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ABSTRACT

PARENTAL READING TRAITS AND FIRST-GRADERS' READING SCORES

by

Beverley Ann Radloff

Master of Arts in
Elementary Education: Reading Improvement

June, 1978

This study explored the relationship between parental reading habits and first-grade children's Total Reading Score from the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills. This test was administered in May 1977 by the child's first-grade teacher in compliance with the school district's testing program. Subjects were selected from the first-grade population in two schools in the suburbs of the Greater Los Angeles area. The population of these two schools represented families of low, middle and high socio-economic status. The study was limited to those children who resided with both parents.

A questionnaire was utilized to gather data on how parents rated themselves as readers, frequency and duration of parental reading, possession and use of a library
card by the parents, observation by child of parental reading, discussion of what parents read in front of and with the child, parent reading to child, child's possession and use of a library card, number of magazines and newspapers purchased or subscribed to regularly by parents and children, number of books in the home, number of books owned by child, child's reading of newspaper, parents' rating of own reading enjoyment and parents' rating of child's reading enjoyment. Information on age, sex of child, reading score of child and main wage earner's occupation were obtained from school records. Separate questionnaires were supplied for each parent. Each parent was asked to respond without consulting the other parent.

The data from the questionnaire for all yes/no type questions were analyzed using an analysis of variance. The remainder of the questions were of the multiple choice variety. The data from these questions were analyzed using a Chi Square. In all cases the .05 level of significance was used to either accept or reject each hypothesis.

The findings of this study indicated that first-grade children who reportedly asked their parents to read to them, first-grade children who had library cards, first-grade children who enjoyed reading, as rated by the parents and female first-graders all had significantly higher reading scores than first-grade children who did not ask for reading to them.
their parents to read to them, who did not have library cards, who did not enjoy reading as much and who were male.

The other areas explored by this study did not have significant results.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background and Significance

The effects of a family's background on the attitude of the child toward reading is currently a topic of much research. Trying to determine which variables in a family's background effect the reading of the child has led researchers to explore the economic status of the family, educational attainment of the parents, ethnic background, marital status and position of the child in the family. There are also variables within the home environment itself, which help define a child's attitude toward reading.

Trotzig (1957) states that: "Children cannot be expected to do any more reading than their elders." Homes that have a television set, several radios, a phonograph, an automobile or two, and a host of mechanical gadgets and toys but no shelves of books or magazines are not likely to house persons who spend much time reading. If a child comes home each day to find a conspicuous array of good reading materials and his parents absorbed in reading and in discussing what they have read, he may tend to emulate this happy home enterprise and make it a part of his
pattern of life. Alexander and Filler (1976) refer to the home environment, notably the attitudes expressed by parents and the willingness of parents to be actively involved with their children in the reading experience, as being reflected in the attitudes of the child toward reading. Parents, they infer, play a large role in shaping the attitudes of their children.

This study will explore the relationship between parent's reports of their own reading habits and their reported enjoyment of reading and the creation of a home environment which encourages the child to read. The role of parental reading in encouraging the child to read is significant to both teachers and parents. Teachers and parents could use this knowledge to help them create an environment which makes reading easier and more enjoyable for the child. If reading is more enjoyable, then the child may be more successful in reading. Reading success and success in school may be closely related.

The subjects for this study are first-graders, chosen because they have completed one year of formal reading instruction. This study will compare the test scores of the subjects with various facets of the home environment as reported by parents which may be indicators of parental reading habits.

Statement of the Problem

This study explores the relationship between
parental reading habits and children's reading scores on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills. The children whose parents were surveyed were selected randomly from two schools from a suburb in the Greater Los Angeles area. The population of these two schools represent families of low, medium and high socio-economic status as defined by Scoville's Revised Scale for Rating Occupation (1972).

Research Hypotheses

The basic hypotheses of this study are as follows:

Hypothesis 1

There will be no significant difference between the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents set time aside during the day to read and the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents do not set time aside during the day to read.

Hypothesis 2

There will be no significant difference in the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents claim to have a library card and the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents do not claim to have a library card.

Hypothesis 3

There will be no significant difference in the reading scores of first-grade children who are afforded
more of an opportunity to observe parental reading and the scores of first-grade children who are afforded less of an opportunity.

Hypothesis 4

There will be no significant difference in the reading scores of first-grade children who are afforded an opportunity to hear a discussion of things read by their parents and the reading scores of first-grade children who are not afforded an opportunity to hear a discussion of things read by their parents.

Hypothesis 5

There will be no significant difference in the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents discuss what they have read directly with their child and the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents do not discuss what they have read directly with their child.

Hypothesis 6

There will be no significant difference in the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents read things that they enjoy aloud to their child and the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents do not read things that they enjoy aloud to their child.

Hypothesis 7

There will be no significant difference in the
reading scores of first-grade children who asked their parents to read to them and the reading scores of first-grade children who do not ask their parents to read to them.

**Hypothesis 8**

There will be no significant difference in the reading scores of first-grade children who have library cards and the reading scores of first-grade children who do not have library cards.

**Hypothesis 9**

There will be no significant difference in the reading scores of first-grade children who do read a portion of the newspaper and the reading scores of first-grade children who do not read the newspaper.

**Hypothesis 10**

The distribution of reading scores of first-grade children whose parents read less than an average amount, an average amount or more than an average amount (Durkin, 1966) will not differ significantly from chance.

**Hypothesis 11**

The distribution of reading scores of first-grade children and the claimed duration of parental reading will not differ significantly from chance.
Hypothesis 12

The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the frequency of library card usage by the child will not differ significantly from chance.

Hypothesis 13

The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the number of magazines subscribed to or purchased regularly by the parents will not differ significantly from chance.

Hypothesis 14

The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents subscribe to a newspaper daily, weekly, other or never will not differ significantly from chance.

Hypothesis 15

The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the number of books in the home will not differ significantly from chance.

Hypothesis 16

The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the number of magazines subscribed to by the child will not differ significantly from chance.
Hypothesis 17

The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the number of books owned personally by the child will not differ significantly from chance.

Hypothesis 18

The distribution of reading scores of first-grade children and the frequency of library card use by their parents will not differ significantly from chance.

Hypothesis 19

The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and parental enjoyment of reading will not differ significantly from chance.

Hypothesis 20

The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and parental opinion of the child's enjoyment of reading will not differ significantly from chance.

Hypothesis 21

The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and family socio-economic status will not differ significantly from chance.

Hypothesis 22

The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the sex of the child will not differ
significantly from chance.

Hypothesis 23

The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the age of the first-grade children will not differ significantly from chance.

Basic Assumptions

a. Since the subjects were drawn from all classrooms containing first-grade children in two schools it is assumed that the subjects' experiences and skill abilities in reading during the preceding months of school are varied.

b. The general health and basic visual and auditory abilities of the subjects varies in a random manner.

c. The distribution of family socio-economic status reflects a variety typical of suburban middle class communities.

d. The subjects have had a varied exposure to media such as television, radio, theaters, libraries, etc.

Limitations of the Study

The findings of this study will be generalizable to the remaining first-grade population of the two schools involved in the study.
The findings may be generalizable to first-grade children from environments similar to those utilized in this investigation.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Studies exploring the home environment of children are numerous. In most studies the author started with children who were identified as having some special trait -- they were poor readers, early readers, competent children, etc. -- and then went back to attempt to determine which characteristics of the environment, in retrospect, seemed to have influenced the appearance of the trait under study.

In a study of over and under achievers (Kurtz and Swenson, 1951), it was found that over achievers appeared to have a home situation which was more child oriented than the homes of under achievers.

"Pride, confidence, affection and interest of parents in their children, as shown in instances in which parents read to their children, plan with them, build for them, or attend school functions with them, appear to be in greater evidence for plus achievers than for minus achievers" (Kurtz and Swenson, 1951, p.475).

The question that then arises is: Was this
support by parents the result of the achievement of the child, or was it the influencing factor behind the child's achievement?

In a study of parents of children who were poor readers Preston (1939) found that the less capable the child the less supportive the parents. Negative types of home situations were generated. Thus success seems to breed success and failure only compounds failure.

In studies of children who were early readers, Durkin (1966) found that in interviewing parents about their previous behavior which may have contributed to the child reading early, that the parents had difficulty in many instances recalling what had caused their child to read early. Durkin did, however, discover enough similarly remembered behavior to cause her to feel that there were environmental factors which did contribute. She found significant differences, for example, between the amount of reading done by mothers of early readers and that of the mothers of non-readers.

"This kind of difference again emphasizes the likelihood of an early reader having in his home an adult model who reads often. Perhaps, like other attitudes, early interest in becoming a reader is as much 'caught' as taught" (Durkin, 1966, p.95).
Other studies supported Durkin's findings that the environment found in the home could have a direct influence on a child's educational success, especially that part of the environment where the child comes into direct contact with a family member who provides the child with a reading model.

Interaction between the child and his general home environment (as created by his parents) was felt to provide certain kinds of experiences which could produce educationally competent children, if the interaction was favorable (Price, 1974).

Plessas and Oakes (1964) found that parents, grand-parents and siblings directly affected the early reading of children by supplying many "encouraging and stimulating activities related to reading" (Plessas and Oakes, 1964, p.245).

George (1972) explored the hypothesis that the home environment, namely that which is created directly by the parents, is important in developing children who read. He stated that the parents should be trained to provide a proper environment to foster reading competency. George developed a questionnaire in which he looked for twenty factors that he felt may influence the child's reading including the parents own reading, the number of books owned by the child and parents, how many magazines were read in the home and the amount of time spent by the
parents reading.

Almy (1949) advocates parental interference in controlling the reading environment, recommends that parents seize every opportunity to teach reading and believes, primarily, that it is the child's interest in and response to opportunities to read that will determine whether or not he becomes a reader. Almy does temper her directive to parents by stating that:

"The effect of the child's early reading experiences or his skills in and attitudes toward beginning reading depends considerably on how these experiences fit into his whole life pattern" (Almy, 1949, p.109).

Swick and Willis (1973) put forward the idea that the home environment of the child is the greatest influence on the child's in-school behavior.

"The performance of the parents in terms of the kind of behavior they present to the child is more important than any other learning experience in which the child might become involved" (Swick and Willis, 1973, p.379).

"All behavior is learned, and much of it is learned by imitation. Reading behavior in children is no exception."
Attitudes toward reading and the way of life that reading creates are learned by children from both the conscious and the unconscious actions and feelings of the adults who surround them from earliest years" (Mathews, 1972, p.21).

Mathews' article dealt with the influence an adult who reads can have on a child's or young person's reading habits. Mathews believes that any adult, not just a family member, can produce a child who reads. She felt that the exposure to someone who reads need not be prolonged, but only occasional.

Other studies looked at factors which could have a bearing on the quality of the home environment.

Higher education of parents was related to the success of their children in a study of the reading and math scores of high school freshmen. Bell and Starkey (1974) stated that the mother's educational attainment had more effect than did the father's because, they assumed, mothers tend to be with their children more during their earliest years.

Bloom (1964) cited numerous studies which indicated that the father's occupation, when considered by how many years of school were needed to attain a certain job, directly influenced the reading comprehension scores
of their children. Bloom felt that the environment of the educational institution influenced the child's reading in his later years when he is more removed from his home environment. He does conclude that the home environment and the school environment must be mutually supportive.

Sheldon (1952) found a direct relationship between reading scores of children and the number of books found in the home. An increase in the number of books in the home corresponded to an increase in reading score.

It becomes evident from the research that there seem to be common factors influencing a child's learning to read. The type of home environment from which a child comes may affect his or her ability to read to some degree. Some components of this environment may be:

1. Parents, siblings, grand-parents and/or other adults who are readers and who act as either models by reading themselves or as teachers to encourage a child's interest in reading.

2. Readily available materials to read and early exposure to the act of reading.

3. Socio-economic status may be a factor. The educational achievement of the father may influence the economic status of the family, which in turn may influence the reading scores of the children.

4. The educational achievement of the mother may
influence the reading of the younger child. Although some elements, common to children who read, are explored in the research, there is little definitive data which pin-points specific acts which take place in the confines of the home environment which definitely influence the reading scores of young children.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN & PROCEDURES

This Chapter describes the subjects of the study, the procedures, instrument and statistical treatments used.

Subjects of the Study

The subjects of this study were first-graders from two Los Angeles area schools. The schools were selected for their differing socio-economic characteristics. Sixty-nine subjects were selected randomly from the total first-grade enrollment of these two schools. Each parent of each subject was asked to complete a survey which requested detailed information about the child's home reading environment (See Appendix A). On the assumption that each family was a two-parent family, 138 questionnaires were issued. From the total of 94 surveys returned, six responses were not usable as no reading test data was available for the subjects, while four responses were also deemed not usable because only one parent responded.

Hence, the remaining 84 surveys, representing 42 families where both parents responded and a reading score was available for their child, were used as the basis of this study.
Research Instrument

A written questionnaire was used to gather information about the reading habits of parents and children from the parents of randomly selected first-grade students at each of the two schools participating in the study. The questionnaire was designed as suggested by Oppenheim (1966). It was determined that a mail questionnaire using closed type questions (yes/no and numerical responses) would help eliminate bias, and increase ease of response. The questions were sequenced to move from questions directly about the parent to questions about the child.

Two nine-point attitudinal scales were used. On the first the parent rated their own enjoyment of reading. On the second scale the parent rated their child's enjoyment of reading.

The survey was distributed by the classroom teachers. Each survey package included a cover letter to the parents explaining the purpose of the survey and a statement of confidentiality (See Appendix B), a stamped, self-addressed envelope for the return of the completed survey(s), and, on the assumption that each child had two parents, two survey forms were provided to each family. The parents were asked to respond independently of each other to the survey questions. Student names were replaced by numbers to insure confidentiality during
A compilation of survey results.

**Data Collection**

The Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) was administered to each subject as part of a district-wide testing program in May of 1977, at the conclusion of the subjects' first-grade year. The tests were scored electronically by the school district. Each subject's test scores were obtained from the participating schools' records. The subjects' test scores for the Total Reading portion of the test were reported as being either above or below the mean of the CTBS. School record cards were also used to obtain the birthdate of each subject and the occupation of the main wage earner in each subject's family. The age of each child was computed in months from birth to May 1977. In each family, the main wage earner's occupation was classified using Scoville's Revised Scale for Rating Occupation. Eighty-four usable surveys were returned by parents willing to participate in the study. The yes/no responses of the parents on the parent survey were given a numerical value with yes being 1 and no being 2. All other questions either required a numerical response or were assigned a numerical value. The resulting data for each child (test score, birthdate, and sex) and for each parent (main wage earner's occupation, mother or father, and questionnaire responses) were
recorded on punched cards that were used for the computerized analysis.

**Data Analysis**

The data received from the questionnaire for items 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 19 (yes/no type questions) were analyzed using an analysis of variance. Since the returns were almost equally distributed among first-grade children above and below the mean score for Total Reading on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, it was decided that the randomness assumption for the analysis of variance had been met. The responses to the Reading Survey were considered in relation to each hypothesis. The responses were then analyzed with the children's reading scores to determine if any significant variations in reading scores occurred for each item. In each instance the .05 level of significance was used to accept or reject each hypothesis.

The remainder of the questions on the Reading Survey asked for multiple responses. For each of these questions the parental responses were divided into two groups at or near the mean for comparative purposes. The children's reading scores were divided at the mean score of the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills. The data from the Reading Survey questions and the reading scores of the children were then analyzed using a Chi Square. The
.05 level of significant was used to either accept or reject each hypothesis.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION
OF THE DATA

This chapter presents the data and analyzes the results of the study.

Hypothesis 1

The null hypothesis states that there will be no significant difference between the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents set time aside during the day to read and the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents do not set time aside during the day to read (Item 2 on the Reading Survey: See Appendix A).

There was no significant difference found between the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents claimed to set time aside during the day for their own reading and the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents claimed they did not set time aside during the day for their own reading (See Table 1).

Consequently, Hypothesis 1 was not rejected. This data indicates that the scores of first-grade children whose parents did set time aside to read may be unrelated to the scores of first-grade children whose parents did not set time aside to read.
TABLE 1

A SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS OF THE NINE NULL HYPOTHESES REQUIRING A YES OR NO RESPONSE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis Number</th>
<th>Mean Score Yes</th>
<th>Mean Score No</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>Degree Of Freedom</th>
<th>Signif. Of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.220</td>
<td>5.559</td>
<td>2.323</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.385</td>
<td>5.313</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.333</td>
<td>5.556</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.301</td>
<td>5.727</td>
<td>1.734</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.383</td>
<td>5.292</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.368</td>
<td>5.333</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.473</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>8.340</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.026</td>
<td>5.630</td>
<td>7.595</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.205</td>
<td>5.489</td>
<td>1.682</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.S. = Not Significant

Hypothesis 2

The null hypothesis stated that there would be no significant difference between the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents claim to have a library card and the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents do not claim to have a library card (Item 4 on the Reading Survey: See Appendix A).

There was no significant difference demonstrated between the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents claimed to have a library card and the reading
scores of first-grade children whose parents did not claim to have a library card (See Table 1). Consequently the null hypothesis was not rejected. The first-grade children of parents who claimed to have a library card did not have significantly higher reading scores than those first-grade children whose parents did not have a library card.

**Hypothesis 3**

The null hypothesis stated that there would be no significant difference in the reading scores of first-grade children who are afforded more of an opportunity to observe parental reading and the scores of first-grade children who are afforded less of an opportunity to observe parental reading (Item 6 on the Reading Survey: See Appendix A).

There was no significant difference evident between the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents claimed to read in their presence and the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents claimed they did not read in their presence (See Table 1).

Therefore, Hypothesis 3 was not rejected. This data indicates that the opportunity to observe parental reading may be unrelated to a first-grade child's reading score.

**Hypothesis 4**

The null hypothesis stated that there would be no significant difference in the reading scores of first-grade children who are afforded an opportunity to hear a
discussion of things read by their parents and the reading scores of first-grade children who are not afforded an opportunity to hear a discussion of things read by their parents (Item 7 on Reading Survey: See Appendix A).

There was no significant difference discovered between the reading scores of those first-grade children who were purportedly afforded an opportunity to hear a discussion of things read by their parents and the reading scores of first-grade children who were not purportedly afforded an opportunity to hear a discussion of things read by their parents (See Table 1). Therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected. The reading scores of first-grade children whose parents claim that their child was afforded the opportunity to hear a discussion of things read by their parents may be unrelated to the reading scores of those first-grade children whose parents claim that their child was not afforded the opportunity to hear a discussion of things read by their parents.

Hypothesis 5

The null hypothesis stated that there would be no significant difference in the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents discuss what they read directly with their child and the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents do not discuss what they have read directly with their child (Item 8 on the Reading Survey: See Appendix A).
There was no significant difference shown between the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents claimed to discuss what they have read directly with their child and the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents claim not to discuss what they have read directly with their child (See Table 1). Hence the null hypothesis was not rejected. The opportunity to hear parental discussion of what has been read may be unrelated to the reading scores of first-grade children.

Hypothesis 6

The null hypothesis stated that there would be no significant difference in the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents read things that they enjoy aloud to their child and the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents do not read things that they enjoy aloud to their child (Item 9 on the Reading Survey: See Appendix A).

There was no significant difference demonstrated in the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents claimed to read things that they enjoy aloud to their child and the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents claimed not to read things that they enjoy aloud to their child (See Table 1).

Therefore, Hypothesis 6 was not rejected. The reading scores of first-grade children of parents who claimed to read things that they enjoy aloud to their
child did not significantly differ from the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents claimed that they did not read things that they enjoy aloud to their child. **Hypothesis 7**

The null hypothesis stated that there would be no significant difference in the reading scores of first-grade children who asked their parents to read to them and the reading scores of first-grade children who do not ask their parents to read to them (Item 10 on the Reading Survey: See Appendix A).

There was a significant difference at the .05 level between the reading scores of first-grade children who purportedly asked their parents to read to them and the reading scores of first-grade children who purportedly did not ask their parents to read to them (See Table 1).

Consequently Hypothesis 7 was rejected. The reading scores of first-grade children who purportedly asked their parents to read to them differed significantly from the reading scores of first-grade children who purportedly did not ask their parents to read to them. The differences could possibly be attributed to the child's attitude about reading. If a child is successful in reading, as indicated by high reading scores, he may ask to be read to because the experience is pleasurable. If a child experiences reading difficulty, as indicated by low reading score, he may not find being read to a
pleasurable experience. Therefore, the child who has a high reading score asks to be read to more often. The child with a low reading score does not often ask to be read to.

**Hypothesis 8**

The null hypothesis stated that there will be no significant difference in the reading scores of first-grade children who have library cards and the reading scores of first-grade children who do not have library cards (Item 11 on the Reading Survey: See Appendix A).

There was a significant difference at the .05 level between the reading scores of first-grade children who had library cards as reported by their parents and the reading scores of first-grade children who do not have library cards as reported by their parents (See Table 1).

Hence, Hypothesis 8 was rejected. There was a significant difference between the reading scores of first-grade children who had library cards and the reading scores of first-grade children who did not have library cards as reported by their parents.

The child who has a library card may be the child who finds reading enjoyable, and uses the library card to do more reading. The high reading scores could be the result of more practice in reading or success in reading (high test scores) could generate more interest in reading related activities such as ownership of a library card.
Hypothesis 9

The null hypothesis stated that there would be no significant differences in the reading scores of first-grade children who do read a portion of the newspaper and the reading scores of first-grade children who do not read the newspaper (Item 19 on the Reading Survey: See Appendix A).

There were no significant differences found in the reading scores of first-grade children who read a portion of the newspaper as reported by their parents and the reading scores of first-grade children who do not read the newspaper as reported by their parents (See Table 1).

Therefore, Hypothesis 9 was not rejected. The reading scores of first-grade children who read a portion of the newspaper were not significantly different from the reading scores of first-grade children who do not read the newspaper.

Hypothesis 10

The null hypothesis states that the distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents read less than an average amount, an average amount, or more than an average amount (Durkin, 1966) will not differ significantly from chance.

The analysis of the results of Item 1 on the Reading Survey (See Appendix A) indicates that the distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents
rated themselves as persons who read more than an average amount and the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents rated themselves as persons who read an average amount or less than an average amount did not differ significantly from chance (See Table 2).

Thus the null hypothesis was not rejected. The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents claimed to read less than an average amount, an average amount, or more than an average amount did not differ significantly from chance.

TABLE 2

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF CHILD'S READING SCORE BY THE AMOUNT OF READING OF PARENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child's Reading Score</th>
<th>Parents Read More Than An Average Amount</th>
<th>Parents Read Avg. &amp; Less Than Avg. Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 20</td>
<td>N = 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 20</td>
<td>N = 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\text{Chi}^2 = 0.38018 \ (\text{N.S.})^*$  (3.84 is needed for significance at the .05 level with one degree of freedom)

N.S. = Not Significant

Hypothesis 11

The null hypothesis states that the distribution of reading scores of first-grade children and the claimed duration of parental reading will not differ significantly from chance. (Item 3 on Reading Survey: See Appendix A)
First-grade children with reading scores above the mean and first-grade children with reading scores below the mean show an approximately equal proportion of parents reading more than 60 minutes each day and parents reading less than 60 minutes each day (See Table 3).

Thus, the null hypothesis was not rejected. The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the claimed duration of parental reading did not differ significantly from chance.

**TABLE 3**

<p>| FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF CHILD'S READING SCORE BY DAILY DURATION OF TIME SPENT READING BY PARENT |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child’s Reading Score</th>
<th>More Than 60 Minutes</th>
<th>Less Than 60 Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 17</td>
<td>N = 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 16</td>
<td>N = 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi² = 0.06579 (N.S.)

**Hypothesis 12**

The null hypothesis states that the distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the frequency of library card usage by the child will not differ significantly from chance (Item 12 on Reading Survey: See Appendix A).

First-grade children with reading scores above the mean and first-grade children with reading scores below the mean show an approximately equal proportion of
of first-grade children who use their library cards and
first-grade children who do not use their library cards
(See Table 4).

Hence the null hypothesis was not rejected. The
distribution of the reading scores of first-grade chil-
dren and the frequency of library card usage by the child
will not differ significantly from chance.

TABLE 4
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF CHILD'S READING SCORE BY CHILD'S
USAGE OF LIBRARY CARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child's Reading Score</th>
<th>Library Card Used</th>
<th>Library Card Not Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Test Mean</td>
<td>( N = 17 )</td>
<td>( N = 29 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Test Mean</td>
<td>( N = 20 )</td>
<td>( N = 18 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 1.48735 \) (N.S.)

Hypothesis 13

The null hypothesis states that the distribution of
the reading scores of first-grade children and the number
of magazines subscribed to or purchased regularly by the
parents will not differ significantly from chance (Item 13
on Reading Survey: See Appendix A).

First-grade children whose reading scores are
above the mean and first-grade children whose reading
scores are below the mean have an approximately equal pro-
portion of parents who subscribe to 4 or more magazines
and parents who subscribe to less than 4 magazines (See
Table 5).

Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. The distribution of reading scores of first-grade children and the number of magazines subscribed to or purchased regularly by the parents did not differ significantly from chance.

**TABLE 5**

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF CHILD'S READING SCORE BY THE NUMBER OF MAGAZINES SUBSCRIBED TO OR PURCHASED REGULARLY BY PARENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child's Reading Score</th>
<th>4 Or More Magazines</th>
<th>Less Than 4 Magazines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 19</td>
<td>N = 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 16</td>
<td>N = 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi² = 0.02197 (N.S.)

Hypothesis 14

The null hypothesis states that the distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents subscribe to or purchase a newspaper daily, weekly, other or never (Item 14 on Reading Survey: See Appendix A) will not differ significantly from chance.

The first-grade children whose reading scores were above the mean and the first-grade children whose reading scores were below the mean demonstrated an approximately equal proportion of parents who purchased or subscribed to a daily newspaper and parents who purchased...
or subscribed to a newspaper on a weekly, other or never basis (See Table 6).

Thus the null hypothesis was not rejected. The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents subscribed to or purchased a newspaper daily, weekly, other or never did not differ significantly from chance.

TABLE 6
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF CHILD'S READING SCORE BY THE PARENT'S TYPE OF NEWSPAPER SUBSCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child's Reading Score</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>Weekly, Other And None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 31</td>
<td>N = 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 21</td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi² = 0.83461 (N.S.)

Hypothesis 15

The null hypothesis states that the distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the number of books in the home will not differ significantly from chance (Item 15 On Reading Survey: See Appendix A).

First-grade children with reading scores above the mean and first-grade children with reading scores below the mean show an approximately equal proportion of homes with more than 200 books and homes with 200 or less books (See Table 7).

Thus, for this sample the distribution of the
reading scores of first-grade children and the number of books in the home did not differ significantly from chance.

TABLE 7
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF CHILD'S READING SCORE BY THE NUMBER OF BOOKS IN THE HOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Score</th>
<th>More Than 200 Books</th>
<th>200 Or Less Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 20</td>
<td>N = 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 16</td>
<td>N = 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi² = 0.00901 (N.S.)

Hypothesis 16

The null hypothesis states that the distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the number of magazines subscribed to by the child will not differ significantly from chance (Item 17 on the Reading Survey: See Appendix A).

First-grade children whose reading score were above the mean and first-grade children whose reading scores were below the mean show approximately equal proportions of first-grade children who subscribed to 1 or more magazines and first-grade children who subscribed to no magazines (See Table 8).

Therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected. The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the number of magazines subscribed to by the child did not differ significantly from chance.
TABLE 8

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF CHILD'S READING SCORE BY THE CHILD'S NUMBER OF MAGAZINE SUBSCRIPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child's Reading Score</th>
<th>1 Or More</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 27</td>
<td>N = 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 21</td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi² = 0.00901 (N.S.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 17**

The null hypothesis states that the distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the number of books owned personally by the child will not differ significantly from chance (Item 18 on the Reading Survey: See Appendix A).

First-grade children whose reading scores were above the mean and first-grade children whose reading scores were below the mean showed an equal proportion of first-grade children who owned 40 or more books personally and first-grade children who own less than 40 books personally (See Table 9).

Thus, the null hypothesis was not rejected. The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the number of books owned personally by the child did not differ significantly from chance.
TABLE 9
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF CHILD'S READING SCORE BY THE
CHILD'S NUMBER OF BOOKS OWNED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Score</th>
<th>40 Or More Books</th>
<th>Less Than 40 Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 23</td>
<td>N = 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 19</td>
<td>N = 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{Chi}^2 = 0.04805 \text{ (N.S.)} \]

Hypothesis 18

The null hypothesis states that the distribution of reading scores of first-grade children and the frequency of library card use by their parents will not differ significantly from chance (Item 5 on the Reading Survey: See Appendix A).

An approximately equal proportion of parents who used their library cards and parents who did not use their cards was found for those first-grade children whose reading scores were above the mean and for those first-grade children whose reading scores were below the mean (See Table 10).

Therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected. The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the frequency of library card use by their parents did not differ significantly from chance.
TABLE 10
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF CHILD'S READING SCORE BY THE PARENTS USAGE OF THEIR LIBRARY CARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Childs Reading Score</th>
<th>Library Card Used</th>
<th>Library Card Not Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 29</td>
<td>N = 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 23</td>
<td>N = 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\text{Chi}^2 = 0.00012 \text{ (N.S.)}$

**Hypothesis 19**

The null hypothesis states that the distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and parental enjoyment of reading will not differ significantly from chance (Item 21 on the Reading Survey: See Appendix A).

First-grade children with reading scores above the mean and first-grade children with reading scores below the mean showed an approximately equal proportion between those parents who rated themselves as enjoying reading very much and parents who rated themselves as enjoying reading not as much. Parents rated themselves on a nine-point scale with 1 being the most positive response and 9 being the least positive response (See Table 11).

The null hypothesis was not rejected. The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children...
and the reported parental enjoyment of reading did not differ significantly from chance.

**TABLE 11**

**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF CHILD'S READING SCORE BY PARENTAL ENJOYMENT OF READING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Childs Reading Score</th>
<th>Rated As A 1 Or 2 (Very Much)</th>
<th>Rated As 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 Not As Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 26</td>
<td>N = 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 18</td>
<td>N = 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\text{Chi}^2 = 0.38018 \text{ (N.S.)}$

**Hypothesis 20**

The null hypothesis states that the distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and parental opinion of the child's enjoyment of reading will not differ significantly from chance (Item 22 on the Reading Survey: See Appendix A).

First-grade children with reading scores above the mean and first-grade children with reading scores below the mean did not show an almost equal proportion of parents who rated their first-grade child as enjoying reading very much and parents who rated their child as not enjoying reading as much. On a nine point scale 35 parents whose first-grade children's reading scores were above the mean rated their first-grade child as enjoying reading (1 and 2 on the rating scale). Eleven
parents whose first-grade child scored above the mean rated them as enjoying reading less (3 to 9 on the rating scale) (See Table 12). In a majority of the cases when a first-grade child had a high reading score, the parents equated performance with enjoyment. In the case of the first-grade child whose reading score fell below the mean, the majority of parents rated their child as enjoying reading less.

Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and parental opinion of the child's enjoyment of reading did differ significantly from chance.

**TABLE 12**

**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF CHILD'S READING SCORE BY PARENT'S OPINION OF CHILD'S ENJOYMENT OF READING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child's Reading Score</th>
<th>Parents Rated 1 Or 2 (Very Much)</th>
<th>Parents Rated 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 (Not As Much)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 35</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>N = 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi² = 16.81163 (Significant at the .05 level)

**Hypothesis 21**

The null hypothesis states that the distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and family socio-economic status will not differ significantly from chance. The reading scores for those first-grade children
whose parent ranked in the top three categories on Scoville's Revised Scale for Rating Employment (1972) were almost equally proportioned with the reading scores of those first-grade children whose parents ranked in categories 4 thru 7 on Scoville's Revised Scale for Rating Employment (1972). Thus the null hypothesis was not rejected (See Table 13).

The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and family socio-economic status did not differ significantly from chance.

**TABLE 13**

**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF CHILD'S READING SCORE BY THE FAMILY'S SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child's Reading Score</th>
<th>Top 3 Ratings</th>
<th>4 Lower Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
<td>N = 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 8</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi\(^2\) = 0.00352 (N.S.)

**Hypothesis 22**

The null hypothesis states that the distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the sex of the child will not differ significantly from chance.

First-grade children whose reading scores were above the mean and first-grade children whose reading scores were below the mean were not equally proportioned between boys and girls. Seven male children had reading
scores above the mean while 16 female children had test scores above the mean. The inverse was true for those children whose reading scores were below the mean: 13 boys and 6 girls had reading test scores below the mean (See Table 14). Thus, it appears that the girls had a higher proportion of test scores above the mean and boys had a higher proportion of test scores below the mean.

The null hypothesis was rejected. The distribution of reading scores of first-grade children and the sex of the child did differ significantly from chance.

| TABLE 14 |
| FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF CHILD'S READING SCORE BY THE SEX OF THE CHILD |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Childs Reading Score</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 7</td>
<td>N = 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 13</td>
<td>N = 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi² = 4.59252 (Significant at the .05 level)

Hypothesis 23

The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the age of the first-grade children will not differ significantly from chance.

First-grade children with reading scores above the mean and first-grade children with reading scores below the mean were almost equally proportioned between those first-grade children who were 84 months of age or
older and those first-grade children who were less than 84 months of age (See Table 15).

Thus the null hypothesis was not rejected. The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the age of the first-grade children did not differ significantly from chance.

TABLE 15

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF CHILD'S READING SCORE BY THE AGE OF THE CHILD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Childs Reading Score</th>
<th>84 Month Or Older</th>
<th>Less Than 84 Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 12</td>
<td>N = 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Test Mean</td>
<td>N = 10</td>
<td>N = 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 0.07885 \) (N.S.)
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study investigated the relationships between parental reading habits and the reading scores of first-grade children, as measured by the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills.

This study was based on the premise that parental reading habits would act as a model for their first-grade child's reading. Factors which lent significance to this study were: (1) the inference by researchers that the clues to reading success may lie within the home environment, (2) the belief that parents exert a major, long term influence over their children and (3) that reading could be a modeled behavior with the parent's attitude toward reading being reflected in the child's attitude toward reading.

The subjects of this study were first-grade children from two Los Angeles area schools. The schools were selected for their differing socio-economic characteristics. Two-parent family responses were the only responses used for this study. Two survey forms, one for each parent, were sent home with each child. The parents were
asked to respond confidentially, and separately, to the survey and return it in a stamped, self-addressed envelope. The results of the surveys were then analyzed with the child's total reading score from the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills. The data for Hypotheses 1 through 9 were analyzed using an analysis of variance. All other data were treated by the use of a Chi Square Analysis. In each instance the level of significance necessary to reject a hypothesis was set at the .05 level.

Null Hypothesis 1 was not rejected. No significant differences were indicated between the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents claimed to set time aside during the day for their own reading and the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents claimed not to set time aside during the day for their own reading.

Null Hypothesis 2 was not rejected. The reading scores of first-grade children in this study whose parents claimed to possess a library card were not demonstrated to be significantly different from the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents claimed they did not have a library card.

Null Hypothesis 3 was not rejected. No significant differences appear to exist between the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents claim to afford them more of an opportunity to observe parental
Null Hypothesis 4 was not rejected. There was no significant differences discovered in the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents reported that the child was afforded an opportunity to hear a discussion of things read by their parents and the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents reported that the child was not afforded an opportunity to hear a discussion of things read by their parents.

Null Hypothesis 5 was not rejected. No significant differences were found between the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents claim to discuss what they have read directly with their child and the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents claim not to discuss what they have read directly with their child.

Null Hypothesis 6 was not rejected. No significant differences were reported between the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents read things they enjoyed aloud to their child and the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents did not read things they enjoyed aloud to their child.

Null Hypothesis 7 was rejected. A significant difference was discovered at the .05 level of significance
between the reading scores of first-grade children who reportedly asked their parents to read to them and the reading scores of first-grade children who reportedly did not ask their parents to read to them.

Null Hypothesis 8 was rejected. A significant difference was found to exist between the reading scores of first-grade children who claimed to have library cards and the reading scores of first-grade children who did not claim to have library cards.

Null Hypothesis 9 was not rejected. The reading scores of first-grade children who reportedly read a portion of the newspaper were not found to be significantly different from the reading scores of first-grade children who reportedly did not read the paper.

Null Hypothesis 10 was not rejected. The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children whose parents rated themselves as reading less than an average amount, an average amount or more than an average amount did not differ significantly from chance.

Null Hypothesis 11 was not rejected. The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children in this study and the claimed duration of parental reading did not differ significantly from chance.

Null Hypothesis 12 was not rejected. The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the claimed library card usage by the child did not
differ significantly from chance.

Null Hypothesis 13 was not rejected. The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the number of magazines subscribed to or purchased regularly by the parents did not differ significantly from chance.

Null Hypothesis 14 was not rejected. The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the reported subscription to a newspaper by the parents on a daily, weekly, other or never basis did not differ significantly from chance.

Null Hypothesis 15 was not rejected. The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the number of books in the child's home did not differ significantly from chance.

Null Hypothesis 16 was not rejected. The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the number of magazines subscribed to by the child did not differ significantly from chance.

Null Hypothesis 17 was not rejected. The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the claimed number of books owned personally by the child did not differ significantly from chance.

Null Hypothesis 18 was not rejected. The distribution of reading scores of first-grade children and the frequency of library card usage by their parents did
not differ significantly from chance.

**Null Hypothesis 19** was not rejected. The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the reported enjoyment of reading by the parents did not differ significantly from chance.

**Null Hypothesis 20** was rejected. The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and their enjoyment of reading as rated by their parents did differ from chance.

**Null Hypothesis 21** was not rejected. The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and the family socio-economic status did not differ significantly from chance.

**Null Hypothesis 22** was rejected. The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade girls were found to differ from the distribution of the reading scores of first-grade boys.

**Null Hypothesis 23** was not rejected. The distribution of the reading scores of first-grade children and their age did not differ significantly from chance.

**Conclusions**

The findings of this study indicate that there may be some types of interaction between the reading scores of a first-grade child and his home environment.

First-grade children who reportedly asked their
parents to read to them had a significantly higher reading score than first-grade children who reportedly did not ask their parents to read to them. Success in reading in the classroom could prompt children to ask their parents to read to them. Lack of success with reading or little success may deter children from asking to be read to. Pleasurable experiences are usually repeated whereas non-pleasurable experiences are not repeated willingly.

First-grade children who had library cards had significantly higher reading scores than first-grade children who did not have library cards. The possession of a library card could prompt the child to read more and thus practice reading, thereby increasing his/her reading skills. The opposite could also be true. Those children who are skilled at reading may possess a library card so that they can read more.

The concept of reading enjoyment, as rated by the parents, seemed to indicate that the more the parent thought that the child enjoyed reading, the higher the child's reading scores. Success in reading could increase reading enjoyment and could be related to higher reading scores.

In this study, female first-grade children had significantly higher reading scores than male first-grade children. This confirms already well known findings concerning the reading achievement of male and female students.
in the early grades.

Many parental reading behaviors explored by this study appeared to have little relationship to the reading scores of first-grade children. Among these were: frequency and duration of parental reading, discussion of what parents read in front of and with the child, parental possession of a library card and parental use of a library card, observation by child of parental reading, number of magazine and newspaper subscriptions, number of books in the home, number of books owned by child, enjoyment of reading by parents, socio-economic status of family, and age of child.

Non-significant results on these items may have been due to the following:

1. Children were at the conclusion of their first-grade year and the influence of the school may have begun to override the influence of the home.

2. Parents may have responded to the questionnaire as they assumed the researcher wished them to respond.

3. The items on the questionnaire may have been worded in such a way as to imply that a "correct" or biased answer was sought.

Recommendations for Further Research

In view of the findings of this study, the
following areas are recommended for further research:

First, a different testing device could be used in place of the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills. Perhaps a test which deals only with the different components of reading such as comprehension, word analysis, etc. Exploring each component of reading in relation to parent behaviors may indicate that certain behaviors affect specific aspects of a child's reading.

Second, a test could be used which is administered individually rather than in a group situation. Some children do not do well on group tests and may score higher on a one-to-one test.

Third, different areas of the home reading environment could be explored, such as the implications of the parent's early reading history on the child's reading performance.

Fourth, a home interview could be used in place of a questionnaire. This may give researchers more insight into the possible reasons behind parental answers.

Fifth, a larger sampling of subjects could alter research results.

Sixth, a longitudinal study of reading habits of children and their parents could be started while the children were still in pre-school. Certain parental reading habits may have more effect on the younger child as opposed to the child exposed to reading instruction in
school.

Seventh, a different socio-economic community could be used to ascertain if differing results could be obtained.
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APPENDIX A

READING SURVEY
Reading Survey

Background Data:

My child is a:

[ ] boy
[ ] girl

Person responding on this survey form is:

[ ] Female
[ ] Male

Questionnaire:

1. If the average reader is someone who reads the newspaper, perhaps a magazine and an occasional book, how would you rate your reading habits?

[ ] read less than average
[ ] read average amount
[ ] read more than average

2. Do you set time aside during the day for your own reading?

[ ] yes  [ ] no

3. About how much time in minutes do you spend reading each day?


4. Do you have a library card?

[ ] yes  [ ] no
5. Do you use your library card?
   ________ one or more times a week
   ________ one or two times a month
   ________ less than once a month
   ________ not at all or don't have one

6. Do you read in the presence of your child?
   ________ yes
   ________ no

7. Do you discuss things you have read with others while your child is present?
   ________ yes
   ________ no

8. Do you discuss things you have read with your child directly?
   ________ yes
   ________ no

9. Do you read things you enjoy to your child aloud?
   ________ yes
   ________ no

10. Does your child ask you to read to him/her?
    ________ yes
       ________ no

11. Does your child have a library card?
    ________ yes
       ________ no
12. Does your child use his/her library card?
   _______ weekly
   _______ monthly
   _______ once or twice a month

13. How many magazines do you subscribe to or purchase regularly?

14. Do you subscribe to or buy a newspaper?
   _______ daily
   _______ weekly
   _______ other
   _______ never

15. About how many books do you have in your home?

16. Does your child regularly subscribe to or purchase magazines?
   _______ yes  _______ no

17. How many magazine subscriptions does your child have?

18. About how many books does your child own personally?

19. Does your child ever read any portion of the newspaper?
   _______ yes  _______ no
20. What parts of the paper does your child read?
____ comics  ____ sports
____ other  ____ none

21. Do you enjoy reading? Circle a number on the scale.

Very Much
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

22. Do you think your child enjoys reading?

Circle a number on the scale.

Very Much
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
APPENDIX B

PARENT LETTER AND STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY
Dear Parents:

As a teacher of primary age children here in Simi Valley, I have told parents many times it is very important for a child to see his parents reading. I became curious about whether or not this statement was totally correct. I decided to find out if parental reading did have an influence on the reading scores of their child and to attempt to discover what other things parents do at home that may influence their children to become better readers. I therefore chose this area of research as the topic of my Master's Degree Thesis.

Would you please take just a few moments to answer the enclosed questionnaire? There is one for both fathers and mothers to respond to. Please don't discuss your answers with each other until after you have filled out the questionnaire. Please place both questionnaires in the enclosed stamped envelope and mail them to me by March 25, 1977.

Thank you very much for your help with my Thesis. Although responding is optional, it is only through research and questioning that teachers and parents together
can build quality education for children.
Sincerely,

Beverley A. Radloff
STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

Please note that all results of this research will be held in the strictest confidence - neither names of children, schools, or school districts will be included in reporting the results of this study. The survey number will be utilized instead of the child's name in the computer processing of this data.