influence how learning is approached as well
as what is important to learn.

3. **Adults Learn What They Consider Important.**
Adults are motivated to learn by the need to acquire skills or make decisions which are important to their lives. Adults will generally work very hard to learn things that are important to them. Since most adult learning is voluntary, adults frequently drop out of programs that do not meet their needs.

4. **Adults Are Often Time Conscious Learners.**
Since adults have many responsibilities and roles (i.e. families, jobs) it is important that their educational needs are met as directly as possible.

5. **What Is Important Varies Among Adults.**
Adults participate in educational programs for a variety of reasons and they tend to do best in programs that provide what they value.

6. **Adults Wish To Be Treated As Adults - Sometimes.**
Adult learning situations should allow adults to retain as much autonomy as possible. Since some adults have only experienced teacher-centered learning environments. They may need assistance in becoming self-directed learners.

7. **Biological Changes May Affect Learning.**
Although adults can continue to learn throughout their lives, physical changes such as speed and reaction time and visual and auditory acuity should be considered when planning educational activities.

(p.3)

Kalamas’ summary of Adult Learning Theory provides adult educators and adult literacy providers with theoretical support for literacy efforts that are comprehensive and holistic. Interviews conducted by Lewis (1984) of 214 adult basic education students in Connecticut found that institutional and personal support can influence ABE students participation in adult education programs.
Lewis found student's family and friends can either be the greatest supporters or non-supporters of an ABE student. In addition, she found that children were the greatest supporters of their parents returning to school. Increased parent-child communication and joint study time were among her findings. Additional research conducted by Askov (cited in Jongsma, 1990) found that literacy instruction with parents reading below a fourth grade reading level "not only increased the parents’ literacy skills but also significantly increased their children’s school attendance and improved their learning behaviors in school" (p. 427).

Irish (1975) polled administrators of ABE programs and found that 80% listed student retention as their greatest problem. A study of Adult Basic Education conducted in New York (cited in Balmuth, 1988) found that there is a strong relationship between regular attendance and school achievement. If adult education students are to achieve, their regular attendance is a critical factor. Attempts must be made to remove the barriers that inhibit adults from full program participation.

Cross (1978) provides a framework for understanding the obstacles which limit adult participation in adult education programs. These barriers fall into the following categories:

1. Situational Barriers (lack of time, money, child care, transportation)
2. Dispositional Barriers (learner’s attitude and perception
of own learning potential)

3. Institutional Barriers (inconvenient scheduling, fees, course offerings, locations)

Addressing the social, psychological and economic hardships that undereducated adults face is vital to program recruitment and retention efforts. Balmuth (1986) identified characteristics of adult literacy programs that are important to program success. Among the characteristics that were identified are the following:

1. Personal contact as a means of recruiting students

2. Conducting intake conferences with students that focus on student expectations, student schedules, as well as a comprehensive diagnosis of students' strengths and weaknesses in reading.

3. Focusing on teacher characteristics (e.g. respect for confidence in students, sensitivity and compassion for students, teacher morale, and the ability of teachers to explain things to students so that students will understand them)

4. Providing counseling for students that focuses on student needs.

5. Providing long-term educational programs and follow-up services for students rather than "quickie"
programs of limited duration.

Other factors cited by Balmuth (1988) as relating positively to retention include the availability of social times for students before, during, and after classes and creating a sense of program ownership by including students in program planning.

Emergent Literacy

Beliefs regarding the acquisition of children's reading and writing skills have changed over the last two decades. Prior to the 1970's, most young children were thought not able to read or understand what it meant to read or write until they were formally taught in first grade (Mason and Allen, 1986). Research conducted in the 1980's has found that preschool children's attempts to read stories before they can read words and to scribble and invent spellings of words prior to conventional writing are prerequisites to learning to read and write (Mason & Allen, 1986). This shift in thinking about the learning of reading and writing skills has been responsible for the adoption of the term literacy to refer to what had traditionally been called reading and writing. "The term "literacy" signals a recognition of the complex relationship among reading, writing, ways of talking, ways of learning, and ways of knowing." (Snow et al., 1991, p. 175).

Just as the term literacy is used to refer to reading and writing, the term emergent literacy has replaced the term reading readiness. "The study of
emergent literacy represents a new perspective which stresses that legitimate, conceptual, developmental literacy learning is occurring during the first years of a child’s life." (Teale & Sulzby, 1986, p. 28). If we accept this viewpoint, then we must accept the fact that literacy can not simply be regarded as a cognitive skill, but also as a complex combination of knowledge and skills that is developing within a child’s home and community setting.

According to Teale & Sulzby (in Strickland and Morrow, 1989) literacy learning must be examined from the child’s point of view if understanding is to occur. The understanding of literacy which Teale & Sulzby gained from a child’s perspective has enabled them to create a portrait of young children as literacy learners. Their portrait is useful in helping us to see that knowledge about and strategies for reading and writing are developed in children from their exploration with written language, from their observations of others engaged in literacy activities, and from their interactions with their parents. Teale & Sulzby’s portrait includes the following:

1. Learning to read and write begins very early in life.

2. Literacy develops from real life settings in which reading and writing are used to accomplish goals.

3. Reading and writing develop concurrently and interrelatedly in young children (reading, writing, and oral language skills mutually reinforce one another in development).

4. Children learn through active engagement. Through children’s observations of their parents writing letters and shopping lists and reading newspapers they construct understandings about written language which they often
demonstrate through play.

5. Parent/child interaction around print is an important aspect of a child's literacy development. Adult-scaffolding of literacy activities promotes literacy learning in children. A child's independent use of print grows out of his literacy interactions with meaningful adults in his life.

(p. 3-5).

Children come to school with literacy backgrounds and knowledge that vary greatly (Strickland & Morrow, 1989). Family communication patterns play an important role in the early literacy development of children. In an analysis of findings from studies of family literacy environments among different social groups Mason & Allen (1986) summarized the following findings regarding family communication patterns, storytime, and reading: Middle-class families often use labeling of pictures and printed words, questioning, and relating the text to children's actual experiences. Working class white families often use less verbal interaction and more visual cues when communicating with and reading to their children. Children are expected to learn through watching rather than through verbal interaction. In Black working-class families children's reading materials are often not available and conversation that is addressed to children is often not simplified. Children, therefore, frequently learn intonation patterns before words. Vygotsky (1978) proposed that interaction with adults is important for children to learn language. He described adult communication with children as necessary in order to create "zones of proximal development". "The zone of proximal
development defines those functions that have not yet matured but are in the process of maturation, functions that will mature tomorrow but are currently in an embryotic state." (Vygotsky, 1978, p.86). Adult scaffolding through social interaction with children is necessary for children to move from what they know to what they will come to know as they move toward their full potential.

In a study by Denny Taylor (1983) of the literacy activities within the family context of families who had children who were successfully learning to read and write, Taylor found that literacy is embedded in the social processes of family life rather than as a list of activities which is taught by parents to their children. The transmission of literacy styles and values generally occurs indirectly and is passed on from one generation to the next. While parents who were interviewed by Taylor had vivid childhood memories of seeing their own parents engaged in literacy activities such as reading the newspaper, few could remember specific occasions in the home which were designed to introduce them to written language. The function of literacy preceded the form. By indirectly learning the value of literacy in the home, Taylor found that children in her study were able to successfully make the transition from the setting of their home where literacy was learned indirectly and valued as a function, to the setting of the school where the literacy emphasis shifted from function to form. Children who come to school lacking literacy experiences at a social level may experience failure because print is abstract and unrelated to their everyday lives. The importance of meaningful experiences to young
children has been well documented (Piaget, cited in Ginsburg & Opper, 1969; Vygotsky, 1978).

There is a tendency to view literacy and illiteracy strictly in educational terms. This view assumes that literacy is a set of skills. Harman (1987) reminds us that literacy is a value more than a skill. In addition to differences among families in literacy knowledge and backgrounds, literacy acquisition is further complicated because the value of literacy is not the same for all families (Mason & Allen, 1986). We are reminded by Barton (1989) that reading and writing must be viewed in terms of social practices so that we see the purposes behind the activities. "In general, people do not read in order to read, nor write in order to write, rather, people read and write to do other things, in order to achieve other ends (Barton, 1989, p. 5).

In an analysis of the value of literacy, Harman (1987) describes its importance as a means of transmitting democracy. Throughout history those in power have attempted to control ideas by controlling the writing and reading of ideas. Democracy depends on the free flow of ideas and the ability of individuals to formulate their own ideas. "The illiterate must be satisfied with the knowledge supplied by others" (p. 94). As long as communities of cultures exist where a value for family reading and writing activities is not needed for families to function, high illiteracy rates will continue regardless of literacy campaigns. Sticht and McDonald (1989) put it well when they said

"social groups direct the person’s cognitive development through the value placed on the learning of certain skills,
thereby providing the all important motivation for engaging in learning and behavior that lead to an individual's cognitive development beyond that resulting from untutored experience in the world" (p. 28-29).

Summary

In developing and organizing this literature review, several predominant issues were emphasized. The following is a summary of these key points:

1. Illiteracy is intricately related to many of our country's most serious social and economic problems. Efforts to alleviate illiteracy must focus on addressing these problems concurrently and comprehensively if literacy campaigns are to be successful. (Berlin and Sum, 1988; Hodgkinson, 1989; Hunter and Harman, 1979; Schorr, 1988; Kerka, 1989; National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education, 1988; Nickse, 1990)

2. Literacy efforts will be most effective if they focus on "understanding" from the perspective of the student rather than through stereotypes that have been created (Auerbach, 1989; Beder, 1991; Bronfenbrenner, 1984; Fingeret, 1982; Hunter & Harman, 1979).

3. If we are committed to enhancing the outcomes for children of undereducated adults then we must acknowledge families as learning units and provide intergenerational programs that address the educational needs of parents as well as those of

4. Retention is a major problem in adult education programs.

Learning environments that meet the needs of adult learners is an important factor in improving adult education programs and increasing student retention (Balmuth, 1988; Beder, 1991; Hunter and Harman, 1979; Lewis, 1984; Solarzano, 1989).
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The literature review that was described in Chapter II of this study indicated that during the past decade the need for increased literacy among the American population has intensified. Changing economic conditions require that upgraded skills are needed for economic survival. Additionally, demographics indicate that the need for upgraded skills will continue to expand during the next decade.

Traditional adult education has not experienced great success in alleviating the problem of adult illiteracy. Poor retention of adult education students may contribute to this problem.

The research examined in Chapter II of this study which links a mother’s level of education to the educational outcomes of her children supports the need to examine alternative forms of adult education such as family literacy programs as a means of not only increasing the educational levels of mothers, but also improving the educational outcomes of children.

Studies cited in Chapter II have focused on the effect of home factors on the achievement of school-aged children. Research has shown that a
relationship exists between home variables and achievement of school-aged children. No studies have been located that have examined home variables as they relate to the reading and language achievement and retention rates of parents in adult education programs. This study investigated this relationship.

The purpose of this study was twofold. First, this study compared adult participants in family literacy programs with adult participants in a traditional adult education program in order to determine if there were differences between the two group's literacy achievement gains, retention rates, and home educational environments. Secondly, this study examined home educational environments and achievement gains and retention rates in order to determine if a relationship existed between home factors and achievement and retention rates.

Population of the Study

The population consisted of parents who had at least one child between the ages of two and twelve. All students participated in adult education classes through Prairie State College's Adult Education Program located in Chicago Heights, Prairie State College's Family Literacy Program located in Chicago Heights, the West Aurora Even Start Program located in Aurora, or the East Aurora National Institute for Literacy's Learning With East Aurora Families located in Aurora. Although the West Aurora Even Start Program and the National Institute for Literacy's Family Literacy Program were housed at
separate sites and funded through different sources, they were examined as one group in this study. Both programs were directed under the auspices of Waubonsee Community College.

All of the participants in the study had registered for classes in an adult education program. Students either registered for ABE or GED classes (to obtain a high school diploma or upgrade their reading and/or math skills) or for ESL classes (to upgrade their English language skills). Students participated in classes during the fall, 1992 and spring, 1993 semesters.

Family Literacy and Even Start participants were required to have children in order to participate in these programs. All students who registered for classes, who completed the intake information form (Appendix A), and who participated in pre-testing were included in the sample.

Non-family literacy students were selected to participate in the study on the basis of whether or not they had children between the ages of two and twelve. Such information was obtained from the intake information form which was completed by all adult education students.

The state of Illinois requires that all adult education students who participate in ABE/GED classes be pre-tested at the beginning and post-tested at the end of each semester in the area of reading with the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE). The TABE is a norm-referenced written test which measures students' performance in the areas of vocabulary and comprehension.

ESL students were not required at the time this study was conducted by
the state of Illinois to be pre-tested and post-tested in order to participate in adult education programs. Since there was no statewide assessment and evaluation policy in effect to measure the performance of ESL students, a great deal of variation was found among programs within the state. Prairie State College Family Literacy Program agreed to pre-test and post-test ESL students with the following two norm-referenced tests:

1. The CELSA which is a written test designed for ESL students who have literacy skills in their native language.

2. The HELP which is an oral and written test designed for ESL students who have no literacy skills or beginning literacy skills in their native language.

Information obtained during student intake determined the test which was most appropriate for each individual student. Students who had limited education in their native country, who had difficulty reading in their native language, and who were unable to understand and respond to questions in English (i.e. what language do you speak, what country are your from, what is your address) were given the HELP.

Non-family literacy ESL students were selected from an off-campus class offered through Prairie State College. Although Prairie State College's ESL students are not tested with the CELSA or the HELP, arrangements were made to pre-test and post-test students in this class with these tests.

Two Hundred Eleven students were included in the sample. Efforts
were made to locate programs to be included in this study that had demographically similar student populations. These efforts were complicated by the need to locate programs that offered similar educational programs and services to students.

Demographic data that has been compiled on these 211 students is presented to provide an understanding of the population in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Students by Ethnic Classification</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic Classification</strong></td>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Students by Income Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - $7,000</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,000 - $15,000</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $30,000</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - $45,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over $45,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not available</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3
Number of Students by Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Works full-time</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works part-time</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receives public assistance</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receives unemployment benefits</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receives Social Security</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>211</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4
Number of Students by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>211</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Age</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Age 29.9
The Home Educational Environment Inventory was used to measure home factors that have been found to have a high correlation with children's academic success. (Bloom, 1981; Dave, 1963). Completion of the Home Educational Environment Inventory was done on a voluntary basis by students. Table 6 presents a breakdown of the number of students who completed the Home Educational Environment Questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEE Completed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prairie State College Family Literacy Participants

Subjects were from two separate family literacy programs located in two separate counties in Illinois.

One of these programs was Prairie State College's state funded Family Literacy Program which was housed at Garfield Elementary School in Chicago Heights (approximately three miles from Prairie State Community College). Students in this program had children who attended Garfield or other local schools or the Family Enrichment Program (a state funded joint parent/child program for children from ages 0-2 and their parents). Childcare, transportation, and joint and individual parent and child activities were offered to families.

Seventy participants from this program were included in this study. Pre-
test scores were available for 66 of the 70 subjects. Thirty-five of these 66 students were tested with the TABE, 18 with the CELSA, and 13 with the HELP. TABE reading scores were reported as scale scores, CELSA scores were reported as the percent of correct responses, and HELP scores were reported as the number of correct responses the student obtained. The grade level range of scores for the TABE is 2.6 to 12.9.

Within several weeks after the beginning of classes, the Home Educational Environment Questionnaire (see Appendix B) was administered to students who volunteered to complete it. Forty-six of the 70 students from the Prairie State College Family Literacy Program volunteered to complete the questionnaire.

Waubonsee Community College Family Literacy Participants

Waubonsee Community College's West Aurora Even Start Project was funded through federal and local funds. Its purpose was to provide adult education for parents and joint and individual parent and child activities for families whose parents participated in ABE/GED and ESL classes.

This program was housed at McCleery School in Aurora. Students were residents in School District #129 and had children who were in attendance in the schools. All families had one child in attendance in a School District #129 kindergarten class. Students attended ABE/GED classes. Child care, transportation, and individual and joint parent and child activities were provided to participants.
Waubonsee Community College received additional federal funds from the National Institute for Literacy in October, 1992 to expand its family literacy effort. An additional site (Learning with East Aurora Families) was added at the Gates Elementary School in East Aurora School District #131. All families had one child in attendance in a School District #131 kindergarten class or in the district's state funded Pre-Kindergarten-At-Risk Program. Adult students attended ABE/GED Classes. Child care, transportation, and individual and joint parent and child activities were provided to participants.

Pre-test scores were available for 100% of the subjects. All ABE/GED students were tested in reading with the TABE. Scores were reported as scale scores. Within several weeks after the beginning of classes the Home Educational Environment Questionnaire was administered to students who volunteered to complete it. Twenty students from the West Aurora Even Start Program and 15 students from the East Aurora Program completed the Home Educational Environment Questionnaire.

**Prairie State College Adult Education Participants**

The adult education sample was selected on the basis of information that was obtained from the intake information form. All ABE/GED subjects attended classes at the community colleges adult education building located at the college's main campus. Students were residents of College District #515 which includes the far southeast suburbs of Chicago. Transportation, child
care, and parent/child activities were not offered through the program.

Ninety-one ABE/GED students were included in the Prairie State College Adult Education Sample. One off campus ESL class offered through Prairie State College was included in the sample. Fifteen of these ESL students were parents and were included in the sample.

Efforts were made to expand the ESL comparison group sample. Contact was made with South Suburban Community College and Truman College’s Lakeview Learning Center. Difficulty in locating ESL Programs that used norm-referenced assessment instruments affected the size of the ESL Comparison Group in this study.

Demographic data that have been compiled on students from these three programs (Prairie State College Family Literacy, Waubonsee Community College Family Literacy and Prairie State College Adult Education) is presented to provide an understanding of the similarities among and differences among participants from these three programs.
### Table 7
Number of Students from Each Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prairie State College Family Literacy Program (ABE/GED)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie State College Family Literacy Program (ESL)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wauponsee Community College West Aurora Even Start Program (ABE/GED)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wauponsee Community College Learning with East Aurora Families (ABE/GED)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie State College Adult Education Program (ABE/GED)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie State College Adult Education Program (ESL)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8
Six Program Types by Ethnic Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSC Family Literacy (ABE/GED)</td>
<td>16 (40%)</td>
<td>20 (50%)</td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC Family Literacy (ESL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Aurora Even Start Wauponsee</td>
<td>5 (25%)</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat’l Inst. for Literacy (Waubonsee)</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
<td>4 (26.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8 (continued)

Six Program Types by Ethnic Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSC Adult Education (ABE/GED)</td>
<td>41 (45.1%)</td>
<td>19 (20.9%)</td>
<td>31 (34.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC Adult Education (ESL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>64 (30.30%)</td>
<td>100 (47.40%)</td>
<td>46 (21.80%)</td>
<td>1 (.50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9

Six Program Types by Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employed full-time or part-time</th>
<th>Receives Public Assistance Social Security, Unemployment Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSC Family Literacy (ABE/GED)</td>
<td>9 (29%)</td>
<td>22 (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC Family Literacy (ESL)</td>
<td>10 (62.5%)</td>
<td>6 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Aurora Even Start (Waubonsee ABE/GED)</td>
<td>9 (52.9%)</td>
<td>8 (47.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat'l Inst. for Literacy (Waubonsee ABE/GED)</td>
<td>4 (28.6%)</td>
<td>10 (71.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC Adult Education (ABE/GED)</td>
<td>26 (32.5%)</td>
<td>54 (67.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC Adult Education (ESL)</td>
<td>11 (91.7%)</td>
<td>1 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>69 (40.60%)</td>
<td>101 (59.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment Information was not available for 41 students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prairie State College Family Literacy Program (ABE/GED)</td>
<td>36 (90%)</td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie State College Family Literacy Program (ESL)</td>
<td>26 (86.7%)</td>
<td>4 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waubonsee Community College West Aurora Even Start Program (ABE/GED)</td>
<td>14 (70%)</td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waubonsee Community College Nat'l Institute for Literacy Program (ABE/GED)</td>
<td>12 (80%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie State College Adult Education Program (ABE/GED)</td>
<td>73 (80.2%)</td>
<td>18 (19.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie State College Adult Education Program (ESL)</td>
<td>7 (46.7%)</td>
<td>8 (53.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>168 (79.6%)</td>
<td>43 (20.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Literacy Program (ABE/GED)</td>
<td>0-$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000-$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25(62.5%)</td>
<td>7(17.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Literacy Program (ESL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7(23.3%)</td>
<td>10(33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Aurora Even Start (ABE/GED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5(25%)</td>
<td>8(40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat'l Institute for Literacy (ABE/GED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4(26.7%)</td>
<td>3(20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education Program (ABE/GED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44(48.4%)</td>
<td>23(25.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education Program (ESL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2(13.3%)</td>
<td>9(60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87(41.2%)</td>
<td>60(28.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12
Six Program Types by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Under 30</th>
<th>30 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSC Family Literacy (ABE/GED)</td>
<td>27 (67.5%)</td>
<td>13 (32.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC Family Literacy (ESL)</td>
<td>15 (50%)</td>
<td>15 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Aurora Even Start (Waubonsee)</td>
<td>9 (45%)</td>
<td>11 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat’l Institute for Literacy (Waubonsee)</td>
<td>10 (66.7%)</td>
<td>5 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC Adult Education (ABE/GED)</td>
<td>50 (54.9%)</td>
<td>41 (45.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC Adult Education (ESL)</td>
<td>4 (26.7%)</td>
<td>11 (73.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>115 (54.5%)</td>
<td>96 (45.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean age was 29.9
Table 13
Six Program Types by Home Educational Environment Questionnaire Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSC Family Literacy (ABE/GED)</td>
<td>23 (57.5%)</td>
<td>17 (42.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC Family Literacy (ESL)</td>
<td>23 (76.7%)</td>
<td>7 (23.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waubonsee Even Start</td>
<td>20 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waubonsee Nat'l Institute for Literacy</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC Adult Education (ABE)</td>
<td>60 (65.9%)</td>
<td>31 (34.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC Adult Education (ESL)</td>
<td>5 (33.3%)</td>
<td>10 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>146 (69.2%)</td>
<td>65 (30.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Participants

The total number of family literacy students was 105. The total comparison group sample of adult education students was 106. Participants from Prairie State College’s Family Literacy Program, Waubonsee Community College’s West Aurora Even Start, and Waubonsee Community College’s Learning With East Aurora Families Program were combined and examined as the family literacy sample in this study. Participants from Prairie State
College's ABE/GED and ESL Programs were combined and examined as the adult education sample in this study.

Demographic data on these two groups are presented to provide an understanding of the groups for which some of the statistical analysis that will be presented in Chapter IV of this study will be completed on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14</th>
<th>Family Literacy/Adult Education Program Type by Ethnic Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black (21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Literacy</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30.30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 15
Family Literacy/Adult Education
Program Type by Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Family Literacy</th>
<th>Adult Education</th>
<th>Column Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-$7,000</td>
<td>41 (39%)</td>
<td>46 (43.4%)</td>
<td>87 (41.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,000-$15,000</td>
<td>28 (26.7%)</td>
<td>32 (30.2%)</td>
<td>60 (28.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-$30,000</td>
<td>12 (11.4%)</td>
<td>14 (13.2%)</td>
<td>26 (12.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over $30,000</td>
<td>5 (4.8%)</td>
<td>5 (4.7%)</td>
<td>10 (4.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>19 (18.1%)</td>
<td>9 (8.5%)</td>
<td>28 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 16
Family Literacy/Adult Education
Program Type by Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Family Literacy</th>
<th>Adult Education</th>
<th>Column Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed full-time or part-time</td>
<td>32 (41%)</td>
<td>46 (59%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receives Public Assistance, Social Security, Unemployment Benefits</td>
<td>37 (40.20%)</td>
<td>55 (59.80%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69 (40.60%)</td>
<td>101 (59.40%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment information was not available for 41 students.
### Table 17
Family Literacy/Adult Education
Program Type by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under Age 30</th>
<th>Age 30 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Literacy</td>
<td>61 (58.10%)</td>
<td>44 (41.90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>54 (50.90%)</td>
<td>52 (49.10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>115 (54.50%)</td>
<td>96 (45.50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 18
Family Literacy/Adult Education
Program Type by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Literacy</td>
<td>88 (83.8%)</td>
<td>17 (16.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>80 (75.5%)</td>
<td>26 (24.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>168 (79.6%)</td>
<td>43 (20.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose of this study was to investigate family literacy and traditional adult education programs to determine if differences existed between the two groups in terms of home educational environments, achievement gains, and retention rates. The study also examined the relationship between home educational environments and achievement gains and retention rates of adult education students.

One of the primary difficulties in the development of this research design was in locating similar populations from which samples could be drawn. Obtaining similar samples allowed the effects of the independent variables of program type and home educational environments to be studied.
as they relate to student achievement and retention without possible socio-
economic (i.e. race, income, employment status) differences between the two
groups affecting the results.

Additionally, it was important that the programs were instructionally the
same so that the effects of the family literacy component and the traditional
adult education component could be studied. Family literacy programs are
relatively new in the state of Illinois. Few programs are in existence and
among those programs there is a great deal of program variation.

The assistance of the Northern Illinois Adult Education Resource
Center and the Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center was sought in
the locating of possible programs for this study.

After telephone contacts and meetings with program coordinators, the
population for the study was selected on the basis of above mentioned criteria
as well as the willingness of program coordinators to volunteer to participate in
the study. The Northern Area Adult Education Resource Center advised the
researcher regarding the selection of appropriate ESL Tests for this study.
The intake information form which was completed by students and used to
select the sample and the home educational environment questionnaire was
translated into Spanish (see Appendix C) and read for clarity, content, and
understanding by two bilingual readers. The Spanish translation of these
materials was available to all ESL students.
The Development and Piloting of the Home Educational Environment Questionnaire

The development of the questionnaire that was used to measure the home educational environment presented a challenge to the researcher.

The purposes of the questionnaire were: to determine if a relationship existed between variables found in homes and families and adult student's retention and reading and language achievement; and to determine if the family literacy sample and the adult education sample were similar in terms of these home and family variables.

If home variables and student demographic information were similar then differences between the two groups retention rates and achievement gains may be attributed to program variables. Additionally, if home variables that are related to school-aged children's achievement are also related to the achievement and retention of parents then it may be useful to address these variables in adult education programs.

The home educational environment questionnaire was revised and administered to a sample of students twice before the final version was developed.

The initial questionnaire was designed as an open-ended interview to be administered individually to a portion of the sample that was representative of the population. This interview consisted of open-ended questions designed to obtain information on student's goals and support systems, work and study
habits in the home, academic guidance and support in the home, and academic aspirations and expectations (see Appendix D). The interviews were conducted with two ABE/GED students and one ESL student in June, 1992. Students were representative of the study's population. The interview protocol and the subjects' responses were reviewed to determine question clarity and comprehension of questions by subjects. The ability of the questions and the interviewing technique to elicit candid responses from the subjects was also reviewed. This review found that the open-endedness of the questions presented students with difficulty in comprehending what was being asked. This affected the ability of the interview to elicit candid responses.

A search of the literature was conducted for a direct questionnaire that could be used to measure home education variables. Bloom's (1981) version of Dave's Home Education Environment Questionnaire (1963) was located (Appendix E). This questionnaire was administered in July, 1992 to a group of three ABE/GED students and one ESL student who were representative of the population in the study. A review of student responses and the questionnaire protocol found problems with question clarity and student comprehension of variables being examined. These problems were believed to influence student responses.

There was a need to develop a direct questionnaire which students could comprehend without additional explanation of items by the interviewer which could influence student responses. The newly developed questionnaire
measured the variables contained in Bloom's (1981) version of Dave's Home Educational Environment Questionnaire (1963) but was designed in the format of Dolan's (1983) Home Educational Environment Index which was developed to examine the relationship between home variables and the academic success of school-aged children. Dolan's Index was a multiple choice questionnaire which utilized direct questions to measure home variables.

A 26 item multiple choice questionnaire (Appendix B) was developed and administered to three ABE/GED and three ESL students in early September, 1992.

This questionnaire was translated into Spanish and administered in Spanish to two of the three ESL students in the pilot. (Appendix F) Concerns with clarity and comprehension which were found with the previously piloted questionnaires were eliminated in this questionnaire. The 26 item multiple choice questionnaire was used to measure home education variables in this study.

**Procedures**

This study was conducted during two consecutive community college semesters during the 1992-93 school-year.

The sample was selected on the basis of information that was obtained from the intake questionnaire (Appendix A). Participants were required to be a parent of at least one child between the ages of two and twelve. Student's age, income, employment status, ethnic classification, and sex were also
obtained from the intake questionnaire.

Students were pre-tested prior to the beginning of the semester and pre-test scores in reading for ABE/GED students and pre-test scores in language for ESL students were obtained from program coordinators. Post-test and retention information was obtained from program coordinators at the close of each semester.

The 26 item questionnaire was administered to all students in the sample within several weeks after classes began. The fall, 1992 Prairie State College adult education and family literacy samples completed the questionnaire in September, 1992. The spring, 1993 Prairie State College samples completed the questionnaire in January, 1993. The West Aurora Even Start sample completed the questionnaire in mid-October. The Learning with East Aurora Family Literacy sample completed the questionnaire in mid-February. Students were invited to complete the questionnaire on a voluntary basis. Questionnaires and instructions were available in Spanish for ESL students who preferred the Spanish versions.

During the administering of the questionnaire, the researcher, or in some cases the program coordinator, read the directions and each question along with the responses to small groups of students and students read and completed the questions. Questionnaires were collected and responses were reviewed by the researcher.

Each of the 26 items was examined individually when the analyses were
conducted to avoid the possibility of the total score masking the results. Cronbach’s Coefficient was obtained for purposes of determining the reliability of the 26 item HEE Questionnaire. The overall reliability of the questionnaire was .8516.

The following is the breakdown of questions and the items they measure from Bloom’s version (1981) of Dave’s Home Educational Environment Questionnaire.

*Work habits of the children and parents - Item measured from Bloom’s Questionnaire*

| A. The degree of structure, sharing, and punctuality in the home activities |
| B. Emphasis on regularity in the use of time and space in the home |
| C. Priority given to schoolwork, reading, and other educative activities over TV and other recreation |

1. Do members of your family all share in helping with household chores?
   - A. Seldom or never
   - B. Sometimes
   - C. Very often or always

2. Do family members have set and regular times to eat, sleep, and study?
   - A. Seldom or never
   - B. Sometimes
   - C. Very often or always

3. Do family members spend time reading, doing homework, and studying even if it reduces the time spent for play, fun, sports, and television?
A. Yes, the parent should go over what the child has to do and see that he/she understands and does the work.

B. Yes, but only to see that the child does all the work.

C. Yes, but only when the child asks for a particular explanation.

D. No, the parent should not help, even if the child asks.

23. Do you know the areas that your child(ren) does well or poorly in?

A. Yes, I am quite sure

B. Yes, I know some of them

C. No

D. None of my children attend school or preschool

Stimulation to explore and discuss ideas and events - Item measured from Bloom's Questionnaire

A. Family interest in hobbies, games, and other activities which have educative value

B. Family use and discussion of books, newspapers, magazines, and TV programs

C. Frequent use of libraries, museums, and cultural activities by the family

8. Do family members share educational hobbies and games that involve all members of the family (ex. board games, puzzles, camping?)

A. Seldom or never

B. Sometimes

C. Very often or always

9. Do you read newspapers and books that are not required for school?

A. Seldom or never

B. Sometimes

C. Very often or always

10. How often do you read to your child(ren)?

A. Frequently (at least once a day)

B. Often (several times each week)
11. How often do you listen to your child(ren) read at home?

- A. Frequently, almost every day
- B. Often, several times each week
- C. Sometimes, at least once a week
- D. Once or twice a month
- E. Seldom or never

12. How often do you discuss with your child books that he/she is reading?

- A. Frequently, almost every day
- B. Often, several times each week
- C. Sometimes, at least once a week
- D. Once or twice a month
- E. Seldom or never

14. Do you have a library card?

____ yes
____ no

15. How often do you go to the library?

- A. More than once a week
- B. A few times a month
- C. A few times a year
- D. Every few years
- E. Never

16. Do family members go to and discuss places such as the zoo, museums, concerts, and plays? If you are unable to go to these places do you watch television programs about such places and events?

- A. Seldom or never
- B. Sometimes
- C. Very often or always

*Language development in the home - Item measured from Bloom’s Questionnaire*
A. Family concern and help for correct and effective language usage
B. Opportunities for the enlargement of vocabulary and sentence patterns

17. Is there a dictionary available in your home and is it used by adults and children who are old enough to use it?

A. Seldom or never  
B. Sometimes  
C. Very often or always

18. Do family members talk about daily events at the dinner table or at a daily time when the family gathers together?

A. Seldom or never  
B. Sometimes  
C. Very often or always

Academic aspirations and expectations - Item measured from Bloom’s Questionnaire

A. Parental knowledge of the child’s current schoolwork and school activities
B. Parental standards and expectations for the child’s schoolwork
C. Parental educational and vocational aspirations for the child

19. How important do you feel your child’s/children’s education is to his/her success in life?

A. Schooling has nothing to do with his/her success  
B. Neither helps nor hurts his/her chances  
C. Not very important  
D. Important  
E. Extremely important

20. How much school do you expect your child(ren) to receive?

A. Won’t finish high school  
B. Finish high school  
C. Finish two years of college or trade school  
D. Finish four years of college  
E. Finish some graduate school education
21. Have you met your child's/children(s) current teacher(s)?

   ---- A. Yes  
   ---- B. No  
   ---- C. None of my children attend school or preschool

22. Do you know what your children are learning and doing in school? (If preschoolers, do you know their daily activities and routine?)

   ---- A. Seldom or never  
   ---- B. Sometimes  
   ---- C. Very often or always  
   ---- D. None of my children attend preschool or school

24. Do you know about activities which take place at your child's/children's school(s) (ex: parent meetings, assemblies, field trips)?

   ---- A. Seldom or never  
   ---- B. Sometimes  
   ---- C. Very often or always  
   ---- D. None of my children attend school or preschool

25. Do you check your child's/children's schoolwork, homework, progress and grades daily and weekly?

   ---- A. Seldom or never  
   ---- B. Sometimes  
   ---- C. Very often or always  
   ---- D. None of my children attend school or preschool

26. Do you communicate regularly with the teacher and school that your child attends so that you know what is taking place in the school and the classroom?

   ---- A. Seldom or never  
   ---- B. Sometimes  
   ---- C. Very often or always  
   ---- D. None of my children attend school or preschool
Design of the Study

The first purpose of this study was to compare participants in two family literacy programs with participants in a community college adult education program in order to determine if there were differences between the group’s achievement gains, retention rates, and home educational environments.

A comparison group quasi-experiment design was used to compare and analyze the three groups. The independent variable was program type. Age, race, and employment status were included as independent variables. Achievement gains, retention rates, and responses to items on the home educational environment questionnaire were the dependent variables.

The following analyses were used to compare the three groups:

I. Both sets of scores (TABE and CELSA) were reported as interval data. The value of the scores was retained by using analysis of variance to compare the achievement gains of the groups. Each of the tests measured a different type of gain (the TABE measured reading gains and the CELSA measured language gains). The two sets of scores were analyzed separately for this reason.

A. Five separate ANOVAS were conducted to compare the achievement gains of students who were administered the TABE.

1. A repeated-measures ANOVA with program type (Waubonsee Family Literacy ABE/GED, Prairie State Family Literacy ABE/GED, and Prairie State Adult Education ABE/GED) as the independent variable.

2. A repeated-measures ANOVA with program type (all ABE/GED family literacy students, all ABE/GED adult education students) as the independent variable.

3. A repeated-measures ANOVA with age (all students under 30, all students age 30 and over) as the independent variable.
4. A repeated-measures ANOVA with race (black, Hispanic, white) as the independent variable.

5. A repeated-measures ANOVA with employment status (all students employed full or part time, all students receiving public assistance, unemployment benefits, or social security) as the independent variable.

B. Three separate ANOVA's were conducted to compare the achievement gains of students who were administered the CELSA.

1. A repeated-measures ANOVA with program type (Prairie State Family Literacy ESL Students, Prairie State Adult Education ESL Students) as the independent variable.

2. A repeated-measures ANOVA with age as the independent variable.

3. A repeated-measures ANOVA with employment status as the independent variable.

II. Seven separate Chi Squares were conducted to compare retention rates. Retention rates were reported as nominal data with categories of yes and no.

A. A 2x3 table that contained cells for the dependent variable of retention (yes/no) and the independent variable of program type (Waubonsee Family Literacy, Prairie State Family Literacy, Prairie State Adult Education).

B. A 2x2 table with retention as the dependent variable and program type (all family literacy/all adult education) as the independent variable.

C. A 2x3 table with retention as the dependent variable and race (black, Hispanic, white) as the independent variable.

D. A 2x2 table with retention as the dependent variable and age (under 30, age 30 and over) as the independent variable.

E. A 2x2 table with retention as the dependent variable and employment status (students employed full or part time, students
receiving public assistance, unemployment benefits, or social security) as the independent variable.

F. A 2x9 multi-way contingency table with retention as the dependent variable and program type and race (Prairie State Family Literacy black students, Prairie State Family Literacy Hispanic students, Prairie State Family Literacy white students, Waubonsee black students, Waubonsee Hispanic students, Waubonsee white students, Prairie State Adult Education black students, Prairie State Adult Education Hispanic students, and Prairie State Adult Education white students) as the independent variables.

G. A 2x6 multi-way contingency table with retention as the dependent variable and program type and age (Prairie State Family Literacy Students who are under 30, Prairie State Family Literacy Students who are 30 and over, Waubonsee Students who are under 30, Waubonsee Students who are age 30 and over, Prairie State College Students who are under 30, Prairie State College Students who are 30 and over) as the independent variables.

III. One hundred thirty separate Chi Squares were conducted to compare the categorical responses within the five independent variables (program type (3 programs), program type (2 programs), race, age, employment status) to each of the 26 items on the Home Education Environment Questionnaire. Separate analyses were performed for each of the 26 items to avoid the possibility of any significant results being masked by the scores if analyses had been performed on the total scores.

The second purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between scores on the home educational environment questionnaire and achievement gains and retention rates.

The following analyses were used to understand these relationships:

I. Cramer's V Coefficient was used to measure the degree of association between responses to each of the individual 26 items on the Home Educational Environment Questionnaire and the achievement gains of CELSA and TABE students. A nonparametric statistic was used because each of the items on the Home Educational Environment
Questionnaire measured a separate variable. Different classifications of measurement were used for some of these items. A concern existed that if items were not analyzed separately, distortion in the interpretation of the data analysis may have occurred. Fifty two separate coefficients were computed (CELSA 26, TABE 26). Gains were calculated for each of the groups and the median gain score was used to create the two categories for the groups (gains that fell below the median, gains that were at or above the median). The median was the most appropriate measure to use to classify achievement gains because there was an interest in whether cases fell within the upper or lower halves of the distribution and not particularly in how far they fell from the central point.

II. Cramer’s V Coefficient was used to measure the degree of association between responses to each of the individual items on the Home Educational Environment Questionnaire and the retention rates of students.

Data Analysis

The following statistics and quantitative tests were used to analyze the data:

1. frequency tabulations
2. crosstabs
3. Cronbach’s Coefficient
4. Analysis of Variance
5. Chi-Square
6. Cramer’s V Coefficient

Summary of the Study

This study investigated the differences between the achievement gains, retention rates, and home educational environments of parents who participated in family literacy and adult education programs. It further determined if a relationship existed between scores on the home educational environment questionnaire and the achievement gains and retention rates of participants in the study.
The study was conducted during two consecutive semesters (fall, 1992; spring, 1993) with separate groups of students in order that the sample size could be increased.

Participants in this study were examined over a semester period in order that achievement gains, retention rates, and home variables between family literacy students and adult education students could be compared. Home variables and achievement gains and retention rates of participants who completed the home educational environment questionnaire were examined to determine if a relationship among these variables exists.

All students were pre-tested prior to the beginning of the semester. ABE/GED students were tested in reading and ESL students were tested in language. Those students who completed a semester were post-tested. The 26 item home education environment questionnaire was administered to students who volunteered to complete it during the first few weeks of the semester.

An analysis of the data was conducted. The description and analysis of the data is presented in Chapters IV and V of this study.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of adult education is to provide instruction designed to meet the needs of adults past the age of compulsory school attendance who have either completed or interrupted their formal education and who have primary occupations other than being full-time students" (Costa, 1988, p.147).

Experts in the field of adult education have cited student retention as their primary program concern (Irish, 1975). Costa's (1988) discussion of adult education calls for "instruction designed to meet the needs of adults." Research supports the need to create learning environments that meet the needs of adult learners as a key element of a successful adult education program (Balmuth, 1988; Lewis, 1984; Solarzano, 1989).

Studies (Davies, 1989) that have focused on the benefits of family involvement in education for parents as well as children support the need for research which examines the effectiveness of family literacy programs. According to Davies (1989), family involvement in education may contribute to the empowerment of parents and the heightened motivation for them to continue their education.
The purpose of this study was twofold: First, this study compared adult participants in family literacy programs with adult participants in a traditional adult education program in order to determine if there were differences between the two group's literacy achievement gains, retention rates, and home educational environments. Secondly, this study examined home educational environments and achievement gains and retention rates in order to determine if a relationship existed between home factors and achievement and retention rates. Five research questions were designed for this study:

1. Do parents who participate in family literacy programs show greater achievement gains than parents who participate in traditional adult education programs?

2. Is the retention rate greater for those parents who participate in family literacy programs than for those who participate in traditional adult education programs?

3. Is there a difference between the responses of family literacy participants and traditional adult education participants to items on the home educational environmental questionnaire?

4. Is there a relationship between home educational environment scores and achievement gains?

5. Is there a relationship between home educational environment scores and student retention rates?

The corresponding data for each research question will be presented in this
chapter. Discussions will be presented with each set of data.

**Program Type and Reading Achievement**

To test the effect of program type on student’s gains in reading as indicated by performance on the TABE Reading Subtest (Vocabulary and Comprehension), five analyses were performed: A repeated-measures ANOVA with program type (Waubonsee Family Literacy ABE/GED, Prairie State Family Literacy ABE/GED, and Prairie State Adult Education ABE/GED) as the independent variable; a repeated-measures ANOVA with program type (All ABE/GED Family Literacy, All ABE/GED Adult Education) as the independent variable; a repeated-measures ANOVA with race (black ABE/GED students, Hispanic ABE/GED students, white ABE/GED students) as the independent variable; a repeated-measures ANOVA with age (ABE/GED students under 30, ABE/GED students 30 and over) as the independent variable; and a repeated-measures ANOVA with employment status (all ABE/GED students employed full-time or part-time, all ABE/GED students receiving public assistance, social security, or unemployment) as the independent variable.

As frequently happens in adult education programs, the number of students who are available for post-testing at the end of a semester is generally considerably less than the number of students who were available for pre-testing at the beginning of the semester. This was also the case in this study where 157 ABE/GED students were available for pre-testing and 75 were
available for post-testing at the end of their first semester. The number of ABE/GED students who were available for post-testing at the end of their second consecutive semester in the program decreased to 17. An analysis of gains for students who post-tested at the conclusion of both semesters was not completed due to the numbers being too low to complete analyses on.

**Effect of the Three Program Types on Reading Achievement**

The mean reading scores for the three groups of ABE/GED students are shown in Table 20.

### Table 20

Analysis of Variance (TABE/Three Program Types)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PSC Family Literacy</th>
<th>Waubonsee Family Literacy</th>
<th>PSC Adult Ed</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Test</strong></td>
<td>757</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Test</strong></td>
<td>777</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marginal</strong></td>
<td>767</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard Deviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Test</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Test</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA (Three Program Types)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6704685.48</td>
<td>9182.39</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15494.90</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.1272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7301.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7005.16</td>
<td>20.64</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time/Program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>182.51</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.5864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>339.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The estimated grade level range for the TABE is from 2.6 to 12.9. A score of 757 (see PSC Family Literacy Pre-Test Score in Table 20) is equivalent to a grade level score of 8.5. A score of 777 (see PSC Family Literacy Post-Test Score in Table 20) is equivalent to a grade level score of 10.9.

The repeated measures ANOVA that compared the reading achievement gains of the three groups indicated that there was no significant difference between the achievement gains of the three groups with a level of significance of $F=0.1272$ (see Table 20). When the effect of time on reading gains (pre-test, post-test) was analyzed within the entire group, a significant increase was found in reading achievement gains from pre-testing to post-testing (significance of $F=0.0000$). There was no significant interaction between the variables of the three program types and time (significance of $F=0.5864$).

**Effect of Two Program Types on Reading Achievement**

Efforts to further examine the effect of participation in a family literacy program on reading achievement were implemented by combining the Waubonsee Family Literacy ABE/GED sample and the Prairie State College ABE/GED Family Literacy sample to form one group (All ABE/GED Family Literacy Students). This group was compared to Prairie State College’s ABE/GED Adult Education Students. This allowed the researcher to increase
the sample size of ABE/GED family literacy students.

The mean reading scores for the two groups of ABE/GED students are shown in Table 21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Family Literacy</th>
<th>All Adult Education</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA (Two Program Types)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Program Type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80865742.54</td>
<td>10808.90</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7481.40</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.2385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8227.23</td>
<td>24.27</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time/Program Error</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59.76</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.6758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>338.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant differences in reading gains were found between the means of the two groups with the significance of F=0.2385 (see Table 21). The achievement gains of all the students within the group did increase significantly between pre-testing and post-testing (significance of F=0.0000).
There was no significant interaction between the variables of the two program types and time (significance of $F=0.6578$).

Effect of Race on Reading Achievement

A breakdown of the mean reading scores for each of the three racial groups (black, Hispanic, white) is shown in Table 22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77054709.79</td>
<td>10090.05</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3433.85</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.6396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7636.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8314.21</td>
<td>24.52</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time/Race</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>197.54</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.5610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>339.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When race was studied as the independent variable to determine if there were differences between all of the black ABE/GED students from all
three programs, all of the Hispanic ABE/GED students from all three programs, and all of the white students from all three programs no significant differences were found between the groups. The level of significance of F=0.6396 (see Table 22). The achievement gains of all the students within the entire group increased significantly between pre-testing and post-testing (significance of F=0.0000). There was no significant interaction between the variables of race and time (significance of F=0.5610).

Effect of Age on Reading Achievement

Students from each of the three ABE/GED Programs were categorized on the basis of age (all ABE/GED students under age 30, all ABE/GED students age 30 and over) to determine if there was a difference between the reading achievement gains of the two groups.

A breakdown of the mean reading scores for each of the age categories is shown in Table 23.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students Under 30</th>
<th>Students 30 and over</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard Deviations

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When age was studied as the independent variable to determine if there were differences between the mean scores of all students under age 30 and the mean scores of all students age 30 and over, no significant differences were found (see Table 23). The level of significance of \( F = 0.0611 \). There was, however, a significant increase in achievement gains from pre-testing to post-testing among the students within both groups (significance of \( F = 0.0000 \)). No significant interaction occurred between the variables of age and time (level of significance of \( F = 0.5420 \)).

### Effect of Employment Status on Reading Achievement

Students from each of the three ABE/GED programs were categorized on the basis of employment status (all ABE/GED students who are employed
full-time or part-time, all ABE/GED students who are receiving public assistance, unemployment, or social security) to determine if there was a difference between the reading achievement gains of the two groups.

A breakdown of the mean reading scores for each of the employment status categories is shown in Table 24.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58047617.66</td>
<td>7845.65</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8497.79</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.2881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7398.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5243.97</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time/Employment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.58</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.7217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>355.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When employment status was studied as the independent variable to determine if there were differences between all of the ABE/GED students who were employed and all of the ABE/GED students who were not employed
no significant difference was found between the groups with the level of significance of $F=0.2881$ (see Table 24). Achievement gains that were shown within the groups from pre-testing to post-testing were significant (significance of $F=0.0003$). When employment status and testing occasion were examined as independent variables, no significance was found (significance of $F=0.7217$).

Program Type and Language Gains for ESL Students

Two separate tests were utilized in this study to measure language gains in ESL students. Information obtained during student intake determined the test which was most appropriate for each individual student. Students who had limited education in their native country, who had difficulty reading in their native language, and who were unable to understand and respond to questions in English (i.e. what language do you speak? what country are you from? what is your address?) were given the HELP. This is an oral and written test designed for ESL students who have no literacy skills or beginning literacy skills in their native language. The CELSA which is a written test was used with ESL students who had literacy skills in their native language.

One of the problems that was encountered in the analysis of language score gains for ESL students was in obtaining a large enough sample of students who were pre-tested with the HELP and who were available for post-testing at the end of the semester. Due to problems with retention, there were not enough ESL students who were administered the HELP to complete
Analyses of ESL students, therefore, only included students who had taken the CELSA. Three repeated-measures ANOVA's were performed with program type (Prairie State Family Literacy (ESL), and Prairie State Adult Education (ESL) as the independent variable (The Waubonsee Family Literacy Program did not include ESL students); with employment status (all ESL students who are employed full-time or part-time; all ESL students who are receiving public assistance, social security, or unemployment) as the independent variable; and with age (all ESL students under 30; all ESL students 30 and over) as the independent variable.

The number of ESL students who were pre-tested with the CELSA was 27. Eighteen students were available for post-testing at the end of their first semester and 14 students were available for post-testing at the end of their second consecutive semester. Analyses included those 18 students who participated in post-testing at the end of one semester.

Effect of Two Program Types on the Language Achievement of ESL Students

A breakdown of the mean language score gains for the two groups of ESL students (Prairie State Family Literacy; Prairie State Adult Education) is shown in Table 25.
When program type was studied as the independent variable to determine if there were significant differences between the mean scores of the two groups, no significant differences were indicated as shown in Table 25 (level of significance of F=0.3940). Additionally, no significant differences were found within the language gains of both group’s pre-test and post-test scores on the CELSA (see Table 25) over time with the level of significance of F=0.1089.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Literacy</th>
<th>Adult Education</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Count</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25
Analysis of Variance (CELSA/Program Type)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Program Type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64361.27</td>
<td>134.48</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>478.59</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.3940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>303.35</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time/Program Error</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.7890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>105.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students from each of the two ESL Programs were categorized on the basis of age (all ESL students under age 30, all ESL students age 30 and over) to determine if there was a difference between the language achievement of the two groups.

A breakdown of the mean language scores for each of the age categories is shown in Table 26.

### Table 26
Analysis of Variance (CELSA/Age)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students Under 30</th>
<th>Students 30 &amp; Over</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard Deviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA (Age)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52190</td>
<td>104.09</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.9428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>501.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>155.38</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.2313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time/Age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85.38</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.3700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When age was studied as the independent variable to determine if there were differences between all of the ESL students from both of the programs no significant difference between the two age groups was found with the level of significance of $F=0.9428$ (see Table 26). No significant gains were found within both group’s pre-test and post-test scores on the CELSA (see Table 26) across time. The level of significance of $F=0.2313$.

Effect of Employment Status on the Language Achievement of ESL Students

ESL Students from each of the two groups were categorized on the basis of employment status (all ESL students who are employed full-time or part-time, all ESL students who are receiving public assistance, unemployment, or social security) to determine if there was a difference between the language achievement gains of the two groups.

A breakdown of the mean language scores for each of the employment status categories is shown in Table 27.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Not Employed</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard Deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27 (continued)
Analysis of Variance
(CELSA/Employment Status)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>399960.30</td>
<td>78.08</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>158.70</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.5725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6153.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.03</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.5657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time/Employment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.03</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.5657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1198.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When employment status was studied as the independent variable to determine if there were differences between all of the ESL students who were employed and all of the ESL students who were not employed no significant difference was found between the groups with the level of significance of \( F=0.5725 \) (see Table 27). No significant gains were found within both groups pre-test and post-test scores on the CELSA (see Table 27) across time. The level of significance of \( F=0.5657 \).

Summary of Analyses on Achievement Gains of T ABE and CELSA Students

The data analyses that were performed found that none of the independent variables (program type, race, age, employment status) had a significant effect on student achievement gains. T ABE scores for all of the groups did increase significantly from pre-testing to post-testing. When the interaction of each of the independent variables with time was examined, no interaction was found. This indicated that none of the program types, races,
age groups, or employment groups accounted for these gains to a significantly larger degree than any other categories within that group. None of the CELSA scores for any of the groups showed significant gains. This held true when program type, age, and employment status were examined.

**Program Type and Retention**

Chapter 2 of this study described research which addressed the problem of student retention in adult education programs and the relationship between regular attendance and school achievement.

The issue of retention in adult education programs posed a problem for this researcher. Of the 182 students who were included in the analyses, 118 retained in their program for at least one semester. Only 48 students retained in their program for two consecutive semesters. Of the 48 students who retained in their program for two consecutive semesters 16 were from Prairie State’s Family Literacy Program, 10 were from the Waubonsee Family Literacy Program, and 22 were from Prairie State’s Adult Education Program. It should be noted that 53 students first registered for classes during the spring semester and were therefore, unable to remain in their program for both semesters during which this study was conducted. Of these 53 students, 11 were from Prairie State’s Family Literacy Program, 15 were from Waubonsee’s Family Literacy Program, and 27 were from Prairie State’s Adult Education Program.

Chi Square was used to analyze differences in retention rates that may have existed between the Family Literacy and Adult Education participants in
this study. The results of the analyses are presented following a description of the Chi Square Table the results were obtained from.

1. A 2x3 table that contains categorical cells for the dependent variable of program retention for one semester (yes/no) and categorical cells for the independent variable of program type (Waubonsee Family Literacy, Prairie State Family Literacy, and Prairie State Adult Education).

There were no significant differences in the retention rates of students from the three programs in this study. The level of significance of the Chi Square statistic was .10404 (see Table 28). Sixty five percent (118) of the 182 students who were included in this analysis retained in their program one semester. Sixty-seven percent of Prairie State Colleges Family Literacy Students retained in the program at least one semester, 79% of Waubonsee’s Family Literacy Students retained in the program at least one semester, and 59% of Prairie State College’s Adult Education Students retained in the program at least one semester.

Table 28
Chi Square
(Retention by Three Program Types)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prairie State Family Literacy</th>
<th>Waubonsee</th>
<th>Prairie State Adult Education</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35(67.3%)</td>
<td>26(78.8%)</td>
<td>57(58.8%)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.7(EF)</td>
<td>21.4(EF)</td>
<td>62.9(EF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17(32.7%)</td>
<td>7(21.2%)</td>
<td>40(41.2%)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.3(EF)</td>
<td>11.6(EF)</td>
<td>34.1(EF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. A 2x2 table that contained categorical cells for the dependent variable of program retention for one semester (yes/no) and categorical cells for the independent variable of program type (all family literacy/all adult education). The two family literacy cells were combined to see if retention differences would be significant if the number of family literacy participants were increased.

No significant differences were found in the retention rates of students when the two family literacy cells were combined. The level of significance of the Chi Square statistic was .06684 (see Table 29).
Seventy-two percent of the family literacy participants in both groups retained in the program at least one semester. Fifty-nine percent of the adult education participants retained in the program at least one semester.

The effect of race, age, and employment on program retention was included in the analyses. The following Chi Square tables were conducted:

3. A 2x3 table that contained categorical cells for the dependent variable of program retention for one semester (yes/no) and categorical cells for the independent variable of race (black, Hispanic, white).

Race was found to have a significant effect on student retention at the .05 level (see Table 30) with a level of significance of .03022.

**Table 30**
Chi Square
(Retention by Race)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39(62.9%)</td>
<td>56(74.7%)</td>
<td>23(51.1%)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.2(EF)</td>
<td>48.6(EF)</td>
<td>29.2(EF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23(37.1%)</td>
<td>19(25.3%)</td>
<td>22(48.9%)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30 (continued)

Chi Square
(Retention by Race)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>35.9%</th>
<th>29.7%</th>
<th>34.4%</th>
<th>35.2%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>21.8(EF)</td>
<td>26.4(EF)</td>
<td>15.8(EF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(EF) = Expected Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>6.99871</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.03022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventy-five percent of the Hispanic students in the study retained in their program at least one semester, while 51% of the white students and 63% of the black students retained a minimum of one semester. A greater number of Hispanic students (56) retained than would be expected (48.6). Fewer Hispanic students (19) dropped out of the program than would be expected (26.4). Attempts were unsuccessful in analyzing retention rates by program type and race in a 2x9 contingency table (PSC Family Literacy black, PSC Family Literacy white, PSC Family Literacy Hispanic, Waubonsee black, Waubonsee white, Waubonsee Hispanic, PSC Adult Education black, PSC Adult Education white, PSC Adult Education Hispanic) due to the number of cells with expected frequencies <5.

4. A 2x2 table that contained categorical cells for the dependent variable of program retention for one semester (yes/no) and categorical cells for the independent variable of student age (under 30, age 30 and
Age was found to have a significant effect on student retention at the .05 level (see Table 31) with a level of significance of .00598.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age Under 30</th>
<th>Age 30 and over</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64 (57.1%)</td>
<td>54 (77.1%)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.6 (EF)</td>
<td>45.4 (EF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>48 (42.9%)</td>
<td>16 (22.9%)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.4 (EF)</td>
<td>24.6 (EF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(EF) = Expected Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi Square Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>7.55762</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventy-seven percent of students who were age 30 and over retained in their program a minimum of one semester while only 57% of students under 30 retained at least one semester. Fewer students (64) under 30 retained than would be expected (72.6), while more students (54) age 30 and over retained than would be expected (45.4). A greater number of students (48) under 30 dropped out of the program than would be expected (39.4) and fewer students (16) age 30 and over dropped out of the program than would be expected (24.6). A 2x6 contingency table (PSC Adult Education under 30, PSC Adult Education 30 and over, Waubonsee under 30, Waubonsee 30 and over, PSC Family Literacy under 30, PSC Family Literacy 30 and over) to analyze
program type and age by retention could not be completed due to the number of cells with expected frequencies <5.

5. A 2x2 table that contained categorical cells for the dependent variable of program retention for one semester (yes/no) and categorical cells for the independent variable of student employment status (employed full-time and part-time; receiving public assistance, unemployment, social security).

Employment status was not found to have a significant effect on the retention rate of students. The level of significance of the Chi Square statistic was .40932 (see Table 32).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Not Employed</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42(68.9%)</td>
<td>58(62.4%)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.6(EF)</td>
<td>60.4(EF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19(31.1%)</td>
<td>35(37.6%)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.4(EF)</td>
<td>32.6%(EF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(EF) = Expected Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>.68078</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.40932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixty-three percent of the students who were not employed remained in the
program one semester and 69% of the students who were employed remained in the program one semester.

Program Type and Responses to Items Measured on the Home Educational Environment Questionnaire

The 26 item Home Educational Environment Questionnaire that 69% of the students in the population volunteered to take measured five different items from Bloom's version (1981) of Dave's Home Educational Environment Questionnaire. Each of the 26 questions required students to indicate the degree of presence of a variable that has been found to have a positive correlation with elementary school student's academic achievement. A discussion of the items from Bloom's Questionnaire and the questionnaire that was used in this study to measure the home educational environments of students is included in Chapter 3 of this study.

One of the purposes of this study was to determine if significant differences in items measured on the Home Educational Environment Questionnaire existed between participants from the three programs that were included in this study. If significant differences in responses to variables measured on the Home Educational Environment Questionnaire were not found in this study, then any differences in achievement and/or retention among the groups in this study may be attributed to the independent variables that were identified in this study (program type, race, age, employment status) rather than to home educational environment factors.
The Chi Square statistic was used to analyze differences that may exist between the various group's responses to the 26 items on the questionnaire. The three program types (Prairie State's Family Literacy Program, Waubonsee's Family Literacy Program, and Prairie State's Adult Education Program): the two program types (all family literacy students, all adult education students); race (black, Hispanic, white); age (all students under age 30, all students age 30 and over); and employment status (all students working full-time and part-time, all students receiving public assistance, unemployment, or social security) were the independent variables. The 26 individual items on the questionnaire were the dependent variables. Each of the five independent variables was categorized as described earlier in this paragraph. Twenty-six separate Chi Square analyses were performed for each of the five variables (5 x 26 = 130). The 26 variables and the categories of responses for each variable are shown as follows:

1. Do members of your family all share in helping with household chores?
   - A. Seldom or never
   - B. Sometimes
   - C. Very often or always

2. Do family members have set and regular times to eat, sleep, and study?
   - A. Seldom or never
   - B. Sometimes
   - C. Very often or always

3. Do family members spend time reading, doing homework, and studying even if it reduces the time spent for play, fun, sports, and television?
   - A. Seldom or never
4. Do family members give praise and approval for accomplishments and good schoolwork that is done by other family members (ex. children's accomplishments in school, young children learning to walk and talk)?

--- A. Seldom or never
--- B. Sometimes
--- C. Very often or always

5. Are friends and family told about the accomplishments of family members that are described in question #4?

--- A. Seldom or never
--- B. Sometimes
--- C. Very often or always

6. Are materials provided for studying in your home (ex. books, pens, pencils, paper)?

--- A. Seldom or never
--- B. Sometimes
--- C. Very often or always

7. Is there quiet time and space available in your home for family members to read and study?

--- A. Seldom or never
--- B. Sometimes
--- C. Very often or always

8. Do family members share educational hobbies and games that involve all members of the family (ex. board games, puzzles, camping?)

--- A. Seldom or never
--- B. Sometimes
--- C. Very often or always

9. Do you read newspapers and books that are not required for school?

--- A. Seldom or never
--- B. Sometimes
--- C. Very often or always
10. How often do you read to your child(ren)?

   ———— A. Frequently (at least once a day)
   ———— B. Often (several times each week)
   ———— C. Sometimes (at least once a week)
   ———— D. Once or twice a month
   ———— E. Seldom or never

11. How often do you listen to your child(ren) read at home?

   ———— A. Frequently, almost every day
   ———— B. Often, several times each week
   ———— C. Sometimes, at least once a week
   ———— D. Once or twice a month
   ———— E. Seldom or never

12. How often do you discuss with your child books that he/she is reading?

   ———— A. Frequently, almost every day
   ———— B. Often, several times each week
   ———— C. Sometimes, at least once a week
   ———— D. Once or twice a month
   ———— E. Seldom or never

13. Do you think a parent should help a child with his school work at home?

   ———— A. Yes, the parent should go over what the child has to do and see that he/she understands and does the work.
   ———— B. Yes, but only to see that the child does all the work.
   ———— C. Yes, but only when the child asks for a particular explanation.
   ———— D. No, the parent should not help, even if the child asks.

14. Do you have a library card?

   ___ yes
   ___ no

15. How often do you go to the library?

   ———— A. More than once a week
   ———— B. A few times a month
   ———— C. A few times a year
16. Do family members go to and discuss places such as the zoo, museums, concerts, and plays? If you are unable to go to these places do you watch television programs about such places and events?

   A. Seldom or never
   B. Sometimes
   C. Very often or always

17. Is there a dictionary available in your home and is it used by adults and children who are old enough to use it?

   A. Seldom or never
   B. Sometimes
   C. Very often or always

18. Do family members talk about daily events at the dinner table or at a daily time when the family gathers together?

   A. Seldom or never
   B. Sometimes
   C. Very often or always

19. How important do you feel your child’s/children’s education is to his/her success in life?

   A. Schooling has nothing to do with his/her success
   B. Neither helps nor hurts his/her chances
   C. Not very important
   D. Important
   E. Extremely important

20. How much school do you expect your child(ren) to receive?

   A. Won’t finish high school
   B. Finish high school
   C. Finish two years of college or trade school
   D. Finish four years of college
   E. Finish some graduate school education

21. Have you met your child’s/children(s) current teacher(s)?
22. Do you know what your children are learning and doing in school? (If preschoolers, do you know their daily activities and routine?)

- A. Seldom or never
- B. Sometimes
- C. Very often or always
- D. None of my children attend preschool or school

23. Do you know the areas that your child(ren) does well or poorly in?

- A. Yes, I am quite sure
- B. Yes, I know some of them
- C. No
- D. None of my children attend school or preschool

24. Do you know about activities which take place at your child’s/children’s school(s) (ex: parent meetings, assemblies, field trips)?

- A. Seldom or never
- B. Sometimes
- C. Very often or always
- D. None of my children attend school or preschool

25. Do you check your child’s/children’s schoolwork, homework, progress and grades daily and weekly?

- A. Seldom or never
- B. Sometimes
- C. Very often or always
- D. None of my children attend school or preschool

26. Do you communicate regularly with the teacher and school that your child attends so that you know what is taking place in the school and the classroom?

- A. Seldom or never
- B. Sometimes
- C. Very often or always
- D. None of my children attend school or preschool
Separate analyses were performed for each of the 26 items to avoid the possibility of any significant results being masked by the total scores. Students who took the HELP, who were not available for pre-testing, or who indicated on the questionnaire that none of their children attended school or preschool were not included in the analyses. Three of the 130 Chi Square tests that were performed were significant (see Tables 33, 34, 35).

Item two on the questionnaire measures the degree of regularity of time that is shown by family members in their habits of eating, sleeping, and studying. This question is related to the item on Bloom's Questionnaire which measures the work habits of children and parents. Age was found to have an effect on responses to this question by students from all three groups with a significance level of .02722 (see Table 33). Twelve of the 63 students under 30 whose responses were calculated in this analysis responded seldom or never to this item, while one of the 46 students age 30 or over whose responses were calculated in this analysis responded seldom or never.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seldom/Never</th>
<th>Age Under 30</th>
<th>Age 30 and over</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12(19.0%)</td>
<td>1(2.2%)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.7(EF)</td>
<td>5.3(EF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>16(25.4%)</td>
<td>14(30.4%)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33
Chi Square
HEE Question 2 (Family sets regular time to eat, sleep, study - Responses by Age)
Table 33 (continued)

Chi Square

| HEE Question 2 (Family sets regular time to eat, sleep, study - Responses by Age) |
|----------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Often/Always                     | 17.1(EF)         | 12.9(EF)        |
|                                  | 35(55.6%)        | 31(67.4%)       |
|                                  | 53.0%            | 47.0%           |
|                                  | 34(EF)           | 31(EF)          |
| Column                           | 63               | 46              |
| Total                            | 57.8%            | 42.2%           |
|                                  | 66               | 109             |
|                                  | 100%             |                 |

( EF ) = Expected Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>7.20739</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.02722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 7 on the questionnaire measures the degree of quiet time and space that is available in the home for family members to read and study. This question is related to the item on Bloom’s Questionnaire which measures the degree of academic guidance and support that is found in the home. Race was found to have an effect on the response to this question by students from all three groups (see Table 34) with a significance level of .01258. Eleven of the 49 Hispanic students whose responses were calculated in this analysis responded seldom or never to this item while one of the 36 black students and one of the 24 white students whose responses were calculated in this analysis responded seldom or never to this item. A greater number of Hispanic students (17) responded sometimes to this item than did black students (13) and white students (five).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seldom/Never</td>
<td>1(2.8%)</td>
<td>11(22.4%)</td>
<td>1(4.2%)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4(EF)</td>
<td>7.3(EF)</td>
<td>2.3(EF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>13(36.1%)</td>
<td>17(34.7%)</td>
<td>5(20.8%)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.9(EF)</td>
<td>17(EF)</td>
<td>7.9(EF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often/Always</td>
<td>22(61.1%)</td>
<td>21(42.9%)</td>
<td>18(75.0%)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.7(EF)</td>
<td>21(EF)</td>
<td>18(EF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(EF) = Expected Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi Square Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>12.74754</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 9 on the questionnaire measures the frequency that books and newspapers are read that are not required for school. This question is related to the item on Bloom’s Questionnaire which measures the degree of stimulation to explore and discuss ideas and events that is present in the home. Race was found to have an effect on the response to this question by students from all three groups with a significance level of .02542. Of the 24 white students whose responses were calculated in this analysis, 14 responded often/always while the expected frequency of responses was 10. Fewer white
students responded sometimes (observed frequency = nine, expected frequency = 11.5) and fewer white students responded seldom/never than were expected (observed frequency = one, expected frequency = 2.3).

Table 35
Chi Square
HEE Question 9 (Read newspapers/books not required for class - Responses by Race)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seldom/Never</td>
<td>4(11.1%)</td>
<td>7(14.3%)</td>
<td>1(4.2%)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4(EF)</td>
<td>7(EF)</td>
<td>2.3(EF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>13(36.1%)</td>
<td>30(61.2%)</td>
<td>9(37.5%)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13(EF)</td>
<td>30(EF)</td>
<td>11.5(EF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often/Always</td>
<td>19(52.8%)</td>
<td>12(24.5%)</td>
<td>14(58.3%)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19(EF)</td>
<td>12(EF)</td>
<td>10.2(EF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(EF) = Expected Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>11.10377</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.02542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Relationship Between Responses to Items on the Home Educational Environment Questionnaire and Student Achievement

Cramer’s V Coefficient was used to measure the association between responses to each of the 26 items on the Home Educational Environment Questionnaire and degree of achievement gains. Since the TABE and CELSA
measured different types of gains (the TABE measured comprehension and vocabulary and the CELSA measured language) and were scored on different scales, analyses for the two groups were completed separately. The median gain for each group was used to categorize students into two groups. Fifty-two separate analyses were computed.

One of the difficulties that was encountered by the researcher in these analyses was the inability to obtain reliable coefficients for some of the items due to the small sizes of some of the cells. In order for students to be included in the analyses, they needed to have post-tested and to have completed the Home Educational Environment Questionnaire. Twelve CELSA students and 55 TABE students met these criteria. The tests that were completed on CELSA students were invalid and will not be included due to all 26 tests having 50% or greater of their cells containing less than five. Twenty items had 100% of their cells containing less than five.

Similar problems were encountered with TABE students. Although 55 students were included in this group, this problem occurred due to the majority of student’s responses to questions falling in the same category. Most of the students indicated a high degree of presence of positive home educational factors in their home. This created many small cells in categories which measured negative home educational factors. Table 36 shows the Cramer’s V Coefficient value for each of the 26 items. Cells with expected frequencies less than five are also included in the table.
Table 36
Cramer's V Coefficients for Home Educational Environment Items (TABE Students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Expected Frequencies &lt;5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20694</td>
<td>2 of 6 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.06092</td>
<td>3 of 6 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.12244</td>
<td>2 of 6 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.03637</td>
<td>2 of 6 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.12206</td>
<td>2 of 6 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.17063</td>
<td>2 of 4 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.20398</td>
<td>2 of 6 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.25067</td>
<td>2 of 6 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.11166</td>
<td>2 of 6 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.18470</td>
<td>6 of 10 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.27927</td>
<td>4 of 10 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.18623</td>
<td>4 of 10 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.00636</td>
<td>2 of 4 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.08935</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.24902</td>
<td>6 of 10 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.01268</td>
<td>2 of 6 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.15562</td>
<td>2 of 6 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.20520</td>
<td>2 of 6 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.05197</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.18284</td>
<td>2 of 8 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.13496</td>
<td>2 of 4 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.09042</td>
<td>4 of 6 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.13482</td>
<td>2 of 6 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.17833</td>
<td>2 of 6 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.17182</td>
<td>4 of 6 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.38401</td>
<td>4 of 8 (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the limitations of Cramer's V Coefficient is that it is difficult to interpret concretely. Its usefulness in this study is in measuring the strength of association between the two variables in Table 36 when compared to other items within the table. Table 36 shows that all but two of the 26 items had greater than 20% of their cells with expected frequencies <5. Although on a
scale of 0 to 1 none of these items showed high measures of association, items 8-11-15-26 showed the highest Cramer’s V. Presentation of the data within these cells is shown in Tables 37-40.

Table 37
Cramer’s V Coefficient (Achievement/Question 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seldom/</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>4(66.7%)</td>
<td>18(58.1%)</td>
<td>6(33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>3.1(EF)</td>
<td>15.8(EF)</td>
<td>9.2(EF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores at</td>
<td>2(33.3%)</td>
<td>13(41.9%)</td>
<td>12(66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median or</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over</td>
<td>2.9(EF)</td>
<td>15.2(EF)</td>
<td>8.8(EF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(EF) = Expected Frequency

Measure of Association Value
Cramer's V .25067

Table 38
Cramer's V Coefficient (Achievement/Question 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seldom/</th>
<th>1-2 times</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>1(33.3%)</td>
<td>1(100%)</td>
<td>4(33.3%)</td>
<td>10(62.5%)</td>
<td>8(42.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>1.4(EF)</td>
<td>0.5(EF)</td>
<td>5.6(EF)</td>
<td>7.5(EF)</td>
<td>8.9(EF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores at</td>
<td>2(66.7%)</td>
<td>0(0%)</td>
<td>8(66.7%)</td>
<td>6(37.5%)</td>
<td>11(57.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 7.4%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median or Over</td>
<td>2(EF)</td>
<td>.5(EF)</td>
<td>6.4(EF)</td>
<td>8.5(EF)</td>
<td>10.1(EF)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 38 (continued)
Cramer’s V Coefficient (Achievement/Question 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(EF) = Expected Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure of Association</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td>.27927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39
Cramer’s V Coefficient (Achievement/Question 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never Scores</th>
<th>Every few Years</th>
<th>Few times a Year</th>
<th>Few Times a Month</th>
<th>Once a Week</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25.0%</td>
<td>7(43.8%)</td>
<td>2(40.0%)</td>
<td>7(77.8%)</td>
<td>10(50.0%)</td>
<td>2(40.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median 8.1(EF)</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores 9(56.3%)</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 33.3%</td>
<td>2.5(EF)</td>
<td>4.4(EF)</td>
<td>9.8(EF)</td>
<td>2.5(EF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median 7.9(EF)</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Above</td>
<td>2.5(EF)</td>
<td>4.4(EF)</td>
<td>9.8(EF)</td>
<td>2.5(EF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(EF) = Expected Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure of Association</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td>.24902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 40
Cramer’s V Coefficient (Achievement/Question 26)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No children</th>
<th>Seldom/Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often/Always</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attend School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>0(0.0%)</td>
<td>0(0.0%)</td>
<td>16(72.7%)</td>
<td>12(38.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>.5(EF)</td>
<td>.5(EF)</td>
<td>11.2(EF)</td>
<td>12(EF)</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores</td>
<td>1(100%)</td>
<td>1(100%)</td>
<td>6(27.3%)</td>
<td>19(61.3%)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 3.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>.5(EF)</td>
<td>.5(EF)</td>
<td>10.8(EF)</td>
<td>15.2(EF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(EF) = Expected Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure of Association</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td>.38401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As discussed in Chapter 3 of this study, items 8, 11, and 15 are a measure of the degree of stimulation to explore and discuss ideas and events that is present in the home. Although these findings must be accepted with caution due to the frequency of small cell sizes, students demonstrating gains at the median or above were found to engage in educational hobbies and gains to a greater degree than students who showed less gains on the TABE (see Table 37). Thirty-seven percent of the respondents indicated that they listen to their child read frequently while 6% responded that they never listen to their child read (see Table 38). The Cramer’s V value was .27927. Responses to this item were similar for both groups of students (see Table 38). Twenty-nine
percent of the students who responded indicated that they never go to the library, while only 9% indicated that they go to the library once a week.

Responses to this item were similar for both groups of students (see Table 39). The value of Cramer's V was .24902. Forty percent of the cells in Table 38 had sizes smaller than five and 60% of the cells in Table 39 had cells smaller than five. This may have accounted for these coefficients having some of the higher values when compared to the rest of the items in this analysis when few differences were found between the responses given by those who showed achievement gains below the median and those who showed gains at or above the median.

Table 40 shows that students (62%) with scores at or above the median maintain a higher degree of regular communication with their child's teacher than do students (39%) with scores below the median. The value of Cramer's V was .38401.

The Relationship Between Responses to Items on The Home Educational Environment and Student Retention

One hundred and seven TABE and CELSA students who volunteered to complete the Home Educational Environment Questionnaire were included in this analysis of home educational environment factors and student retention. Cramer's V Coefficient was computed to measure the degree of association between item responses for each of the 26 items on the questionnaire and retention rates. Coefficient values and the number of cells with expected
frequencies less than five are included in Table 41.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Expected Frequencies &lt;5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.13714</td>
<td>1 of 6 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.16516</td>
<td>1 of 6 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.08606</td>
<td>1 of 6 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.10116</td>
<td>2 of 6 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.12206</td>
<td>2 of 6 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.07474</td>
<td>3 of 6 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.14201</td>
<td>1 of 6 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.23033</td>
<td>1 of 6 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.10922</td>
<td>1 of 6 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.12066</td>
<td>3 of 10 (30.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.16051</td>
<td>5 of 10 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.04361</td>
<td>3 of 10 (30.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.07575</td>
<td>1 of 4 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.08016</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.14646</td>
<td>3 of 10 (30.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.10670</td>
<td>1 of 6 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.22544</td>
<td>2 of 6 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.10577</td>
<td>1 of 6 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.11705</td>
<td>3 of 6 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.04729</td>
<td>1 of 8 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.01870</td>
<td>1 of 4 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.01425</td>
<td>2 of 6 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.14033</td>
<td>2 of 6 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.17216</td>
<td>2 of 6 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.10661</td>
<td>3 of 6 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.19999</td>
<td>3 of 8 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixteen of the 26 items had greater than 20% of their cells with less than an expected frequency of five. The measures of association between retention and item response were not found to be large for any of these items. Items 8 and 17 showed the greatest measures of association.
Presentation of the data in these cells is shown in Tables 42 and 43.

Table 42  
Cramer's V Coefficient (Retention/Question 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Seldom/Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often/Always</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10(58.8%)</td>
<td>43(76.8%)</td>
<td>30(88.2%)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10(EF)</td>
<td>43.4(EF)</td>
<td>26.4(EF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7(41.2%)</td>
<td>13(23.2%)</td>
<td>4(11.8%)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.8(EF)</td>
<td>12.6(EF)</td>
<td>7.6(EF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

( EF ) = Expected Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure of Association</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>.23033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42 shows that a greater than expected number of students (30) who retained in the program often or always participate in educational hobbies and games with their families. Of those students who did not retain fewer students (four) than expected responded often or always to this item. Fewer retained students (10) than expected responded seldom or never to this item while a larger number of students (seven) than were expected who did not retain responded seldom or never to this item. The value of Cramer's V was .23033.
Table 43
Cramer’s V Coefficient (Retention/Question 17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11(57.9%)</td>
<td>19(86.4%)</td>
<td>52(80.0%)</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.7(EF)</td>
<td>17(EF)</td>
<td>50.3(EF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8(42.1%)</td>
<td>3(13.6%)</td>
<td>13(20.0%)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3(EF)</td>
<td>5(EF)</td>
<td>14.7(EF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(EF) = Expected Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure of Association</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td>.22544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 43 indicates that a greater number of students (52) than expected who retained often or always had access to a dictionary in their home while fewer students (13) than expected who did not retain often or always had access to a dictionary in their home. Fewer retained students (11) than expected responded seldom or never to this item while a larger number of students (eight) than were expected who did not retain responded seldom or never to this item.

**Unanticipated Outcomes**

As this study progressed, the researcher became aware of some
unexpected and interesting observations and findings. This information is presented in Chapter 4 as in some cases these findings may have had implications on the results of this study.

It was anticipated prior to the beginning of the data collection for this study that the number of students who retained in the program for a full semester may have an effect on post testing results. Several problems that are associated with the retention of adult education students emerged throughout this study. First, it was not anticipated that students who retained in their program but who did not show up on scheduled post-testing dates would pose a problem. Four students from Prairie State’s Family Literacy Program retained in their program but did not participate in post-testing during their first semester of attendance in the program. Three students retained in their program for two consecutive semesters but did not participate in testing. Six students who retained in the Waubonsee Program for one semester did not participate in post-testing and two students who retained for two consecutive semesters did not participate in testing. The Prairie State Adult Education Program had six students who retained for one semester and did not post-test and four students who retained for two consecutive semesters and did not post-test. Secondly, the impact of student’s dropping in and out of programs and exhibiting inconsistent attendance cannot be measured by this study. Retention for purposes of this study is defined as remaining in the program until the completion of the semester. Some of the students in this study may
have missed several consecutive class sessions. Since these classes only met several times per week it is difficult to know how poor attendance may have affected the post-test scores in this study.

Another problem that occurred during this study pertains to the HELP test and those students who were administered the HELP Test. Unfortunately, students who had been administered the HELP could not be included in the data analyses due to the limited number of students who were available for post testing. HELP students were students who had no literacy skills or beginning literacy skills in their native language. This population of students was not included in the analyses that was conducted. An advantage of this may be that the students on whom the analyses were conducted were more demographically similar, however, a growing group of adult education students were not included in the analyses. Thirteen students from Prairie State’s Family Literacy Program were administered the HELP and six students from Prairie State’s Adult Education Program were administered the HELP. At the end of one semester, seven family literacy students retained and six of these students post tested. Two adult education students retained for one semester and neither of these post tested. At the end of two consecutive semesters, two family literacy students retained and were post tested while neither of the two adult education students remained in the program for a second semester.

Another finding that merits reporting is the number of ABE/GED students from each of the three programs who successfully passed the GED
test. These numbers should be reviewed cautiously as they reflect the numbers of students in the sample who reported to their program coordinator that they successfully passed the GED test as of May, 1993. It is possible that students may have passed the test and not contacted their program coordinator. It is also possible that students may have taken the GED test and passed it after the close of their program’s semester. Thirteen Prairie State Family Literacy students, four Waubonsee students, and three adult education students from the sample reported that they passed the GED test.

The final observation that was noted throughout this study was the interest that was displayed by students who completed the Home Educational Environment Questionnaire in ways in which they could improve their study skills and help themselves and their children so that they could achieve greater academic success.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Introduction

Estimates of the number of adults who are functionally or conventionally illiterate have been estimated to be over one third of the entire adult population (Kozol, 1985). Adult education programs which are offered through community colleges are the primary source that is used by adults wishing to upgrade their literacy skills. The goal of such programs is to meet the educational needs of adults. Although many students in community college adult education programs may be parents who are confronted with childcare and transportation difficulties; the focus of such programs remains on the educational needs of the adult rather than on the educational, social, and economic needs of the family as a learning unit.

During the mid 1980s, research on the benefits of parents and children learning together (Nickse, 1990) and the impact of parent involvement on families (Comer, 1986; Epstein, 1985) made policy makers, and adult and early childhood educators realize that the heart of the solution to the problem may exist in the involvement of families jointly in educational programs. Additional support for educational programs which focus on the family unit comes from

Family literacy programs began to be examined as a possible answer to alleviating our national problem of intergenerational illiteracy. Programs have been organized to improve the literacy skills of educationally disadvantaged parents and children by bringing families together as a learning unit to share literacy experiences. Programs are based on the belief that children who come from homes in which parents read and write as well as where reading and writing are viewed as valuable experiences will have greater opportunities to develop literacy skills and will value reading and writing. Such programs provide comprehensive services that generally include adult education, parenting skills training for parents, joint parent/child learning activities, and planned preschool education, and/or planned educational activities for elementary school children.

The purpose of this study was twofold. First, the study compared adult participants in family literacy programs with adult participants in a traditional adult education program in order to determine if there were differences between the two groups in the literacy achievement gains, retention rates, and home educational environments. Secondly, this study examined home educational environments and achievement gains and retention rates in order to determine if a relationship existed between home factors and achievement and retention rates.
This study was conducted during two consecutive community college semesters during the 1992-93 school-year. The sample was selected on the basis of information that was obtained from an intake questionnaire. Participants were required to be a parent of at least one child between the ages of two and twelve. Students's age, income, employment status, ethnic classification, and sex were also obtained from the intake questionnaire.

Students were pre-tested prior to the beginning of the semester and pre-test scores in reading for ABE/GED students and pre-test scores in language for ESL students were obtained from program coordinators. Post-test and retention information was obtained from program coordinators at the close of each semester.

A 26 item Home Educational Environment Questionnaire was administered to volunteers from the sample within several weeks after classes began. Questionnaires and instructions were available in Spanish for ESL students who preferred the Spanish versions.

Analyses were performed on the data to determine if there were differences between the achievement gains, retention rates, and home educational environment scores of family literacy participants and adult education participants. Additional analyses were performed to determine if a relationship existed between home educational environment items and achievement gains and retention rates.

Findings and Conclusions
This investigation found that there were no significant differences between the achievement gains of the students who were included in the analyses. This was found to be true for both TABE and CELSA students when each of the independent variables (program type, race, age, employment status) was examined. Although there were no differences between the groups, all TABE groups who were post-tested were found to demonstrate significant increases in gains between the pre-testing and post-testing periods. No interaction was found between program type and testing occasion, race and testing occasion, age and testing occasion, or employment status and testing occasion which indicated that all groups of students that were examined showed achievement gains over time and there were no differences in the degree of gains that were found between the groups. It appears from these findings that ABE/GED students who are parents of children demonstrate increased gains over time regardless of the program they are enrolled in. Books and workbooks that are utilized in classes that prepare adults to take the GED test are closely related to the content of the GED test. The TABE, which was the test used in this study to measure reading achievement, is closely related to the GED test. The instructional content in all three of the ABE/GED programs in this study emphasized vocabulary and comprehension skills that were measured on the TABE. Differences may have been found in the reading achievement gains between the groups of students if the assessment instrument would have required students to apply skills acquired in
class in a capacity other than a multiple choice test. This may have more accurately demonstrated any differences in learning that had taken place between the groups. An increase in the frequency of participation in reading related activities by students since their enrollment in class may also have impacted these gains. Eighty-nine percent of the students who completed the questionnaire indicated that they always or sometimes read books or newspapers that were not required for class. Questionnaires were completed after classes had begun. It is not known whether student engagement in reading activities increased since the beginning of class.

CELSA students were not found to demonstrate any significant increase in achievement gains over time. This may have been due to the focus in this study on achievement gains as measured by tests. There are numerous problems associated with the testing of ESL students. At the time that this study was conducted, there was no mandated state of Illinois ESL test. It became apparent as this study developed why no such test existed. ESL classes seem to focus on speaking and listening skills rather than survival skills which are assessed by the HELP and reading and writing skills which are assessed by the CELSA. Generally speaking, the ESL instructors who participated in this study did not find these tests to be accurate measures of what was taught in class. Assessment instruments should be instructionally relevant. Teacher support of the assessment component of a program is vital to the success of the assessment program. Attitudinal changes that may have taken place due to
program participation may have an impact on literacy behaviors which may later constitute in gains on formal tests which are taken by these ESL students.

Retention is a major problem in adult education programs. According to Balmuth (1986), programs with as little as 50% retention rates consider themselves successful. The retention rate for participants in this study was 64%. There were no significant differences found between the retention rates of family literacy and adult education students in this study. This suggests that the availability of parent/child activities, child care, and transportation does not affect student retention. Students dropping in and out of adult education programs poses a problem for adult educators. Perhaps retention should have been defined as returning to a program for a second semester rather than completing a semester. This may have been a more accurate measure of the intent of a student to participate in the program. Numerous barriers contribute to the drop out rate of adult education students. Situational barriers which include lack of child care and transportation are among these barriers (Cross, 1978). The family literacy programs in this study addressed situational barriers. Dispositional barriers which include the learner's attitude and perception of his own learning problem (Cross, 1978) may have had a strong impact on the retention rate of participants in this study.

Age and race were found to have significant effects on student retention. Students in this study age 30 and over were found to have a higher level of
program retention than students under age 30. Seventy-seven percent of students over age 30 retained in their program for one semester while 57% of those students who were under age 30 retained for one semester. The possibility may exist that older parents in this study had older children and therefore, were confronted with fewer obstacles that may have interfered with returning to school (i.e. child care, maternal fatigue, health problems of young children). Additionally, it may be that older parents have a higher degree of commitment when returning to school than do younger parents.

Hispanic students in this study were found to have a significantly greater retention rate than the black and white students in this study. Seventy-five percent of the Hispanic students retained one semester, while 63% of the black students and 51% of the white students retained one semester. Twenty-seven of the 184 students that analyses were performed on attended ESL classes. Participation in ESL classes and/or the bond that may be established among students who share the same culture and language may have impacted student retention.

Findings from this study regarding student achievement and retention appear to be inconsistent with what is generally believed about class attendance and progress. These findings suggest that although Hispanic students demonstrated greater retention rates, CELSA students (all of whom were Hispanic) did not show significant achievement gains while TABE students (40% were Hispanic) did show significant achievement gains.
Very few significant differences existed between the groups on home educational factors. Fewer students under 30 exhibited regularity in time spent eating, sleeping, and studying. This again may be attributed to younger parents having younger children who place additional demands on parental time. Fewer Hispanic students than black and white students indicated that quiet time and space was available in their home for family members to read and study. Greater numbers of children and extended family living arrangements may have accounted for this difference. A greater number of white students than black and Hispanic students indicated that they read books and newspapers that were not required for school. Fewer white students than black and Hispanic students responded that they seldom/never or sometimes read books or newspaper that were not required for school. The relationship between young children observing literacy related activities in their home and the development of emergent literacy skills is powerful. This finding may indicate that such literacy activities may exist in a lesser degree in some black and Hispanic families in adult education programs.

Strong measures of association were not found between student's home educational environment and achievement gains and retention rates. Small cell sizes may have contributed to these results. Combinations and varying degrees of too few students to obtain reliable results and numerous students from both groups giving similar responses to items accounted for the small sizes of cells. The majority of these similar responses indicated the presence
of positive home factors in the homes of students from all groups.

The retention rate for students who volunteered to complete the Home Educational Environment Questionnaire was 78%. The retention rate for all of the 182 students (including those who did not volunteer to complete the questionnaire) was 64%. During the completion of the questionnaires, many students expressed interest in the content of the questions and in ways in which they could assist their children's achievement in school as well as their own achievement. A limited measure of association was shown between retention and item responses. This may partly be attributed to the fact that most of the students who completed this questionnaire had a high presence of positive home factors that have been found to contribute to achievement. It is possible that those students who completed the questionnaires had a greater interest in the topic of home factors that may contribute to achievement. This may be one of the reasons they volunteered to participate in the answering of the questionnaires. Their interest may have been responsible for their high presence of positive home factors which may have contributed to this group having a higher retention rate than the retention rate of the entire sample. This is one of the limitations of using volunteers in an investigation such as this.

Several additional findings that did not emerge from the statistical analyses in this study merit mentioning.

1. ESL and ABE/GED Programs appear to be almost completely
segregated in their instruction. Each program has strengths to offer. ESL students would benefit from obtaining high school diplomas and ABE/GED students would benefit from the focus in ESL classes on language skills and self confidence.

2. Many adult education students lack study skills and are interested in learning ways to improve their study skills. Frustration in being able to implement one’s own study plan may contribute to the retention problem that adult education faces.

Recommendations

The literature reviewed in this study discussed the relationship between undereducation, poverty, and unemployment. Efforts to alleviate illiteracy will be most effective if they focus on addressing these problems concurrently and comprehensively. The effect of parents and home factors on the outcomes of children was described in Chapter 2 of this study. Research findings have shown that a relationship exists between the educational levels of parents and the educational success of their children. Homes that provide supportive learning environments may contribute positively to the academic success of children.

The theoretical support that exists for family literacy programs has made such programs appealing to practitioners. The fact that they are a relatively new concept, frequently funded from year to year, geographically spread out, and of great diversity from program to program makes their effects difficult to
study. Perhaps the question that should be asked prior to analyzing the effectiveness of family literacy programs is which program components may or may not be contributing to their success. The answer to this question will most likely come from program evaluations that include feedback from families, teachers, support staff, and administrators who are involved in family literacy programs. Family literacy programs have required adult educators to expand their role to address the needs of families. Additionally, public school administrators and teachers who are involved in family literacy programs are required to consider the educational needs of parents. Such change affects the culture and structure of organizations. Ongoing staff development, availability of resources, administrative support, and open communication nurture vision-building and feelings of empowerment which are necessary for change to be effective.

The recommendations that follow are intended for practitioners and administrators who are involved with adult education and family literacy students. They have been compiled from observations that were made by the researcher and supported by repeated conversations that have taken place throughout this study with program administrators, teachers, and students.

1. Collaboration between public elementary school administrators and teachers, and community college administrators and teachers is imperative for successful family literacy programs. Each of these groups of professionals possess expertise and knowledge that is equally
important to families. Emphasis should be on mutual respect and
shared ownership. On-going staff development that enables all
professionals to strengthen and expand their understanding of working
with children, adults, and families may be beneficial.

2. The status of adult education instructors who are employed through
community colleges should be upgraded. The majority of adult
education instructors are employed as part-time instructors. Such
positions generally do not include faculty status or fringe benefits.
There is no comparison between the salary that is offered for such a
position and the salary and benefits that are offered to public school
teachers. Such a discrepancy not only may cause a high staff turnover
but may have a negative impact on staff morale. Through the creation
of full-time teaching positions in adult education, teachers could be
more accessible to students for counseling, tutoring, and home visits.
This increase in teacher availability to meet the individual needs of
students could have a positive impact on student retention and
achievement. In addition, the creation of full-time teaching positions
would require those wishing to stay in the field of adult education to
strengthen their commitment to the field. Serious consideration would
need to be given to the requirements for full-time adult education
teachers.

3. Adult education and family literacy programs should give increased
attention to the individual goals of students. The principles of adult
learning theory that were described in Chapter 2 emphasize the
importance of such a focus. Home visits, recreational activities,
workshops that address issues affecting parents, and drop-in centers may
be vehicles for meeting the individual needs of students.

4. Assessment instruments that are used to determine instructional
levels and gains with English-As-A-Second-Language-Students should
measure the curriculum that is being implemented in the program.
Additionally, the curriculum that is being implemented in the program
should address the needs of students.

5. Increased program integration between students participating in
ABE/GED Programs and ESL Program may be beneficial to parents
and children. Such integration would allow parents and children to
develop a respect and understanding for cultural differences and
similarities. English-As-A-Second-Language Students should be
encouraged to participate in GED Programs. Such participation would
permit them to upgrade their educational credentials. ABE/GED
students may find ESL classes an avenue that is useful to them in
upgrading their language skills as well as increasing self-confidence.

6. The inclusion of study skills, problem solving skills, and home factors
that have been found to contribute to learning should be a component
of the adult education curriculum. Parents tend to approach their
education and the education of their children in ways that are familiar to them. Most adult education students have not experienced a great deal of success in school. The affective and the cognitive needs of students should be addressed. Emphasis should be placed on families as learning units as family relationships may be used as an instructional vehicle. Parent-child activities that allow families to learn through modeling, family lending libraries, and discussion groups would be the most effective ways of exploring and exposing students to these issues.

Suggestions for Further Research

There is a definite need for additional studies in the area of family literacy, however, any researcher pursuing the task of such a study may find herself challenged with some of the obstacles that this researcher has faced.

The diverse nature of family literacy programs made it difficult to locate similar programs to include in this study. Student retention in adult education is a major concern that merits increased attention from researchers and practitioners. Although teacher efficacy was an issue that was not addressed in this study, its relationship to student retention and achievement may have had a definite impact on the findings of this study. Finally, throughout this study the researcher became increasingly interested in interaction between parent and child that focused on language and reading related activities. Such interactions make one re-think what the focus of studies on family literacy should be.
In light of these obstacles and concerns, the following suggestions for further research are presented:

1. Although program retention is an important factor that may contribute to student academic achievement, the findings from this study do not support this belief. It would behoove researchers who are considering doing further studies in this area to focus their attention either on retention or achievement gains. This researcher was overzealous to investigate both of these issues within this study. Adult education students frequently drop in and out of programs or they exhibit inconsistent attendance. These students may therefore remain in a program for several years even though they do not participate in testing. Furthermore, the issue of effective means of measuring success in an adult education program should be raised. When students are only in attendance in a class 2 days per week and when visits to the library and independent reading may not be regular activities in the home, (46% of the respondents to the questionnaire in this study indicated that they did not have a library card) it may be necessary to utilize other methods in addition to test scores as a means of measuring achievement gains. Qualitative methods such as writing samples, interviews, and videotaping over several semesters would allow for the triangulation of measurement in a study of the achievement gains of adult education students.
2. Adult education instructors have diverse educational and experiential backgrounds. Classes may vary greatly in their focus and method of instruction (i.e. lecture, discussion, independent work, cooperative learning). Little is known about which of these factors (if any) are related to student retention and/or achievement. Effective methods may be dependent on students' ages, cultural backgrounds, and learning styles. Explorations into these issues may enable program coordinators, instructors, and professors of graduate studies in adult education to develop and implement the most effective curriculum based on the needs of students. Additional investigations into family literacy programs may consider implementing an instructional model so that an understanding of the model's effectiveness can be obtained.

3. There is an interest by adult education students in ways in which they can help themselves and their children to be successful in school. Instruction in study skills, critical thinking skills, factors that contribute to academic achievement in parents and children should be emphasized in family literacy programs. Studies which focus on the degree of change which takes place in the home educational environments of parents over several semesters are warranted. Pre-surveys and Post-surveys could be used to measure changes which take place in homes. Adaptions of the 26 item Home Educational Environment Questionnaire could be used as a basis for in class discussions of these issues. Surveys
that include open-ended questions in addition to multiple choice items should be utilized. It is also suggested that the number of multiple choice items that measure each variable be increased. This would improve the discriminability of the survey and enable the researcher to look for patterns that may emerge in her data collection. Such surveys may provide greater insight into student’s home learning environments.

4. This study found that mothers who are age 30 and over had a better retention rate than mothers who are under 30. An examination into the ages of a mother’s children and its relationship to maternal retention in adult education programs may be beneficial. If the younger mothers in this study had a lower rate of retention due to obstacles associated with having younger children (i.e. child care, maternal fatigue, illness of children), agencies which fund adult education programs may wish to address these obstacles in their programs.

5. Hispanic parents in this study were found to have a greater rate of retention in programs than black and white parents. Studies which explore the effect of the cultural and language bonds that are formed between students may provide insight into factors that contribute to student retention.

6. Longitudinal studies that study parents and children and their involvement in literacy activities would be valuable. The State of Illinois Pre-Kindergarten At Risk Program for children aged 3-5
includes a parent involvement component in its program. Data collection is conducted by the state through the children's third grade in school. Longitudinal studies from this population which focus on the literacy skills of parents and children could offer empirical support to family literacy programs.

Summary

Few statistically significant results were found in this study of differences between family literacy students and adult education students and of the relationship between home factors and achievement gains and retention rates. Positive responses by students from all groups on the Home Educational Environment Questionnaire and significant increases by all groups of students on the TABE were unexpected results that support the efforts of adult and family educators. This study contributed to the understanding of the demographic make-up of students in three different adult education programs that are representative of programs in the state of Illinois. Although the majority of the students in this study are poor and unemployed, all of these students are concerned about the success of their children - they all want what is best for their children. It is not known how participation in these programs may have impacted parental attitudinal change. According to Dewey (1938),

"every experience enacted and undergone modifies the one who acts and undergoes, while the modification affects, whether we wish it to or not, the quality of subsequent experiences... It covers the formation of attitudes, attitudes that are emotional and intellectual; it covers our
basic sensitivities and ways of meeting and responding to all the conditions we meet in living”.

(p.35)

Throughout the year that data was collected for this study, the researcher encountered a great deal of evidence of the hope for better outcomes that all parents hold in their hearts for their children. Some of this evidence was tangible, but most of it was intangible. The following responses were compiled from Prairie State College’s Family Literacy Students when they were asked the following question:

"How can Parents Help Their Children to Succeed?"

- learn English for good communication with children and teachers
- talk to them about drugs and the consequences - about sex education and AIDS
- play, write, sing, and read together
- find happiness together
- speak to them about good and bad and the hard times of human life
- support their decisions
- give them a lot of love
- the most important thing is the family - education in the home.

Teach them good manners, discipline, and respect for different cultures.

Economic and social problems intensify the effects of undereducation.
Research that supports family literacy programs by increasing our understanding of successful program components is vital for the expansion of family literacy efforts.

It is the hope of this researcher that increased collaboration among the many disciplines that are involved in family literacy programs (adult educators, early childhood teachers, reading specialists, elementary teachers and community college and public school administrators) will empower those involved in family literacy programs to assess the components of their programs (both qualitatively and quantitatively) in order that the effectiveness of the components of their programs may be evaluated. It is further hoped that such findings will be compiled and disseminated to those wishing to study the effectiveness of the state and federal family literacy effort. If such efforts are successful, they will prove to be invaluable to my colleagues who wish to expand upon this study.
APPENDIX A

INTAKE QUESTIONNAIRE
(ENGLISH VERSION)
Name: ________________________________

1. Age: _______

2. Ethnic Classification:

   ___ Black
   ___ Hispanic
   ___ White
   ___ Asian or Pacific Islander
   ___ American Indian or Alaskan Native

3. How many years of school have you completed? ________________

4. How many people are in your family? __________
   How many Adults? __________
   How many children? __________
   What are the ages of your children? __________________________

5. Do you: ___ work full-time
   ___ work part-time
   ___ receive public assistance
   ___ receive unemployment benefits
   ___ receive Social Security

6. What is your household income level?
   ___0-$7,000  ___$7,000-$15,000  ___$15,000-$30,000  ___$30,000-$45,000  ___over $45,000

Pre-Test                          Post-Test
Reading    ___                  Reading    ___
Math       ___                  Math       ___
Language   ___                  Language   ___
ESL        ___                  ESL        ___
APPENDIX B

HOME EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT QUESTIONNAIRE (ENGLISH VERSION)
NAME: _______________________________________

AGES OF YOUR CHILDREN: ____________________________

Directions: This questionnaire is part of a study about how families and homes might be important to understanding adult students. This is a research study and your responses will be kept completely confidential. It is important to give an accurate response to each of these questions. However, if a question is believed to be an invasion of your privacy, feel free not to answer it. We would rather have no responses to some questions than inaccurate responses.

Please check (✓) the letter that best describes your family members that live in your household.

1. Do members of your family all share in helping with household chores?

   ——— A. Seldom or never
   ——— B. Sometimes
   ——— C. Very often or always

2. Do family members have set and regular times to eat, sleep, and study?

   ——— A. Seldom or never
   ——— B. Sometimes
   ——— C. Very often or always

3. Do family members spend time reading, doing homework, and studying even if it reduces the time spent for play, fun, sports, and television?

   ——— A. Seldom or never
   ——— B. Sometimes
   ——— C. Very often or always

4. Do family members give praise and approval for accomplishments and good schoolwork that is done by other family members (ex. children's accomplishments in school, young children learning to walk and talk)?

   ——— A. Seldom or never
   ——— B. Sometimes
   ——— C. Very often or always
5. Are friends and family told about the accomplishments of family members that are described in question #4?

   A. Seldom or never  
   B. Sometimes  
   C. Very often or always  

6. Are materials provided for studying in your home (ex. books, pens, pencils, paper)?

   A. Seldom or never  
   B. Sometimes  
   C. Very often or always  

7. Is there quiet time and space available in your home for family members to read and study?

   A. Seldom or never  
   B. Sometimes  
   C. Very often or always  

8. Do family members share educational hobbies and games that involve all members of the family (ex. board games, puzzles, camping?)

   A. Seldom or never  
   B. Sometimes  
   C. Very often or always  

9. Do you read newspapers and books that are not required for school?

   A. Seldom or never  
   B. Sometimes  
   C. Very often or always  

10. How often do you read to your child(ren)?

    A. Frequently (at least once a day)  
    B. Often (several times each week)  
    C. Sometimes (at least once a week)  
    D. Once or twice a month  
    E. Seldom or never
11. How often do you listen to your child(ren) read at home?
   
   ________ A. Frequently, almost every day
   ________ B. Often, several times each week
   ________ C. Sometimes, at least once a week
   ________ D. Once or twice a month
   ________ E. Seldom or never

12. How often do you discuss with your child books that he/she is reading?
   
   ________ A. Frequently, almost every day
   ________ B. Often, several times each week
   ________ C. Sometimes, at least once a week
   ________ D. Once or twice a month
   ________ E. Seldom or never

13. Do you think a parent should help a child with his school work at home?
   
   ________ A. Yes, the parent should go over what the child has to do and see that he/she understands and does the work.
   ________ B. Yes, but only to see that the child does all the work.
   ________ C. Yes, but only when the child asks for a particular explanation.
   ________ D. No, the parent should not help, even if the child asks.

14. Do you have a library card?
   
   __ yes
   __ no

15. How often do you go to the library?
   
   ________ A. More than once a week
   ________ B. A few times a month
   ________ C. A few times a year
   ________ D. Every few years
   ________ E. Never
16. Do family members go to and discuss places such as the zoo, museums, concerts, and plays? If you are unable to go to these places do you watch television programs about such places and events?

_______ A. Seldom or never
_______ B. Sometimes
_______ C. Very often or always

17. Is there a dictionary available in your home and is it used by adults and children who are old enough to use it?

_______ A. Seldom or never
_______ B. Sometimes
_______ C. Very often or always

18. Do family members talk about daily events at the dinner table or at a daily time when the family gathers together?

_______ A. Seldom or never
_______ B. Sometimes
_______ C. Very often or always

19. How important do you feel your child’s/children’s education is to his/her success in life?

_______ A. Schooling has nothing to do with his/her success
_______ B. Neither helps nor hurts his/her chances
_______ C. Not very important
_______ D. Important
_______ E. Extremely important

20. How much school do you expect your child(ren) to receive?

_______ A. Won’t finish high school
_______ B. Finish high school
_______ C. Finish two years of college or trade school
_______ D. Finish four years of college
_______ E. Finish some graduate school education

21. Have you met your child’s/children’s current teacher(s)?

_______ A. Yes
_______ B. No
_______ C. None of my children attend school or preschool
22. Do you know what your children are learning and doing in school? (If preschoolers, do you know their daily activities and routine?)

- A. Seldom or never
- B. Sometimes
- C. Very often or always
- D. None of my children attend preschool or school

23. Do you know the areas that your child(ren) does well or poorly in?

- A. Yes, I am quite sure
- B. Yes, I know some of them
- C. No
- D. None of my children attend school or preschool

24. Do you know about activities which take place at your child’s/children’s school(s) (ex: parent meetings, assemblies, field trips)?

- A. Seldom or never
- B. Sometimes
- C. Very often or always
- D. None of my children attend school or preschool

25. Do you check your child’s/children’s schoolwork, homework, progress and grades daily and weekly?

- A. Seldom or never
- B. Sometimes
- C. Very often or always
- D. None of my children attend school or preschool

26. Do you communicate regularly with the teacher and school that your child attends so that you know what is taking place in the school and the classroom?

- A. Seldom or never
- B. Sometimes
- C. Very often or always
- D. None of my children attend school or preschool
APPENDIX C

INTAKE QUESTIONNAIRE
(SPANISH VERSION)
Name:__________________________________________

1. Edad: _______

2. Clasificacion Etnica:

___Afro-Americano
___Hispano
___Blanco
___Asiatico o de las Islas Pacificas
___Nativo-Americano, o nativo de Alaska

3. Cuantos anos de escuela completo usted?________________________

4. De cuantas personas se compone su familia?_________
   Cuantos son adultos?_________
   Cuantos son ninos?_________
   Que edades tienen sus ninos?____________________________________

5. Trabaja Usted: ___jornada completa?
   ___media jornada?
   ___Recibe usted ayuda publica?
   ___Recibe usted beneficios de desempleo?
   ___Recibe usted Beneficio Social (S.S.)?

6. Cual es su ingreso anual?
   ___0-$7000    ___$7000-$15000    ___$15000-$30000    ___$30000-$45000    ___sobre $45000
APPENDIX D

PILOT STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE
1. Why did you sign up for this class? ________________________________

2. Will you be returning to school next semester? ___yes ___no
   Why or why not? _______________________________________________

3. Some students start coming to school and then stop coming. What are some of the reasons that students quit coming to school?
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

4. How do you feel about your teacher? ______________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   the other students who come to school here? ________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   the books you use? ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

5. Did you set any goals for yourself when you first started back to school? ___yes ___no
   If yes -- what were they? _______________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
6. Are you happy with the progress that you are making toward achieving your goal? __yes __no
   If yes -- what were they? ____________________________________________

6. Are you happy with the progress that you are making toward achieving your goal? __yes __no

7. What are the reasons that you are/aren't achieving your goal?
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

8. What are the things that you are doing to help yourself achieve your goals?
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

9. What are some of the things that stand in your way and keep you from reaching your goals?
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

10. Do you think that there is anything else that you should be doing to help yourself achieve your goal?
    ________________________________________________________________
    ________________________________________________________________
    ________________________________________________________________

11. Is there anything that anyone else (teacher, family, friends) could do to help you achieve your goal?
    ________________________________________________________________
    ________________________________________________________________
12. How old are your children? ______________________________

13. Have you visited your child's/children's school this year? ___yes ___no
   Why did you visit?__________________________________________

14. Have you talked to your child's/children's teacher this year? ___yes ___no
   Did you talk on the telephone or in person?__________________________

15. Have you visited your child's/children's classroom this year? ___yes ___no
   Why did you visit?__________________________________________

16. Should parents come to their child's/children's school? ___yes ___no
   What are some of the reasons they should? _______________________
   How often should parents come to their child's/children's school?
   ______________________________

17. Should parents help their children with homework? ___yes ___no
   Why or why not?__________________________________________
   How often?__________________________________________
   Do you help your child with homework?__________________________________________
   Should parents read to their children? ___yes ___no
   Why or why not?__________________________________________
   How often?__________________________________________
   Do you read to your child?__________________________________________
   How often?__________________________________________
   Should parents talk with their children about school? ___yes ___no
   Why or why not?__________________________________________
   Do you talk with your child about school?__________________________________________
   Why or why not?__________________________________________

18. What is the most important thing that parents can do to help their child do well in school?
   ______________________________
19. Do you like your child’s/children’s school? __yes ___no
What do you/don’t you like? ____________________________
________________________________________________________________________

20. What is one thing you would like to change about your child’s/children’s school?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

21. What would you like to see happen for your child/children when
he/they grow(s) up? ________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX E

CHECKLIST OF HOME ENVIRONMENTAL PROCESSES
RELATED TO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT
CHECKLIST OF HOME ENVIRONMENTAL PROCESSES RELATED TO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT*

1. **Work habits of the children and parents**
   - A. The degree of structure, sharing, and punctuality in the home activities
   - B. Emphasis on regularity in the use of time and space in the home
   - C. Priority given to schoolwork, reading, and other educative activities over TV and other recreation

2. **Academic guidance and support**
   - A. Frequent encouragement of the child for his or her schoolwork
   - B. Parental knowledge of strengths and weaknesses in the child’s school learning and supportive help when it is really needed
   - C. Availability of a quiet place to study with appropriate books, reference materials, and other learning material

3. **Stimulation to explore and discuss ideas and events**
   - A. Family interest in hobbies, games, and other activities which have educative value
   - B. Family use and discussion of books, newspapers, magazines, and TV programs
   - C. Frequent use of libraries, museums, and cultural activities by the family

4. **Language development in the home**
   - A. Family concern and help for correct and effective language usage
   - B. Opportunities for the enlargement of vocabulary and sentence patterns

5. **Academic aspirations and expectations**
   - A. Parental knowledge of the child’s current schoolwork and school activities
   - B. Parental standards and expectations for the child’s schoolwork
   - C. Parental educational and vocational aspirations for the child

   ________ Total number of + marks

* For each of these items, the interviewer reads the item and explains it briefly (see attachment for explanations of items). If an item is something that the parent believes is rarely done or emphasized in the home, a 0 is recorded. If it is something that is frequently done or is emphasized in the home, a + is recorded. It is something that is especially emphasized in the home, a ++ is recorded. The number of plus marks represents the total score.
APPENDIX F

HOME EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT QUESTIONNAIRE
(SPANISH VERSION)
INSTRUCCIONES: Esta encuesta es parte de un estudio sobre la importancia que pueden tener la familia y el hogar en nuestra manera de entender al estudiante adulto. Esto es un estudio de investigación y sus respuestas serán mantenidas con confidencialidad. Es importante que usted responda cada una de estas preguntas con exactitud. Sin embargo, si la pregunta es interpretada como una intrusión a su privacidad, no la conteste. Preferimos que usted no responda ciertas preguntas a tener respuestas sin exactitud.

Por favor marque (✓) la letra que mejor describa a los miembros de su familia que viven en su casa.

1. ¿Ayudan todos los miembros de su familia con los quehaceres de la casa?

   ———— A. Muy pocas veces o nunca
   ———— B. Algunas veces
   ———— C. Muy frecuentemente o siempre

2. ¿Tienen los miembros de su familia horario fijo para comer, dormir, y estudiar?

   ———— A. Muy pocas veces o nunca
   ———— B. Algunas veces
   ———— C. Muy frecuentemente o siempre

3. ¿Dedican tiempo los miembros de su familia, para leer, hacer tareas de la escuela y estudiar aunque eso les reduzca tiempo para jugar, divertirse, hacer deportes, y ver televisión?

   ———— A. Muy pocas veces o nunca
   ———— B. Algunas veces
   ———— C. Muy frecuentemente o siempre
4. ¿Elogian y aprueban, los miembros de su familia, los logros y las tareas de la escuela hechas por otros miembros de la familia (ej., los éxitos alcanzados por sus hijos en la escuela, el aprender a caminar y a hablar)?

_________ A. Muy pocas veces o nunca
_________ B. Algunas veces
_________ C. Muy frecuentemente o siempre

5. ¿Le comunica a los amigos y a la familia acerca de los logros de miembros de la familia que están descritos en la pregunta #4?

_________ A. Muy pocas veces o nunca
_________ B. Algunas veces
_________ C. Muy frecuentemente o siempre

6. ¿Le provee de materiales para estudiar en la casa (ej., libros, plumas, lapiceras, papel)?

_________ A. Muy pocas veces o nunca
_________ B. Algunas veces
_________ C. Muy frecuentemente o siempre

7. ¿Hay un periodo y espacio tranquilo para que miembros de su familia lean y estudien?

_________ A. Muy pocas veces o nunca
_________ B. Algunas veces
_________ C. Muy frecuentemente o siempre

8. ¿Comparten los miembros de su familia los pasatiempos y juegos educacionales los cuales involucran a todos los miembros de la familia (ej., juegos de tablero, rompecabezas, ir de camping)?

_________ A. Muy pocas veces o nunca
_________ B. Algunas veces
_________ C. Muy frecuentemente o siempre

9. ¿Lee usted periodicos y libros que no son prescritos por la escuela?

_________ A. Muy pocas veces o nunca
_________ B. Algunas veces
_________ C. Muy frecuentemente o siempre
10. ¿Con que frecuencia le lee usted a su(s) hijo(s)?

----- A. Frequentemente (por lo menos una vez al día)
----- B. Con frecuencia (avrias veces a la semana)
----- C. Algunas veces (por lo menos una vez a la semana)
----- D. Una o dos veces al mes
----- E. Muy pocas veces o nunca

11. ¿Cuán frecuente escucha usted a su(s) hijo(s) leer en la casa?

----- A. Frequentemente (por lo menos una vez al día)
----- B. Con frecuencia (avrias veces a la semana)
----- C. Algunas veces (por lo menos una vez a la semana)
----- D. Una o dos veces al mes
----- E. Muy pocas veces o nunca

12. ¿Cuán frecuente habla usted con su hijo acerca de los libros que el/ella está leyendo?

----- A. Frequentemente (por lo menos una vez al día)
----- B. Con frecuencia (avrias veces a la semana)
----- C. Algunas veces (por lo menos una vez a la semana)
----- D. Una o dos veces al mes
----- E. Muy pocas veces o nunca

13. ¿Cree usted que uno de los padres debe ayudar a su hijo con la tarea de la escuela hecha en la casa?

----- A. Sí, uno de los padres debe revisar lo que el niño tiene que hacer y asegurarse de que el/ella hagan el trabajo.
----- B. Sí, pero solo para verificar que el niño haga todo el trabajo.
----- C. Sí, pero solo cuando el niño pregunte por una explicación.
----- D. No, los padres no deben ayudar, aún cuando el niño pregunte.

14. ¿Tiene usted una tarjeta para pedir libros prestados en la biblioteca?

_____ Sí
_____ No
15. ¿Cuán frecuente va usted a la biblioteca?

----- A. Más de una vez a la semana
----- B. Varias veces al mes
----- C. Varia veces al año
----- D. Cuda varios años
----- E. Nunca

16. ¿Visitan y hablan los miembros de su familia de lugares como el zoológico, museos, conciertos, y presentaciones teatrales? Si no pueden asistir a esos lugares, ¿miran programas de televisión sobre de esos lugares y eventos?

----- A. Muy pocas veces o nunca
----- B. Algunas veces
----- C. Muy frecuentemente o siempre

17. ¿Hay en su casa un diccionario que es utilizado por adultos y por niños de edad suficiente para usarlo?

----- A. Muy pocas veces o nunca
----- B. Algunas veces
----- C. Muy frecuentemente o siempre

18. ¿Hablan diariamente, los miembros de la familia, acerca de temas de actualidad durante la sobre mesa o cuando la familia está reunida?

----- A. Muy pocas veces o nunca
----- B. Algunas veces
----- C. Muy frecuentemente o siempre

19. ¿Cuán importante cree usted que es la educación de su(s) hijo(s) para su(s) triunfo(s) en la vida?

----- A. La educación no tiene nada que ver con el triunfo
----- B. Ni ayuda ni tampoco hace daño
----- C. No es muy importante
----- D. Es importante
----- E. Sumamente importante
20. ¿Cuánta enseñanza espera usted que su(s) hijo(s) reciba(n)?

----- A. No terminará la escuela secundaria
----- B. Que termine la escuela secundaria
----- C. Que termine dos años de estudios universitarios o de escuela vocacional
----- D. Que termine dos años de estudios universitarios
----- E. Que termine algunos estudios de escuela para graduados

21. ¿Conoce usted el(los) maestro(s) actual(es) de su niño(s)?

----- A. Sí
----- B. No
----- C. Ninguno de mis hijos asiste a la escuela o a la preescuela

22. ¿Sabe usted lo que sus hijos están aprendiendo y haciendo en la escuela? (Si son de edad preescolar, ¿sabe usted cuales son sus actividades o rutinas diarias?)

----- A. Muy pocas veces o nunca
----- B. Algunas veces
----- C. Muy frecuentemente o siempre
----- D. Ninguno de mis hijos asiste a la escuela o a la preescuela

23. ¿Conoce usted las áreas débiles o fuertes de su(s) niño(s)?

----- A. Sí, bastante bien
----- B. Sí, algunas de ellas
----- C. No
----- D. Ninguno de mis hijos asiste a la escuela o a la preesuela

24. ¿Se entera usted acerca de las actividades que tienen lugar en la escuela de su(s) niño(s) (ej.: reuniones con los maestros, asambleas, paseos)?

----- A. Sí, bastante bien
----- B. Sí, algunas de ellas
----- C. No
----- D. Ninguno de mis hijos asiste a la escuela o a la preesuela
25. ¿Revisa usted a diario y semanalmente los trabajos de la escuela, las tareas, progreso y las calificaciones de su(s) niño(s)?

   A. Sí, bastante bien  
   B. Sí, algunas de ellas  
   C. No  
   D. Ninguno de mis hijos asiste a la escuela o a la preesuela

26. ¿Se comunica usted regularmente con el maestro y con la escuela de su niño asiste enterarse de lo que pasa en la escuela y en el salón de clase?

   A. Sí, bastante bien  
   B. Sí, algunas de ellas  
   C. No  
   D. Ninguno de mis hijos asiste a la escuela o a la preesuela
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