

**Brief Report**  
**Every Child Ready to Read Family Workshops**  
**Analysis of Longitudinal Data: Fall 2008 to Fall 2010**

**Submitted by**  
**Roger A. Stewart, Ph.D.**  
[rstewar@boisestate.edu](mailto:rstewar@boisestate.edu)

**September 8, 2011**

**Running Head:** Brief Report ECRTR Family Workshops Longitudinal Data

## Introduction

The purpose of this brief report is to highlight any significant changes or trends in the evaluation data collected from the Every Child Ready to Read Family Workshop program (ECRTR). Primarily the parent/caregiver surveys administered at the conclusion of the six workshop series are the focus of this report. Key tables are provided showing results from two years of program implementation. These results are discussed and recommendations are provided.

## Results

Table 1 presents total attendance statistics (adults and children) for all six workshops by season and year. These statistics are from the final reports the participating libraries submitted after the conclusion of their workshops.

Table 1: Total Attendance for All Six Workshops: Adults and Children

<b>Fall 2008 (n=19)</b>	<b>Spring 2009 (n=20)</b>	<b>Fall 2009 (n=12)</b>	<b>Spring 2010 (n=18)</b>	<b>Fall 2010 (n=17)</b>
5,041	4,718	2,838	7,819	3,926

A quick example will assure that Table 1 is interpreted correctly. During fall 2008 there were 19 libraries (i.e., n=19) that provided ECRTR Family Workshops. A total of 5,041 adults and children attended the workshops provided by these 19 libraries. The other columns in the table are interpreted the same way. It can be seen that after the first year of implementation, that is fall 2008 and spring 2009, both the number of participating libraries and the total attendance at the workshops varied. During fall 2009 only 12 libraries participated and attendance dropped to 2,838. The following spring (i.e., spring 2010), the number of participating libraries went back up to 18 and a large number of adults and children attended. Fall 2010 the number of participating libraries held mostly steady at 17 but attendance dropped back to 3,926. The ICFL may want to discuss the variability in these statistics and decide if library participation rates and attendance are within their targeted ranges.

Since surveys are used to ascertain the impact on participants of the ECRTR Family Workshops, response rates are very important. Large numbers of surveys need to be consistently collected from participants so that the results have a high probability of being representative of all of the parents and caregivers who attend ECRTR Family Workshops. Table 2 presents estimated response rates across the years and seasons that data has been collected.

Table 2: Parent/Caregiver Survey Response Rates by Season and Year

<b>Statistic</b>	<b>Fall 2008 (n=19)</b>	<b>Spring 2009 (n=20)</b>	<b>Fall 2009 (n=12)</b>	<b>Spring 2010 (n=18)</b>	<b>Fall 2010 (n=17)</b>
Total Number of Adults	1944	1880	1107	3181	1556
Average Number of	324.0	313.3	184.5	530.2	259.3

Adults per Session					
Surveys Returned	237	297	147	299	134
Estimated Response Percentage	73.1	94.8	79.7	56.4	51.7

The last row in Table 2 provides the response percentages. The number of adults who attended each of the six workshops varied over time so it was impossible to get an exact number of adults who could have completed surveys. Thus the average number of adults attending a workshop was used in the calculation. The last row shows a quite variable rate of response. The ICFL may want to discuss this variability to ascertain why spring 2009 had such a high response rate and then the rate has dropped considerably since to a level that is probably in need of attention. Response rates above 75% are ideal and when rates drop below this the likelihood increases that respondents are not representative of all the participants.

The primary purpose of the ECRTR Family Workshops is to influence parent and caregiver behaviors. Table 3 shows the impact on key early literacy behaviors over time.

Table 3: Adult Early Literacy Behavior Changes: Percent of Yes Responses

<i>As a result of attending these family workshops, I .....</i>	<b>Fall 2008</b>	<b>Spr 2009</b>	<b>Fall 2009</b>	<b>Spr 2010</b>	<b>Fall 2010</b>
	<b>(n=19)*</b>	<b>(n=20)</b>	<b>(n=12)</b>	<b>(n=18)</b>	<b>(n=17)</b>
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>a.</b> spend more time reading with my child/children.	86.9** (236)	91.3 (289)	93.1 (145)	87.9 (298)	88.5 (131)
<b>b.</b> spend more time talking with my child/children about the books I read to them.	89.0 (237)	95.6 (293)	95.2 (145)	96.3 (299)	95.5 (132)
<b>c.</b> spend more time singing with my child/children.	74.7 (237)	79.7 (286)	77.6 (143)	80.5 (297)	78.5 (130)
<b>d.</b> spend more time playing rhyming games with my child/children.	74.6 (236)	86.2 (290)	78.6 (140)	88.3 (298)	85.1 (134)
<b>e.</b> am more likely to use the library to check out books.	85.8 (239)	89.1 (294)	97.2 (145)	89.3 (298)	86.9 (130)
<b>f.</b> am more likely to attend programs at the library.	92.4 (236)	95.3 (297)	98.0 (147)	96.3 (298)	94.8 (134)
<b>g.</b> am more aware of good books to share with my child/children.	93.2 (236)	96.6 (294)	95.8 (143)	98.3 (297)	96.2 (133)
<b>NEW h.</b> am more knowledgeable about the six early literacy skills.					100.0 (108)
<i>If you <u>only</u> have a child/children age 0-2, please skip to question #4 below.</i>					
<b>OLD h.</b> am more likely to ask my child/children questions that will prompt a retelling of a story.	94.0 (183)	93.4 (244)	95.1 (122)	96.2 (236)	97.1 (102)
<b>i.</b> spend more time “playing” with letters with my child/children.	94.8 (193)	91.0 (245)	91.6 (131)	92.4 (251)	94.6 (111)
<b>j.</b> show my child/children the print in signs.	84.3 (191)	86.8 (243)	80.6 (129)	91.1 (248)	89.2 (111)

\* n is the number of libraries that provided workshops.

\*\* Percent of respondents who marked Yes. Underneath this in ( ) is the total number of respondents for this particular question. This number includes all possible responses, not just the Yes responses.

An example will assure that the table is interpreted correctly. In row a under the column labeled Fall 2008, 86.9% of 236 total responses to this question were Yes. The other cells in the table are interpreted the same way.

Scanning across the rows shows the natural variability in the statistics. Take for example row a, during fall 2008, 86.9% of respondents marked Yes. This proportion increased to 93.1% in fall 2009 and then dropped to 88.5% fall 2010. This variability underscores the importance of having at least five or more data points before deriving a trend. Based on this criterion, only tentative trends are detectable at this time. Table 4 lists the items in Table 3 along with brief statements about trends.

Table 4: Trends in Adult Early Literacy Behavior Changes

<i>As a result of attending these family workshops, I .....</i>	<b>Trends</b>
a. spend more time reading with my child/children.	<b>Trend:</b> Side-ways trend Note: It appears that the percentage responding Yes hovers in the high 80's to low 90's. Because of these high percentages there is probably little room for growth because of ceiling effects operating.
b. spend more time talking with my child/children about the books I read to them.	<b>Trend:</b> Possible increase in Yes responses Note: The percentage of Yes responses appears to be holding in the mid 90's after having started fall 2008 at 89.0%. But it is still possible for this statistic to dip below 90% because of the previously discussed variability in scores. If this occurs, then whether or not the percentage has actually increased over time is questionable. Because of the high percentage of Yes responses ceiling effects are probably operating. Thus consistently pushing the percentage higher is not likely.
c. spend more time singing with my child/children.	<b>Trend:</b> Possible increase in Yes responses Note: The percentage of Yes responses appears to be holding in the upper 70's after having started fall 2008 at 74.7%. But it is still possible for this statistic to dip below 75% because of the previously discussed variability in scores. If this occurs, then whether or not the percentage has actually increased over time is questionable. There is substantial room for growth since ceiling effects are probably minimal in these ranges.
d. spend more time playing rhyming games with my child/children.	<b>Trend:</b> Possible increase in Yes responses Note: With one exception, the percentage of Yes responses appears to be holding in the mid 80's after having started fall 2008 at 74.6%. But it is still possible for this statistic to dip below 80% because of the previously discussed variability in scores. If this occurs, then the increase would probably hold but its magnitude would be less. There remains room for growth.
e. am more likely to use the library to check out books.	<b>Trend:</b> Side-ways trend Note: It appears that the percentage responding Yes hovers in the mid to high 80's. There is limited room for growth since the statistics could probably push

	consistently into the 90's.
<b>f.</b> am more likely to attend programs at the library.	<b>Trend:</b> Side-ways trend Note: It appears that the percentage responding Yes hovers in the 90's. This is such a high percentage that ceiling effects are probably operating and thus pushing the percentage higher is not likely.
<b>g.</b> am more aware of good books to share with my child/children.	<b>Trend:</b> Side-ways trend Note: It appears that the percentage responding Yes hovers in the 90's. This is such a high percentage that ceiling effects are probably operating and thus pushing the percentage higher is not likely.
<b>NEW h.</b> am more knowledgeable about the six early literacy skills.	No trend data available because this is a new question.
<i>If you <u>only</u> have a child/children age 0-2, please skip to question #4 below.</i> <b>OLD h.</b> am more likely to ask my child/children questions that will prompt a retelling of a story.	
<b>i.</b> spend more time "playing" with letters with my child/children.	<b>Trend:</b> Side-ways trend Note: It appears that the percentage responding Yes hovers in the low to mid 90's. This is such a high percentage that ceiling effects are probably operating and thus pushing the percentage higher is not likely.
<b>j.</b> show my child/children the print in signs.	<b>Trend:</b> Side-ways trend Note: It appears that the percentage responding Yes hovers in the 80's with quite a degree of variability. There is room for growth since ceiling effects are probably not overly strong in this range.

Overall, results are quite positive regarding changes in parent/caregiver behaviors. Substantial percentages of respondents report changing their behavior as a consequence of attending the workshops and these percentages appear to be relatively stable over time. Some items do continue to have room for growth but others have such high percentages of Yes responses that pushing them consistently higher is unlikely. The ICFL specifically targeted items c and d in Table 3 and the efforts appear to have been beneficial, however, there remains room for growth.

Table 5 provides longitudinal data on how useful parent/caregivers found the information provided at the workshops.

Table 5: Usefulness of Information: Percent of Very Useful Responses

Please rate the following information provided at the family workshops for usefulness:	Fall 2008 (n=19)*	Spr 2009 (n=20)	Fall 2009 (n=12)	Spr 2010 (n=18)	Fall 2010 (n=17)
	VU	VU	VU	VU	VU
<b>a.</b> Learning about great books for my child/children.	77.8** (221)	81.0 (290)	85.3 (143)	81.8 (292)	80.9 (131)
<b>b.</b> Learning things I can do at home to help my child/children get ready to read.	79.6 (221)	83.4 (290)	86.1 (144)	84.5 (291)	86.3 (131)
<b>c.</b> Learning rhymes and songs that will help my child develop early literacy skills.	70.6 (221)	77.5 (289)	83.2 (143)	77.7 (291)	71.0 (131)
<b>d.</b> Learning about library resources I can use with my child/children.	64.1 (220)	73.8 (290)	75.7 (144)	70.9 (289)	68.7 (131)
<b>e.</b> The free books provided.	91.0	92.4	94.4	89.4	95.4

	(221)	(290)	(143)	(292)	(131)
f. The other take home materials provided.	80.0 (220)	81.2 (288)	84.7 (144)	78.9 (289)	81.3 (128)
g. Please list other information provided at the workshop(s) and rate it for usefulness:	100 (41)	93.8 (65)	94.6 (56)	89.0 (100)	98.0 (49)

\* n is the number of libraries that provided workshops.

\*\* Percent of respondents who marked Very Useful. Underneath this in ( ) is the total number of responses for this particular question. This number includes all possible responses, not just the Very Useful responses.

An example will assure that the table is interpreted correctly. In row a under the column labeled Fall 2008, 77.8% of 221 total respondents to this question marked Very Useful. The other cells in the table are interpreted the same way.

Scanning across the rows shows the natural variability in the statistics. Take for example row a, during fall 2008, 77.8% of respondents marked Very Useful. This proportion increased to a high of 85.3% in fall 2009 and then dropped to 80.9% by fall 2010. This variability underscores the importance of having at least five or more data points before deriving a trend. Based on this criterion, only tentative trends are detectable at this time. Table 6 lists the items in Table 5 along with brief statement about trends.

Table 6: Trends in Usefulness of Information

Please rate the following information provided at the family workshops for usefulness:	Trends
a. Learning about great books for my child/children.	<b>Trend:</b> Possible increase in Very Useful responses. Note: The percentage of Very Useful responses appears to be holding in the low to mid 80's after having started fall 2008 at 77.8%. But it is still possible for this statistic to dip below 80% because of the previously discussed variability in scores. If this occurs, then the increase would be questionable. There remains room for growth.
b. Learning things I can do at home to help my child/children get ready to read.	<b>Trend:</b> Possible increase in Very Useful responses. Note: The percentage of Very Useful responses appears to be holding in the mid 80's after having started fall 2008 at 79.6%. But it is still possible, but not likely, for this statistic to dip below 80% because of the previously discussed variability in scores. If this occurs, then the increase would be questionable. There remains room for growth.
c. Learning rhymes and songs that will help my child develop early literacy skills.	<b>Trend:</b> Side-ways trend Note: The percentage of Very Useful responses appears to be holding in the 70's. The pattern reveals a high degree of variability in the data and thus there is neither clear increase nor decrease detectable. There is substantial room for growth since ceiling effects are probably minimal in this range.
d. Learning about library resources I can use with my child/children.	<b>Trend:</b> Possible increase in Very Useful responses. Note: With one exception, the percentage of Very Useful responses appears to be holding in the low to

	mid 70's after having started fall 2008 at 64.1%. But the data shows it is still possible for this statistic to dip below 70% because of the previously discussed variability in scores. If this occurs, then the increase would probably hold but its magnitude would be less. There remains room for growth.
e. The free books provided.	<b>Trend:</b> Side-ways trend Note: It appears that the percentage responding Very Useful hovers in the very high 80's to mid 90's. There is very little room for growth since ceiling effects are probably pronounced at this level.
f. The other take home materials provided.	<b>Trend:</b> Side-ways trend Note: It appears that the percentage responding Very Useful hovers in the high 70's to low 80's. There is substantial room for growth at these levels.

Except for item e, “The free books provided,” all of the items in this series have room for growth. The ICFL may want to review these items and discuss what might be done within the workshop structure, the workshop materials, and the presenter training to increase these percentages, if it is deemed important to do so.

Table 7 provides longitudinal data showing how parents and caregivers rated the workshops and presenters for overall quality.

Table 7: Overall Quality of Workshops and Presenter(s): Percent of Very Satisfied Responses

Please rate the following aspects of the workshop for satisfaction:	Fall 2008 (n=19)*	Spr 2009 (n=20)	Fall 2009 (n=12)	Spr 2010 (n=18)	Fall 2010 (n=17)
	VS	VS	VS	VS	VS
a. Overall quality of the workshops.	87.7** (220)	94.5 (289)	93.6 (141)	93.8 (290)	91.6 (131)
b. Overall quality of the presenter.	92.7 (220)	96.9 (289)	93.6 (141)	97.6 (288)	93.8 (130)

\* n is the number of libraries that provided workshops.

\*\* Percent of respondents who marked Very Satisfied. Underneath this in ( ) is the total number of responses for this particular question. This number includes all possible responses, not just the Very Satisfied responses.

An example will assure that the table is interpreted correctly. In row a under the column labeled Fall 2008, 87.7% of 220 total respondents to this question marked Very Satisfied. The other cells in the table are interpreted the same way.

It is a credit to the presenters and the ICFL that these two important questions are so consistently rated at the top of the scale by large percentages of respondents. There is little if any room for growth because of potential ceiling effects. But these items should continue to be monitored since a drop in the percentages might signal a decrease in parent/caregiver satisfaction.

Table 8 provides longitudinal data on the number of respondents who received a library card as a result of attending the workshops, already had a library card, or did not receive one during the workshop series.

Table 8: Frequency of Library Card Status of Respondents

<b>Statement About Library Card</b>	<b>Fall 2008 (n=19)</b>	<b>Spring 2009 (n=20)</b>	<b>Fall 2009 (n=12)</b>	<b>Spring 2010 (n=18)</b>	<b>Fall 2010 (n=17)</b>
1. I received a library card as a result of attending this program.	27	37	15	33	10
2. I already had a library card before attending this program.	182	244	120	239	116
3. I did not get a library card.	10	13	7	13	5

An example will assure that the table is interpreted correctly. Under the column labeled Fall 2008, 27 respondents marked that they received a library card as a results of attending the workshops, 182 respondents marked that they already had a library card before attending the program, and ten marked that they did not get a library card.

The large number of respondents who already had a library card before attending the workshops remains quite consistent across all of the years and seasons. This most likely shows that most attendees are already library users. This is fine, but a goal that the ICFL has set for the ECRTR Family Workshops is for the program to be successful at reaching out to underserved populations of potential library patrons. Thus, this goal may or may not have been met. The number of participants who received a library card as a result of attending the program remains quite consistent over time relative to the total number of respondents to this question. The same holds for the number of respondents who did not get a library card.

Table 9 provides longitudinal information about where parents and caregivers heard about the ECRTR Family Workshops. This information is important because of the above mentioned goal of the workshops to draw in substantial numbers of parents and caregivers who are not regular users of the library.

Table 9: Information Sources for Hearing About Workshops: Percentages and Frequencies by Category

<b>Information Source</b>	<b>Fall 2008 (n=240)*</b>	<b>Spring 2009 (n=303)</b>	<b>Fall 2009 (n=161)</b>	<b>Spring 2010 (n=441)</b>	<b>Fall 2010 (n=139)</b>
1. At library	49.6** (119)	47.5 (144)	49.7 (80)	36.5 (161)	64.7 (90)
2. Word-of-mouth	26.2 (63)	27.4 (83)	29.8 (48)	17.7 (78)	21.6 (30)
3. Daycare/Preschool	5.0 (12)	12.2 (37)	7.5 (12)	4.5 (20)	5.8 (8)
4. Public school	13.8 (33)	10.2 (31)	5.0 (8)	28.1 (124)	2.2 (3)
5. Radio/TV	0	0	0	.2 (1)	0
6. Other	9.2 (22)	14.9 (45)	8.1 (13)	12.9 (57)	5.8 (8)

\* n is the total number of respondents to this question.

\*\* The top number is the percentage of respondents marking this information source.

The number below in ( ) is the number of respondents who marked this information source.

An example will assure proper interpretation of Table 9. The cell at the intersection of row 1 and the column labeled Fall 2008 shows that 49.6% of a total of 240 respondents to this question marked “At library.” This equates to 119 respondents marking “At library.” All the other cells in Table 9 are interpreted the same way.

“At library” and “Word-of-mouth” remain the most common sources of information about the workshops. About half of all respondents mark “At library” and about a quarter of all respondents mark “Word-of-Mouth. These are fine modes of information dissemination but if the goal of attracting non-library users is to be achieved, a greater number of respondents should probably be checking information sources more reflective of active library outreach activities, such as Daycare/Preschool, Public school, Radio/TV, and Other. The ICFL may want to discuss additional ways to provide incentives to libraries to reach out to non-library users.

### **Summary and Recommendations**

The longitudinal data shows that the ECRTR Family Workshops are highly regarded by parent and caregiver participants. This high regard is consistent across multiple years of program implementation. Although there remains room for growth on some of the survey items, no item has what would be considered a low rating. Indeed, all items have quite positive response profiles, and importantly, there are a number of items where further growth is not likely since participants’ ratings on these particular items are so consistently high. For the ICFL, participating libraries, and workshop presenters, this is a wonderful position to be in. The data shows that a strong foundation of consistently high performance has been established and maintained while also revealing specific areas of strength and areas where additional improvements are possible. Following are specific recommendations derived from the longitudinal data analyses:

- The ICFL may want to discuss the variability in library participation and adult/child attendance statistics and decide if these are within their targeted ranges.
- Parent/caregiver survey response rates show variability over time. Furthermore, overall response rates have fallen during the past two years. The ICFL may want to discuss these issues since the response rate has dropped to a level that is probably in need of attention.
- When parent/caregivers were asked to rate the usefulness of information received at the workshops, except for item e “The free books provided,” the items in this series manifest at least some room for growth. The ICFL may want to review these items and discuss what might be done within the workshop structure, the workshop materials, and the presenter training to increase these percentages, if it is deemed important to do so.

- Continued monitoring of participants' high levels of satisfaction with the workshops and the presenters is important since a drop in the statistics might signal a decrease in parent/caregiver satisfaction.
- Most ECRTR Family Workshop participants are probably current library users. The ICFL should explore additional incentive structures and support structures to help libraries do more systematic and effective outreach to underserved populations of potential library patrons. An important outcome of this work should be a larger number of Family Workshop participants from underserved populations.