



**GETTING A JUMPSTART ON LITERACY:
A PILOT EVALUATION OF THE
ONE BOOK, EVERY YOUNG CHILD PROGRAM**

A report prepared for the
Office of Commonwealth Libraries
by the
Family and Children's Policy Collaborative

Michelle Harmon
Marsha Weinraub, Ph.D.

December 2006

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

“Getting a Jumpstart on Literacy” represents research conducted by the Family and Children’s Policy Collaborative at Temple University at the request of the Office of Commonwealth Libraries. We thank the Office of Commonwealth Libraries for the opportunity to conduct this pilot evaluation of the One Book, Every Young Child program.

We thank Dr. Anne Shlay for her advice and consultation during the early stages of the project. We thank Melissa Correa, Nicole Hamilton, and Sharlene Hubert, and Dareese Tolson for their help collecting, managing and entering data. And we especially thank all the child care providers, librarians, museum staff and parents who gave of their time so generously to complete our questionnaires.

Family and Children’s Policy Collaborative (FCPC) is a collaboration between Marsha Weinraub, Developmental Psychologist and Anne Shlay, Urban Sociologist and their research teams at Temple University to provide research on public policy issues related to children and their families. Formed in 1996, FCPC conducts evaluations of statewide, regional, and neighborhood-based programs. Many evaluations have centered on programs designed to improve the quality of child care in low and moderate income communities. Additionally, FCPC has investigated the effects of welfare reform and child care subsidies on low-income families. Findings from the child care research conducted by the FCPC have been presented at local, regional and national conferences. Reports have been published in prestigious academic journals.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the results of the pilot evaluation of the first year of the One Book, Every Young Child program which the Family and Children's Policy Collaborative at Temple University conducted at the request of the Pennsylvania Office of Commonwealth Libraries.

In April 2006, the Office of Commonwealth Libraries launched the One Book, Every Young Child program in an effort to improve the literacy skills of preschool aged children by modeling interactive activities centered on story book reading. In this pilot evaluation we evaluated three components of the program: the author visits, book mailers, and the website. In addition, we explored the parent recognition of *Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse (IMOM)* by Lindsay Barrett George (2004), and the literacy activities of a sample of low income families.

To promote the One Book program, Lindsay Barrett George, author of *IMOM*, toured the Commonwealth, reading from her book and modeling interactive play activities with adults and children. To document the attendance and the participation rates at the author's visits, we asked one representative at each site of Lindsay Barrett George's One Book promotional tour to complete and Author Visit Form. All sites reported an excellent turnout for Ms. George's visit. Over 8,000 adults and 6,000 children were reported to be in attendance at all sites combined. At 92% of her site visits, reading from the *Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse* book took place and 84% of the time an orchestrated a hands-on activity was available for the children in attendance. One teacher mentioned using the techniques they learned about with the children in their care.

The Commonwealth mailed over 9,000 free copies of Lindsay Barrett George's Book, *IMOM* to licensed child care centers and registered family day care homes and group day care homes in Pennsylvania. We designed a Book Mailer Questionnaire that was mailed out following the book mailing. The questionnaires yielded a relatively low response rate (17%); with 1,553 questionnaires completed and returned. The responses were favorable of the One Book program. Most early childhood educators who received the book said they read it and took part in some interactive activity regarding the book with children in their care. For the most part, early childhood educators reported reading to children, many as a daily experience. Most of the educators also reported structuring activities for the children that centered on a story book.

The Commonwealth also created a website, paonebook.org, as an additional online resource where parents and early childhood education professionals could learn more about the One Book program, access Ms. George's visit itinerary, and download materials that could be used to provide an interactive experience based on the *IMOM* book. The site seemed to get off to somewhat of a slow start. Many of the web pages were not fully functional at the start of the program and a lot of the material intended for downloading was not readily available when visitors logged onto the site early in April. As more files became available, satisfaction with the site increased. However the momentum of visitors touring the site, as evidenced by the reduction of hits and downloaded materials, waned in the months immediately following the first month of the program. Due to the low response rate, the feedback survey we designed did not yield

any significant data. This response rate was possibly due to its placement within the larger, more prominent feedback page or by the very fact that two feedback options were available to the visitor.

Recognition of the selected book and literacy activities was assessed for a sample of low-income families in our Laboratory on Temple University's main campus. To assess parents' recognition of *Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse*, we displayed it along with two other books (*Muncha! Muncha! Muncha!* by Candace Flemming and *Three Billy Goats Gruff* by Paul Galdone) that were colorful and roughly the same size as the *IMOM* book. Parents were directed to view the books on display. Very few parents recognized the selected book for the program, *Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse*. When given the opportunity to identify three books on display in the room, most instantly recognized *Three Billy Goats Gruff*. It is not clear, however, whether the parents recognized this particular book by Paul Galdone or if they recognized the classic story title. The vast majority of parents reported reading to their child on a daily basis and more than two-thirds indicated their child had a high interest in books. Many had children story books in the home. Fewer parents reported owned reading material for adults in the household. While most said they had a library card, few actually used it.

In light of these findings we offer the following recommendations for the program and future evaluations:

Program Recommendations

1. The One Book, Every Young Child state-wide program should be continued.
2. Consideration should be made to delay the start of the intervention (and promotion of the intervention) in some districts of the Commonwealth in order for the evaluation to assess the impact of the intervention.
3. Local libraries have great potential for use as an effective statewide delivery system for literacy programming. This kind of a delivery system might be especially useful for literacy interventions targeting low-income communities, those most in need of these services.
4. Prepare the website to be ready to accept visitors at the start of the program. Have all the materials readily available and confirm the links go to the intended files prior to the introduction of the website address.
5. Prepare district libraries for accessing children's story book circulation statistics by implementing a system that will help to account for the One Book program's impact on the local libraries.

Evaluation Recommendations

1. Future evaluations of the One Book Program can be more effective if a Logic Model is introduced prior to the evaluation. What are the goals of the program, how are they to be accomplished, and how will anyone know if these goals are attained? Once this model is clear, then choices concerning evaluation will also be clear.
2. Future evaluations of the One Book program can be more effective when control groups or communities are included as part of the intervention design. To ensure that all libraries and communities receive the program benefits, control group participants can receive the program/intervention after, rather than before, the outcome measurements are complete.
3. Measures of program benefits might also include measurement of the effects of the program in the selected communities on the libraries, parent reports of children's literacy skills, child care teacher reports of children's literacy skills, and reports of child care teacher literacy activities in the classroom.
4. Future evaluations of the One Book promotional author tours that involve modeling interactive activities with children could include a short survey to be completed by audience members immediately following the presentation. Such an evaluation can provide a fount of information regarding the information found most and least useful and the likelihood of conducting similar activities with children in their care.
5. Measures of effects on library involvement could include circulation statistics for children's story books and usage of library resources (e.g., web site and One Book program partners) provided by the One Book program.
6. Book recognition by parents can be an effective measure of the effectiveness of the program. However, the program book needs to be compared with other books similar in shape, size and color, as well as title novelty. Classic childhood stories (such as Three Billy Goats Gruff) can lead to artificial responses of book recognition.
7. Changes in children's literacy interest, motivation and skills could be effectively and efficiently assessed using parent reports.
8. Future evaluations of the One Book program could delve deeper into the *type* of activities early childhood educators are conducting with the children in their care. While most teachers said they already conducted activities related to story books, the type of activities and the extent of the interaction between the children and adults were unknown.
9. Future evaluations of the website should re-consider the placement of the visitor profile survey. An alternative could be for the site to require visitors to sign in

with an email address so a follow-up email survey can be sent to them after they complete the website visit.

10. Confirm mailing addresses of actively operated child care facilities in the Commonwealth prior to a mass mailing. The number of returned unopened Book Mailer Questionnaires (n = 444) cost the Commonwealth about \$700 in unnecessary postage stamps. The initial cost of postage for mailing the books and activity posters plus the expense of printing additional questionnaires could be avoided in the future. It is recommended that a bar coded return mailing label be used for future mail surveys. The bar code allows the post office to bill the client only for the postage actually used.

**GETTING A JUMPSTART ON LITERACY:
A PILOT EVALUATION OF THE
ONE BOOK, EVERY YOUNG CHILD PROGRAM**

Table of Contents

Executive Summary..	i
Introduction.	1
The Importance of Early Literacy Development	1
The One Book, Every Young Child Program.	2
The Pilot Evaluation.	
What is a Pilot Evaluation?	3
Goals of the Pilot Evaluation.	4
Author Visits.	4
Evaluation Procedures.	4
Findings.	5
Book / Activity Poster Mailer.	7
Evaluation Procedures.	7
Respondents.	7
Findings.	9
The Website	11
Findings.	12
Book Mailer Questionnaire Feedback.	12
Deep Matrix LiveStats.	12
Website Survey.	15
Book Recognition and Literacy Activities of Low Income Families.	15
Evaluation Procedures.	16
Respondents	16
Findings.	19
Book Recognition.	19
Literacy Activities.	20
Literacy activities of child care users versus non-child care users	22
Summary and Recommendations.	25
Pilot Evaluation Successes.	25
Pilot Evaluation Problems Encountered.	26
Program Recommendations.	26

Evaluation Recommendations.	27
References.	29
Appendices	
Author Visit Utilization Form.	A
Book Mailer Questionnaire.	B
Website Survey.	C
Parent Literacy Questionnaire.	D

List of Tables

Table 1: Activities during the One Book, Every Young Child Author Visits.	6
Table 2: Characteristics of Facilities Completing the Book Mailer Questionnaire by Child Care Center, Family Day Care Home and Group Family Day Care Home.	8
Table 3: Receipt and Utilization of the <i>Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse (IMOM) Book</i> by Child Care Centers, Family Day Care Homes and Group Family Day Care Homes.	10
Table 4: One Book, Every Young Child Website Activity.	14
Table 5: Demographic and Family Characteristics of the Participants in the Baseline Literacy Component of the One Book Pilot Evaluation.	17
Table 6: Book Recognition.	20
Table 7: Baseline Literacy Activities of Low-Income Families.	21
Table 8: Baseline Literacy Activities of Child Care Users and Non Child Care Users.	23

GETTING A JUMPSTART ON LITERACY: A PILOT EVALUATION OF THE ONE BOOK, EVERY YOUNG CHILD PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

This report represents the results of a pilot evaluation of the first year of the One Book, Every Young Child program which was conducted by the Family and Children's Policy Collaborative at Temple University at the request of the Pennsylvania Department of Education's Office of Commonwealth Libraries.

In the following pages, we first present a brief overview of the importance and benefits of early literacy development, a description of the One Book, Every Young Child program and its significance to the early childhood learning community. We then present the evaluation of the program's outreach through author's visits to area libraries, museums and early childhood workshops, child care facility book mailings and utilization of the One Book, Every Young Child website. We also provide some information concerning the recognition of the One Book, Every Young Child book of choice by a sample of low-income parents and their literacy activities with their children. Next, we summarize the significant successes of the evaluation and the difficulties we encountered. Finally, we conclude with recommendations for future programs and their evaluations.

THE IMPORTANCE OF EARLY LITERACY DEVELOPMENT

Despite the best efforts of parents and teachers, a significant proportion of students fail to achieve success in early literacy at school, with grave consequences for their subsequent educational progress, career opportunities, and life long prospects. In Pennsylvania, more than one third of all fourth grade public school students fail to reach a basic proficiency level in reading (The Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2006).

Reading is one of the single most important learning tools and a key component to succeed in life. While listening to story books being read, children learn phonological and syntactic awareness, vocabulary, the way words are strung together to make sentences, and story comprehension. They learn how to recognize letters, and how to distinguish print from other marks on the page. They learn how to hold a book, how to start at the beginning, and in English, how to read each page from left-to-right and from top-to-bottom to get to the end of the book (Neuman, 1999; Whitehurst & Lonigan, 1998). Recent research reports that reading to very young children on a daily basis is associated with enhanced vocabulary and comprehension as early as at 14 months (Raikes, et al., 2006).

While many parents and early childhood educators read to children on a daily basis, simply reading a book to a child is not enough to foster the long term interest and motivation needed to enhance preschool literacy development. Children learn more when

they are actively involved. Sonnenschein and Munsterman (2002) posit that the “...*interaction* between adults and children while reading is just as important as the frequency with which such readings occur.” Their research showed that children’s interest in reading is sparked by the quality of the reading interaction between adults and children. Children who experienced a more positive reading interaction with adults at the start of kindergarten were more motivated for reading when they were in first grade (Sonnenschein & Munsterman, 2002).

In the late 1990’s, a collaboration of five county library systems and the Free Library of Philadelphia targeting economically disadvantaged children in child care programs. The program, called Books Aloud, provided non profit child care centers five high quality books per child and book cases to display them. They hosted special events such as puppet shows, story tellers and guest speakers and offered training sessions to child care staff on literacy strategies and thematic activities in an attempt to increase childrens’ interest in reading. Susan Neuman evaluated the effects of the program and showed that in addition to the physical environment becoming more literacy enriched, the social environment flourished as well. Teacher-child interactions surrounding literacy activities almost doubled after the intervention. Teachers engaged children in talking about stories, counting, using song books, and provided more one-on-one or small group interactions around books (Neuman, 1999). Teachers’ self reports indicated that teachers seemed to regard story reading no longer as an “isolated activity, but as an interactive event” (Neuman, 1999). Likewise, children in the Books Aloud group, as compared to the children in the control classrooms, spent more time reading on their own, asking to be read to, pretending to read, and asking questions about reading. Flooding the children’s environment with literacy rich activities had clear and positive effects on the children’s interest and motivation to read.

THE ONE BOOK, EVERY YOUNG CHILD PROGRAM

In April 2006 the Office of Commonwealth Libraries launched a new initiative in Pennsylvania called One Book, Every Young Child (One Book). The initiative was a first-time joint effort of Pennsylvania libraries, museums, non-profit organizations and state agencies aimed at raising the awareness of the importance of using interactive methods when reading with young children. Multi-faceted in designed, the program had one goal: to inspire adults to engage preschool-aged children in different activities around story telling that would enhance their comprehension, interest and desire to learn to read. The One Book program was geared to provide resources to all children in the Commonwealth, but focused on children considered to be most at risk. Fundamental to the core of the program was an effort to provide multiple opportunities to assist early childhood educators’ and parents’ in applying interactive methods. Using the ‘one book, one state model,’ the One Book Committee selected the children’s book, *Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse (IMOM)* by PA author and illustrator Lindsay Barrett George, as a vehicle for the program.

The program offered a series of events and opportunities for exposure to the materials aimed at supporting the program. They included:

- ◆ Author visits – Lindsay Barrett George, author of *Inside Mouse, Outsides Mouse*, toured the Commonwealth visiting libraries, museums, and other early childhood venues. During her visits, Ms George read from her book, told the story behind its creation and modeled various interactive activities with children and adults.
- ◆ Book mailings - Copies of the book, *Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse*, were mailed to libraries, licensed child care centers, registered family day care homes, group family day care homes, and Head Start programs. Accompanying the book was a poster that included ideas for activities around the book on the reverse side. The activities were linked to eight areas of the PA Early Learning Standards.
- ◆ Promotional material – Promotional material including press releases, posters, buttons, stickers, flyers, and brochures were given to libraries and museums and put on display at early childhood education workshops and conferences.
- ◆ Traveling trunks - Traveling trunks containing the *IMOM* book and related puppets, toys, games, and for interactive play with children were designed by children’s museums and available at district library centers and museums. Tool kits included in the trunks provided ideas for *IMOM* related activities and resources that could be photocopied for use with children.
- ◆ Readers – Staff from the Department of Public Welfare, Department of Education, Regional Keys and Community Engagement teams visited child care centers and Head Start classrooms to share the book with children throughout the state.
- ◆ Website - A website (paonebook.org) was created as an online resource for parents, early childhood professionals, and library and museum educators.

THE PILOT EVALUATION

WHAT IS A PILOT EVALUATION?

We refer to this evaluation as a pilot evaluation because it’s a prelude to a larger evaluation. The goal of a pilot evaluation is twofold; it allows a researcher to learn about a program itself and the best methods for evaluation. Pilot evaluations are minimal cost to the funder as it’s a short term project. There is no pre-testing and no control group. Pilot evaluations allows researchers the opportunity for trouble shooting key issues in the intervention and future evaluation prospects. Protocol measures are drafted as ‘pilots’ for later changes. Quantitative data is also collected from participants that provide further insight to the workings of the program and evaluation efforts.

GOALS OF THE PILOT EVALUATION

The pilot evaluation of One Book, Every Young Child program was designed to examine the general impact of some of the components with the overall goal of capturing the initial outreach and reception of the program throughout the Commonwealth. The pilot evaluation sought to do this by surveying participation in three of the five components; (1) the author visits, (2) use of the book mailings by child care center staff and family day care providers, and (3) use of the One Book website.

In addition we surveyed of a sampling of low-income families from the Philadelphia area about their recognition of the *Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse* book and the literacy activities that took place with the young children in their home. This opportunity was afforded to us as we were simultaneously running another study with parents of young children who recently left the welfare system. In that study, the parents came into our Laboratory at Temple University; as part of their visit we invited them to take part in the One Book pilot evaluation. Thus allowing us to assess the baseline literacy activities of low-income families, families with children considered to be most at risk.

This report is divided into four sections. In the first section of this report we discuss the Author's visits to libraries and other venues across Pennsylvania, and the extent of their outreach. In the second section we present the outcomes of the outreach to the child care centers by way of the mass mailing of books and activity posters. Third, we present the activity on the paonebook.com website. Finally we describe the baseline literacy activities of a sample of low-income families in the Philadelphia area. Each component is described in turn.

AUTHOR VISITS

Between March 30th and June 14th 2006, Lindsay Barrett George, author of *Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse*, visited various venues to promote the One Book program. During her visits, Ms. George read from her book, talked about its creation and lead group activities surrounding the *IMOM* theme with adults and children in the audience. A dynamic and interesting personality, Ms. George signed books that were given away or sold during the visit. Sites for Ms. George's visits included, but were not limited to libraries, Head Start and child care programs, family literacy programs, museums, and early childhood education conferences.

Evaluation Procedures

To document Ms. George's visits we created the Author Utilization Form. The Author Utilization Form consisted of eleven questions that asked the respondent to provide information about the site and the activities conducted during the author's visit. This information included the name of the site, the type of organization it is, and the county in which it was located. We asked questions concerning the visit, attendance, specific activities conducted by Ms. George during her visit, the number of participants

that took part in a hand-on activity, the length of the visit, and the number of books either sold or given away during the visit. We also requested contact information from the person responsible for completing the form. A copy of the Author Visit Utilization Form can be found in Appendix A.

The Office of Commonwealth Libraries sent one copy of the form to each site Ms. George was to visit. The form included instructions for the person overseeing the visit to mail the completed form to the researchers at Temple University. No compensation was provided for the completed form.

Findings

We received Author Visit Forms from 61 sites representing 73 separate events in 23 counties related to the promotion of the One Book, Every Young Child program.¹ Fifty-three of the visits were children's programs, seven were breakfasts or luncheons and two were at early childhood workshops. Ms. George's presentations lasted anywhere from 40 minutes to three and a half hours; the average visit was a little under an hour and a half.² Seventy-five percent of respondents indicated that Ms. Georges stayed at a site longer than she was scheduled.

Table 1 presents the activities that took place during Ms. George's visits. The total number of adults and children who attended Ms. George's presentations over the course of her tour for the One Book program was 14,257 (8,142 adults, 6,115 children). We estimate that over 4, 800 books were given away or sold during her visits. We cannot give an exact number because many respondents provided only estimates or ranges. Some respondents indicated books were given away, some indicated books were sold and some indicated both took place during the visit. On average, there were 138 adults and 99 children in attendance at any one event. The number of people that took part in these activities ranged from 12 to 600 (M = 113, SD = 234).

During 92% of Ms. George's presentations, she read from the *Inside Mouse*, *Outside Mouse* book. On occasion (10% of the time), she read from other books during her visit. During 77% of the visits, Ms. George signed copies of the *Inside Mouse*, *Outside Mouse* book. Forty-seven percent of the time she hosted a Question & Answer session with audience members. In more than half of her visits (58%), Ms. George informally met with and spoke to those in attendance. At 84% of all site visits, a hands-on activity was available for those in attendance.³

¹ A complete itinerary for Ms. George's visits to promote the One Book Every Young Child program was not available to the researchers at Temple University. Therefore it is not possible to ascertain how many visits and how many sites Ms. George was scheduled to attend. However according to the data available, four sites did not return the Author Visit Form. This included the Children's Museum of Pittsburgh, Hayshire Elementary School, the Scranton Public Library, and the initial One Book Reception.

² Ms. George conducted three separate presentations while visiting one library. Because her length of stay was indicated as a 10 ½ hour visit, we did not include this number in computing our average.

³ Hands on activities included children creating book that Ms. George read back to them, puppets, art activities (drawing, coloring, made mouse ear head bands), interactive maze puzzle, mouse obstacle course, songs, musical instruments, on/over/under games, acting like mice,

Table 1
Activities during the One Book, Every Young Child Author Visits (N = 62)

Variable	% or M (SD)
Reason for visit	
% Children's program	85.5
% Breakfast / luncheon	11.3
% Other	3.2
Type of organization hosting event	
% Library	61.3
% Museum	3.2
% Family Literacy	3.2
% Head Start program	9.7
% Child care facility	4.8
% Early Childhood workshop / conference	3.2
% College	1.6
% Elementary School	8.1
% Other	4.8
Activities during visit	
% Read from <i>IMOM</i> book	91.9
% Read from other children's books	9.7
% Hands-on activity	83.9
% Signed copies of <i>IMOM</i> book	77.4
% Question and Answer session with author	46.8
% Informal meet-and-greet with author	58.1
% Other activities with author ^a	42.6
Average length of visit (minutes)	83.3 (40.6)
% of time author stayed at site longer than expected	75.4
Audience attendance during each visit	
Average number of adults	138.0 (777.4)
Average number of children	98.6 (225.9)
Total number in audience at all events	14,257

^a Other activities included presentations by others (i.e., legislators, elected officials, presidents of boards), puppet shows, use of music and instruments, book making activities, etc.

BOOK / ACTIVITY POSTER MAILER

In April 2006, the Office of Commonwealth Libraries (OCL) mailed 9,384 free copies of the book, *Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse (IMOM)* by Lindsay Barrett George along with a poster to all licensed child care centers and registered family day care homes and group day care homes in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.⁴ Their addresses were obtained from the 2004 Department of Public Welfare list of licensed and registered child care facilities in the Pennsylvania.

Evaluation Procedures

To gauge the receipt of the *IMOM* book and assess utilization, a tri-folded questionnaire mailer was sent to each address listed as book recipients. We designed the Book Mailing Questionnaire; the questionnaire was printed and mailed by the Office of Commonwealth Libraries. Book Mailing Questionnaires were sent out the first week in June 2006. Data from the questionnaires received through September 5, 2006 are reported here.

The Book Mailing Questionnaire consisted of 18 questions and took approximately five minutes to complete. Recipients were first asked to identify whether or not they received the *IMOM* book and activity poster. If they said yes, they were asked to answer the remaining questions including frequency of literacy activities conducted with the children in their care and specific activities conducted that related to the *IMOM* book.

Questions about the child care facility were also asked, including they type of program, the number and age of the children in the group, the county in which the facility resides, whether it is a for-profit or not-for-profit facility, and the number of children at the site receiving a child care subsidy. Child care subsidy receipt is often used as an indicator of the number of children in low income families. As such it helps us estimate the extent to which the One Book program is reaching families considered at risk.

Respondents were asked to refold and seal the completed questionnaire so Temple University's printed return address was on the outside of the form and drop it in the mail. Return postage was provided for the recipient. A copy of the Book Mailer Questionnaire can be found in Appendix B.

Respondents

One thousand five hundred fifty-three (17%) Book Mailer Questionnaires were completed and returned to Temple University; 429 questionnaires were labeled 'return to

⁴ The Office of Commonwealth Libraries (OCL) also distributed the *IMOM* books to Head Start and family literacy programs in Pennsylvania. However they were disseminated through the Head Start/family literacy technical assistant, not directly from the OCL. As such no contact information was available for each Head Start program. Therefore, for purposes of the pilot evaluation, Head Starts were not included in the Book Mailing Questionnaire.

sender' and were returned unopened. Fifteen questionnaires were returned with a note indicating the child care facility was closed.

Table 2 presents the characteristics of child care facilities that completed and returned the Book Mailer Questionnaire. Almost half of the respondents (49%) came from child care centers. Thirty-nine were from family day care homes and 11% were from group family day care homes. Child care center classrooms had an average of 26 children per class; family day care homes averaged six children, and group family day care homes averaged ten children in their group. Seventy-four percent of child care center book recipients taught preschoolers (37 months to entry into first grade). Child care centers reported that 29% of their children received a child care subsidy while family day care homes and group family day care homes reported 29% and 33% of children respectively. Of the child care centers, 52% reported being a not for profit entity.

Table 2
Characteristics of Facilities Completing the Book Mailer Questionnaire by Child Care Center, Family Day Care Home and Group Family Day Care Home

Characteristic	Child Care Center	Family Day Care Home	Group Day Care Home	All
	% or M (SD)	% or M (SD)	% or M (SD)	% or M (SD)
Number of respondents	753	600	161	1553
% of total	48.5	38.6	10.4	100.0
Number of children in care at site	69.2 (57.3)	6.7 (7.7)	14.5 (8.0)	40.4 (57.1)
Average age of children in group				
% Infants (Birth to 12 mos.)	0.1	0.8	0.6	0.5
% Young toddlers (13 – 24 mos.)	2.3	4.1	1.3	2.9
% Older toddlers (25 – 36 mos.)	7.0	4.7	2.5	5.5
% Preschoolers (37 mos. to entry in first grade)	74.1	6.3	11.4	40.8
% All ages served ^a	16.4	84.1	84.2	50.3
Number of children in group	25.8(29.2)	5.7(2.1)	10.9(4.1)	16.9(25.1)
% children receiving a child care subsidy	28.9	28.6	33.3	27.5
% Not-for-profit	51.7	17.9	11.7	35.8
% For Profit	48.3	82.1	88.3	64.2

^a Group designed for Family Day Care Homes and Group Family Day Care Homes.

Findings

Table 3 presents the information concerning receipt and utilization of the *Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse* book. Of the 1,553 respondents, 1,423 (92%) reported receiving the *Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse* book and 1,264 (83%) reported receipt of the activity poster. As a general activity, 98% of child care teachers indicated reading to the children in their care with 86% reporting it as an every day occurrence. Eighty-one percent said they planned story book related activities for the children. Of those who received it, the vast majority of teachers (92%) read the *IMOM* book to the children in their care. When asked about the activities they took part in with the children in their care that were related to the *IMOM* book, 61% said they used ideas from the activity poster, 33% said they visited a library or museum, 7% said they used items from a Traveling Trunk, and 3% attended an *IMOM* book signing engagement with Lindsay Barrett George. Almost half (48%) of the Questionnaire respondents said they shared their copy of the *IMOM* book with another teacher.

Unsolicited commentary was provided on the questionnaires by 58 of the respondents. Most respondents (35) were complimentary and grateful for the opportunity to receive the book and be a part of the program.

“Thank you for the wonderful book and ideas in the poster.” (Family child care provider, Received June 14, 2006)

“My kids really loved the book. Thank you.” (Family child care provider, Received June 15, 2006)

“The children loved the book, and we think this is a wonderful program!” (Child care center teacher, Received June 14, 2006)

“Thank you for the books. [The crafts were] done with the children. They loved it, God Bless!” (Group child care home provider, Received July 7, 2006)

“The children loved the book. It’s their favorite. They pretend when they are inside and outside just like the mice. They use the slide and teeter-totters etc. to crawl over and under” (Family child care provider, Received June 10, 2006)

“Our little children love to have this book read. We spend time outside playing mouse, up-down-over-under-around-through-in-and out. My older children also love this book. We each picked a different page to self draw what we could remember. First I read the book to them showing each page to them. Then I read the book again when someone picked a page they would get a fast look at it. Then they did their best to draw what they remembered. Great job! This book will stay in use. We also received the “Kindergarten Here I Come” activities. I am already using a lot out of this book. In the fall I will give [the activity posters] to the families. But for now a lot of my daily activities come from this book. Thank you.” (Family child care provider, Received June 12, 2006)

Table 3
Receipt and Utilization of the *Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse (IMOM) Book* by Child Care Centers, Family Day Care Homes and Group Family Day Care Homes

	Child Care Center n = 753	Family Day Care Home n = 600	Group Day Care Home n= 161	All N =1,553
Received <i>IMOM</i> book	93.1%	91.0%	91.9%	91.8%
Received Activity Poster	86.2%	77.9%	83.6%	82.6%
Read <i>IMOM</i> to children in care	92.9%	92.1%	92.5%	92.3%
Read other books to children in care	98.8%	98.0%	98.7%	98.0%
Typically plan activities related to books read with children in care	90.5%	69.6%	83.4%	81.3%
Frequency of reading with children				
1 -2 times per month	.5%	1.8%	1.9%	1.3%
1 -3 times per week	3.9%	22.1%	17.0%	12.5%
Every day	95.6%	75.3%	81.1%	86.0%
<i>IMOM</i> related activities conducted				
Used ideas from activity poster	66.9%	52.6%	68.2%	61.4%
Visited One Book website	38.6%	26.2%	31.2%	33.1%
Printed materials from website	25.5%	15.8%	28.6%	22.3%
Attended <i>IMOM</i> book signing alone	2.1%	1.6%	1.9%	2.0%
Attended <i>IMOM</i> book signing with children in care	1.5%	1.1%	1.3%	1.3%
Visited library / museum with children in care	33.4%	31.4%	29.7%	32.5%
Used items from a Traveling Trunk with children in your care	7.4%	5.7%	6.5%	6.8%
Lent <i>IMOM</i> book to other teachers	79.0%	12.2%	28.2%	48.2%

Some family child care providers mentioned making a month long theme out of the book.

“I made the entire month “Mouse Month.” Every child in my program received the book. Thank you for allowing me to participate in such an awesome program.” (Family child care provider, Received June 9, 2006)

“*Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse* will be our theme for September” (Family child care provider, Received June 13, 2006)

“We borrowed extra copies of this book from the public library to use in all our classes.” (Child care center teacher, Received June 8, 2006)

“We sent a copy of the book to our pen pal class in Arizona. [The first graders] loved it.” (Family child care provider, Received June 9, 2006)

On occasion, a small number of Book Mailer Questionnaire respondents (5) were candid in their dislike for the book selected for the program.

“This book is terrible. Next time pick better quality literature and you may have more success. [I might have shared it] if it was a better book, but I did not feel it was worth sharing.” (Child care center teacher, Received June 9, 2006)

“Unfortunately, I honestly didn’t care for the book but thank you.” (Family child care provider, Received June 24, 2006)

“Children prefer a story with a story line.” (Group child care home provider, Received June 23, 2006)

THE WEBSITE

The Commonwealth designed the One Book, Every Young Child website, paonebook.org, as an online resource for early childhood professionals, librarians, museum educators, and parents. It provided a background on the creation of the One Book Every Young Child program, a calendar of events related to the program (specifically, locations, dates and times of Lindsay Barrett George’s visits), and links to resources such as games, songs, crafts, finger play activities, suggested booklists, and other related activities centered around the *Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse* theme. The website also provided an opportunity for visitors to offer feedback to the Commonwealth about the activities and programs they have done with children related to the *IMOM* book.

Within the feedback page was a link to a website survey we designed to ascertain utilization of and satisfaction with the website and collect basic demographic information

about the website visitors. The website survey was available as of April 21, 2006. A copy of the website survey can be found in Appendix C.

Findings

Below we present data from three sources; website feedback received from the Book Mailer Questionnaire, general web site data available from Deep Matrix LiveStats, an online web site analysis center, and the website survey.

Book Mailer Questionnaire Feedback. Four hundred eighty-three (33%) child care providers who completed the Book Mailer Questionnaire reported visiting the One Book web site. Of these, 326 (68%) said they printed materials from the site and 286 (88%) said they actually used the materials they printed with the children in their care. Some care providers who responded early to the Book Mailing Questionnaire offered unsolicited commentary about the difficulties they had with the online resource. Specifically they commented on the site being unfinished and materials not be readily available when they tried to access the links to the activities.

“When we first got this book I went to the web site. There was nothing on it when you clicked on different parts.” (Family Day Care Provider, Received April 2006)

“The website had nothing on it when I first tried. I went back again a week later and still nothing. It seems like [it would be] a good idea if it worked.” (Child Care Center teacher, Received May 2006)

“I tried the webpage and it wouldn’t let me print.” (Child Care Center Teacher, Received June 2006)

“When I clicked on the “Mouse Munchies” link and it was a list of games (not mouse snacks). I eventually found the in another section.” (Child Care Center Teacher, Received June 2006)

More positive feedback was received about the website resource from teachers who accessed the site later in the program.

“Great website, extensive materials & ideas” (Child Care Center Teacher, Received July 2006)

“I used some of the games from the website and the kids loved them. Thanks.” (Child Care Center Teacher, Received August 2006)

Deep Matrix LiveStats. Deep Matrix LiveStats is an online statistics manager that allows web site owners to monitor the activity on their site. Examining the visitation, hits, and download trends, allows the site owner to analyze customer interest. Analyzing the visitation trends can help a site owner determine which links are most and

least popular. Access to the statistics provides an opportunity for the site owner to identify problems and make changes within the site. For example, if the number of hits for a particular file is high, but the number of downloaded material is low, there may be a problem with the file to be downloaded.

Table 4 presents activity on the One Book website for March through August 2006. Over 30,000 visitors toured the One Book website during the specified time period. Almost a quarter ($n = 7,228$, 24%) of all visits to the website took place in April 2006; the month the One Book program was launched. While the average number of visitors to the site in March was 184 per day, visitor numbers spiked to an average of 240 per day in April. A slow decline in the average visit activity per day took place in May, June, July, and August ($M = 163, 152, 124, 124$ respectively).

Not surprisingly, the number of requests for files, or 'hits,' on the website was also highest in April with 236,119 (33%) hits. Hits within the site in March came in a close second with 230,214 (32%). The month of May showed signs of the hits tapering off some with only 102,587 (14%). A dramatic decline in activity took place in June (9%), July (6%) and August (5%).

Almost 26,900 files were successfully downloaded during the specified period of time, with one third (31%) of all materials downloaded in the month of April. Seventy-three files in particular were responsible for these downloads, however in the month of May and August, a more diverse number of files were the source of the downloaded materials. As noted above in the commentaries provided by some visitor who indicated blank pages within the website, perhaps this increase in later months was due to more material becoming available on the website later in the program. The five most requested downloads included activities ($n = 1,773$), calendar of events ($n = 856$), finger play and songs ($n = 572$), crafts ($n = 557$), mouse munchies ($n = 535$).

Table 4
One Book, Every Young Child Website Activity (March – August 2006)

Variable	2006						Total
	March	April	May	June	July	August	
Visits^a							
Total	5,696	7,228	5,064	4,549	3,828	3,838	30,203
Percent	18.85%	23.93%	16.76%	15.06%	12.67%	12.71%	
Average per day	183.74	240.93	163.35	151.63	123.48	123.80	
Hits^b							
Total	230,214	236,119	102,587	66,817	39,951	42,697	718,385
Percent	32.05%	32.87%	14.28%	9.30%	5.56%	5.94%	
Average per day	7,426.26	7,870.63	3,309.26	2,227.23	1,288.74	1,377.32	
Downloads^c							
Total	896	8,285	5,409	5,152	3,563	3,566	26,871
Percent	3.33%	30.83%	20.13%	19.17%	13.26%	13.27%	
No. of files responsible	24	73	78	77	62	78	
Most common downloaded items^d							
Activities	232	896	197	188	170	90	1,773
Calendar	----	----	355	208	138	155	856
Contents	135	----	----	----	----	----	135
Crafts	----	390	----	167	----	----	557
Finger plays & songs	----	323	----	161	----	88	572
Mouse munchies	----	302	----	151	82	----	535
One Book release	----	----	170	----	----	89	259
Photo release	----	----	161	----	----	----	161
Special note	----	----	219	----	110	102	431
Trunk manual	124	----	----	----	----	----	124

^a Visits indicate the number of clients viewing the website.

^b Hits indicate the number of requests for file while visiting the website.

^c Downloads indicate the number of items opened or saved by a client visiting the website.

^d Includes downloads by all website visitors (early childhood professionals, parents, and library and museum educators).

Website Survey. The website survey yielded a very poor response. Only ten people completed the survey. As such, the results that are provided from this survey shed minimal light on the success of the website and should be considered cautiously.

Of the 10 people who responded to the survey, most (n = 8) were female, White (n = 8) and not of Hispanic decent (n = 7). Five had their Master's degree, four had their Bachelor's degree and one had some high school or less. Five respondents were library educators, three were parents, one was museum educator, and one identified themselves as a web designer. No early childhood educators responded to this survey.

Most (n = 7) learned of the website through library promotional material or the library web site link. One learned of it through the One Book, Every Young Child button and two learned of it through other means. No one learned of the site from the poster, brochure, Library of Congress website, news paper or through search engines (such as Google). When people viewed the site, they seemed to view almost all aspects the site had to offer including 'About One Book' (n = 8), '*Inside Mouse Outside Mouse*' (n = 8), 'One Book events' (n = 7), 'Resources' (n = 8), 'Our Partners' (5). When asked about the resources they planned to use from the site, most (n = 8) said they planned to use the finger play and songs, followed by 'activities' (n = 7), 'crafts' (n = 7), games (n = 5), links to other website (n = 5), book lists (n = 4), and Lindsay Barrett George's visit calendar (n = 3). Four respondents said they were very satisfied with the website; five said they were somewhat satisfied; and one said they were somewhat dissatisfied with the website.

BOOK RECOGNITION AND LITERACY ACTIVITIES OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

Measurement of children's' early literacy skills has posed significant challenges to literacy researchers. Formally assessing a child's level of knowledge or ability on a certain task with a trained professional examiner may lead to an inaccurate assessment due to very the nature of the assessment environment. Children may be more inhibited around an unfamiliar person (i.e., the examiner) or overwhelmed by the pressure to succeed at a task, or simply uncomfortable taking part in a contrived examination of their abilities (Dale, 1991). Researchers have used parent reports as an effective indicator of a child's early literacy skills. Not only are parent questionnaires a cost effective strategy, but also parents are often able to provide greater insight to the child and perhaps provide a more representative account of the child's abilities (Boudreau, 2005). Parent is in the unique position to report on their child's abilities and report accordingly.

Evidence in support of reliable parent report is provided by Dickinson & DeTemple (1998). They found that mothers' evaluation of children's literacy development was significantly related to the child's emergent literacy when formally tested. The researchers interviewed parents of preschoolers about their support for their child's literacy development. The children were subsequently formally assessed in kindergarten and again in first grade with a battery of language measures and early literacy tasks. The results showed that parent's reports of literacy support were strongly associated with the child's performance on all the language and literacy measures in

kindergarten. Furthermore, they found that parental reports correlated strongly with first grade teacher evaluations and the end of first grade assessments of early literacy development (Dickinson & DeTemple, 1998).

Parents who completed the Book Recognition and Literacy Parent Questionnaire for the One Book pilot evaluation were parents of young children who came into Temple University to take part in the Welfare Reform and Child Care Subsidies Study, another study funded by the William Penn Foundation. Participants completed the questionnaire in the Personality and Social Development Research Laboratory on the main campus of Temple University in Philadelphia, PA. Upon completion of the Parent Questionnaire, each parent was given a copy of the children's book *Lunch* by Denise Fleming as a thank you for their participation in the One Book component of the visit. Copies of the book, *Lunch*, were provided by the Office of Commonwealth Libraries.

Evaluation Procedures

We measured recognition of the *Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse (IMOM)* book and baseline literacy activities with a 24 question Parent Questionnaire. The questionnaire contained several questions pertaining to the recognition of the *IMOM* book which was on display in the room where the parents completed the questionnaire. Parent's attention was directed to the books. Along with the *Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse* book by Lindsay Barrett George (2004) were two other books; *Muncha Muncha Muncha* by Candace Fleming (2002) and *Three Billy Goats Gruff* by Paul Galdone (2001). All three books were similar to each other in that they were all about the same size and shape, all had colorful, attractive book jackets.

The Parent Questionnaire also contained questions that we adapted from the Early Literacy Parent Questionnaire (Boudreau, 2005) to assess the literacy activities of low income children. Questions included the activities surrounding the interaction between the child and adult while reading a story (such as whether the child asks questions or talks about the pictures in the book), number of books owned (children and adult), access to and use of local libraries, and the child's interest in reading story books. A copy of the Parent Questionnaire can be found in Appendix D.

Respondents

Table 5 presents demographic and family characteristics of the participants. One hundred twenty-two low-income adult parents with young children (less than five years of age) comprised the sample. All were either receiving or had recently received welfare benefits through the Department of Public Welfare. The vast majority (97%) were female, single (76%) and had, on average, two children in their care. Their ages ranged from 18 to 29 years old ($M = 25$, $SD = 5$). Two thirds of the sample were African American (62%), 17% were white, and 22% were of Hispanic origin.

Table 5
Demographic and Family Characteristics of the Participants in the Baseline Literacy Component of
the One Book Pilot Evaluation (N = 122)

Characteristic	% or M (SD)
Gender	
Female	96.7%
Average Age	25.5 (5.1)
Race / Ethnicity	
Non-Hispanic Black	62.0%
Non-Hispanic White	16.5%
Hispanic ^a	21.5%
Educational Level	
Less than High school diploma	22.1%
High school diploma / GED	35.2%
Vocational / Technical school	18.9%
Some college	17.2%
Associate's degree	4.1%
Bachelor's degree	2.5%
Marital Status	
Married and living with spouse	9.3%
Divorced	6.8%
Separated	6.8%
Widowed	.8%
Single, never married	76.3%
Living with a partner	18.0%
Average number of children in household	2.1 (1.0)
County	
Philadelphia	71.3%
Montgomery	4.9%
Bucks	7.4%
Chester	3.3%
Delaware	13.1%
Housing ^b	
Own home	9.0%
Rent home	78.4%
Access to car	48.4%
Access to public transportation	95.1%
EMPLOYMENT	
Employed	43.8%
Working more than one job	7.5%
Average number of hours worked per week	35.8 (11.5)

Table 5 continued
Demographic and Family Characteristics of the Participants in the Baseline Literacy Component of the One Book Pilot Evaluation (N = 122)

Characteristic	% or M (SD)
Times of day worked	
Days (7 am – 7 pm)	71.7%
Evenings (7 pm – midnight)	5.7%
Nights (midnight - 7 am)	3.8%
Times vary	18.9%
CHILD CARE	
Use regular child care arrangement	56.6%
Type of care used	
Center / preschool	52.9%
Relative in own home	17.1%
Relative in their home	21.4%
Non-relative in own home	5.7%
Non-relative in their home	2.9%
Licensed or registered care	52.2%
Pay out of pocket for child care expenses	33.6%
Receive financial assistance to offset cost of care	
Child care subsidy	41.4%
Welfare	32.9%
Head Start	7.1%
Tax credit	1.4%
Relative and friends	8.6%
Average amount paid out of pocket per week for child care	\$55.6 (48.9)
HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS	
Income received from	
Child support	20.5%
SSI (disability)	13.9%
Social Security	4.9%
Workman’s compensation	0.8%
Average monthly household income	\$1,229.8 (843.9)

^a Includes those who indicated a racial identity of Black, White, Bi-racial, and some other racial group.

^b Total does not equal 100% because some parents were neither rented or owned the home they were residing.

All parents lived in the five county area of Southeastern Pennsylvania; 71% resided in Philadelphia County, 13% were from Delaware County 7% were from Bucks County, 5% were from Montgomery County, and 3% were from Chester County. Fully 78% reported renting their homes. While just about half (48%) reported having access to a car, most (95%) used public transportation.

Less than half of the parents (44%) were actively employed at the time of the survey. Of those who were employed, 8% worked more than one job. They reported mostly working during day time hours (72%; between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m.) and worked on average 36 hours per week. Nineteen percent reported working different hours from week to week. In addition to revenues from work, parents reported receiving income from child support (21%), Social Security Income (14%), Social Security (5%), and workman's Compensation (1%). Monthly household income for all sources combined for these families ranged from \$50 to \$4,000 with the average household income centering on \$1, 230.

Fifty-seven percent used a regular child care arrangement.⁵ Of these, 53% used a child care center or preschool. Thirty-nine percent used relative care. Fifty-two percent indicated their child care arrangement was licensed or registered with the Department Of Public Welfare. No more than 34% reported paid out of pocket for their child care with the average amount paid per week being only \$56. Eighty-one percent received some form of financial assistance to offset the cost of child care; 41% received a child care subsidy for working families from Child Care Information Services, 33% received assistance from the welfare office, and 7% used a Head Start program.

Findings

Book Recognition. Table 6 presents the recognition of *IMOM* and two similar books on display. When asked if they recognized any of the three books on display, 64 parents (52%) said yes.

Of the 64 parents who reported they had had seen the books on display, only 14 (22%) said they had seen *Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse*. Of these 14, eight (62%) said they saw it at their local library, five (39%) said they had seen it at a book store, seven (54%) said they had seen it at their child's school, and two (15%) said they saw it at a friend's house. Three parents (23%) reported owning the book.

Twelve parents (19%) reported they had seen *Muncha! Muncha! Muncha!*. Of these, ten (83%) said they saw it at their local library, five (42%) said they had seen it at a book store, and five (42%) said they had seen it at their child's school. Three parents (25%) reported owning the book.

Thirty-eight parents (59%) reported they had seen *Three Billy Goats Gruff*. Of these, 28 (73%) said they saw it at their local library, 15 (40%) said they had seen it at a

⁵ Regular child care arrangement was defined as one in which the child attended care 20 or more hours per week.

book store, 24 (63%) said they had seen it at their child’s school, and five (13%) said they saw it at a friend’s house. Nine parents (24%) reported owning the book.

Table 6
Book Recognition (N = 64)

Variable	<i>Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse</i> ^a n = 14	<i>Muncha, Muncha, Muncha</i> ^b n= 12	<i>Three Billy Goats Gruff</i> ^c n = 38
% Seen the book on display	21.8	18.8	59.4
Seen where			
% Library	61.5	83.3	73.7
% Book store	38.5	41.7	39.5
% Child’s school	53.8	41.7	63.2
% Friend’s house	15.4	---	13.2
% Own the book	23.1	25.0	23.7
% Read the book	80.0	71.4	77.8

^a Percent based on those who recognized *Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse* by Lindsay Barrett George

^b Percent based on those who recognized *Muncha, Muncha, Muncha* by Candace Fleming

^c Percent based on those who recognized *Three Billy Goats Gruff* by Paul Galdone

Literacy Activities. Table 7 presents the literacy activities of low-income parents in the study. Two thirds of the sample (62%) reported their child asked to be read to daily or several times a day, and 70% said they read to their child daily or several times a day. The majority (55%) said they have a particular time they read with their child; mostly this took place in the evening hours. When reading to their child, almost all parents (98%) reported that their child points to and talks about the pictures in the stories. Only a third of this sample reported the child creating his or her own stories (39%) or filling in words or lines from a story (33%). When asked to rate their child’s interest in books as related to other activities on a scale of one (least liked activity) to five (favorite activity), most (69%) rated their child’s interest in books as a three or four. Twenty six percent said it was their child’s favorite activity.

Virtually all parents reported owning some children’s books (99%) and some adult books (97%). On average, parents reported having 55 children’s books and 60 adult books in the home. Fully 73% of parents reported having a library card, yet only half (55%) reported borrowing books from the library, and even fewer (17%) reported attending library sponsored parent and child programs. When asked how far they lived from their local library, 74 (61%) of the parents said they lived less than 10 minutes away, and 17 (14%) said it would take more than 20 minutes to travel to their local library. Five parents (4%) reported not knowing where their public library was located.

Table 7
Baseline Literacy Activities of Low-Income Families (N = 122)

Variable	
Child asks parent to read to him/her	
% Never / rarely	13.1
% On occasion	12.3
% Weekly	11.5
% Daily	41.0
% Several times per day	22.1
Parent reads to child	
% Never / rarely	4.1
% On occasion	9.0
% Weekly	16.4
% Daily	48.4
% Several times per day	22.1
% with particular time designated to read to child	54.5
% Child points to pictures in stories	98.3
% Child asks question about the story	78.7
Child pretends to read the story	
% Never	6.6
% Has but rarely	15.6
% Weekly	6.6
% Several times per week	26.2
% Daily	45.1
Child creates stories	
% Never / rarely	29.5
% On occasion	24.6
% Weekly	7.4
% Daily	22.1
% Several times per day	16.4
Child fills in words / lines from story	
% Not currently	31.1
% has but rarely	9.8
% Occasionally	24.6
% A few times per story	22.1
% Very frequently per story	12.3
Parent attempts to teach names of letter and/or alphabet sound when reading	
% Not currently	4.9
% has but rarely	3.3
% Occasionally	21.3
% A few times per story	27.0
% Very frequently per story	43.4

Table 7 continued
Baseline Literacy Activities of Low-Income Families (N = 122)

Variable	
Average child's interest in book (scale 1-5)	3.88 (0.9)
% Perform related story activities with child	66.9
% Child has own books	99.2
Average number of children's book in home	54.22 (107.24)
% Subscribe to newspaper or magazine	58.7
% Internet access	73.6
% Internet access in home	65.9
LIBRARY USAGE	
% Has library card	72.5
% Borrow books from library	53.7
% Attend library programs	16.5
Travel time to local library	
% 5 minutes or less	28.9
% 6 – 10 minutes	32.2
% 11 – 20 minutes	20.7
% More than 20 minutes	14.0
% Do not know location of public library	4.1

Literacy Activities of Child Care Users versus Non-Child Care Users. One of the major outreach activities of the One Book program was by providing *IMOM* books to over 9,000 child care centers, family day care homes, and group family day care homes in the Commonwealth. Are there differences between children who attend a child care program versus those who do not? Do children in child care programs have more opportunities for early literacy exposure? To answer these questions we tested the literacy activities of children in child care arrangements and those who were not.

Table 8 presents the literacy activities of child care users and non-child care users. Three significant differences were found. First, children in child care were more likely to ask their parents questions about the characters or events during story reading than children not attending a child care arrangement (88% v. 66% respectively). Second, child care users were more likely to have access to the internet than non-child care users (81% v. 64% respectively). And finally, parents of children in child care were more likely to have a library card (77% v. 67% respectively). However, there were no differences in the numbers borrowing books from the library or attending library programs.

Table 8
Baseline Literacy Activities of Child Care Users and Non-Child Care Users

	Child Care Users n = 69	Non-Child Care Users n = 53	χ^2
Child asks parent to read to him/her			
% Never / rarely	10.1	17.0	
% On occasion	13.0	11.3	
% Weekly	17.4	3.8	
% Daily	40.6	41.5	
% Several times per day	18.8	26.4	
Parent reads to child			
% Never / rarely	4.3	3.8	
% On occasion	10.1	7.5	
% Weekly	20.3	11.3	
% Daily	46.4	50.9	
% Several times per day	18.8	26.4	
% with particular time designated to read to child	57.4	50.9	
% Child points to pictures in stories	98.6	98.0	
% Child asks question about the story	88.4	66.0	8.94*
Child pretends to read the story			
% Never	7.2	5.7	
% Has but rarely	14.5	17.0	
% Weekly	5.8	7.5	
% Several times per week	29.0	22.6	
% Daily	43.5	47.2	
Child creates stories			
% Never / rarely	21.7	39.6	
% On occasion	29.0	18.9	
% Weekly	7.2	7.5	
% Daily	29.0	13.2	
% Several times per day	13.0	20.8	
Child fills in words / lines from story			
% Not currently	29.0	34.0	
% has but rarely	8.7	11.3	
% Occasionally	27.5	20.8	
% A few times per story	21.7	22.6	
% Very frequently per story	13.0	11.3	
Parent attempts to teach names of letter and/or alphabet sound when reading			
% Not currently	4.3	5.7	
% has but rarely	4.3	1.9	
% Occasionally	21.7	20.8	
% A few times per story	23.2	32.1	
% Very frequently per story	46.4	39.6	

Table 8 continued
Baseline Literacy Activities of Child Care Users and Non-Child Care Users

	<u>Child Care Users</u> % or M (SD) n = 69	<u>Non-Child Care Users</u> % or M (SD) n = 53	χ^2
Average child's interest in book (scale 1-5)	3.9 (.9)	3.9 (1.0)	
% Perform related story activities with child	69.6	63.5	
% Child has own books	98.6	100.0	
Average number of children's book in home	54.9 (125.7)	53.22 (77.7)	
% Subscribe to newspaper or magazine	60.9	55.8	
% Internet access ^b	81.2	63.5	4.775*
% Internet access in home	66.1	65.6	
LIBRARY USAGE			
% Has library card ^c	76.8	66.7	18.301**
% Borrow books from library	52.2	55.8	
% Attend library programs	15.9	17.3	
Travel time to local library			
% 5 minutes or less	31.9	25.0	
% 6 – 10 minutes	29.0	36.5	
% 11 – 20 minutes	20.3	21.2	
% More than 20 minutes	15.9	11.5	
% Do not know location of public library	2.9	5.8	

Note. Chi Square (χ^2) tests indicate the degree to which percentages differ across the groups. Only chi square differences that were significantly significant (not due to chance) are reported.

* $p \leq .05$.

** $p \leq .001$.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this section we discuss what we learned about the program and the evaluation process. We describe the successes of the pilot evaluation, the problems encountered and our recommendations for future One Book programs and evaluations.

PILOT EVALUATION SUCCESSES

The pilot evaluation proved to be a successful and informative effort. We learned about the program and some of the limitations of trying to evaluate too much too soon. While we learn from what was successful, we often learn more by what is not.

Overall, the forms designed for the pilot evaluation worked well in the field. While one question on the Author Visit Form proved to be too ambiguous for respondents to answer in a consistent manner, contact information for each site visit representative was used to clarify the data.

Response rates for the Author Visit Forms were very high. We received completed forms from almost all sites. On the flip side, Book Mailer Questionnaires were yielded about a 20% return rate. What happened to the rest of the mailers? About 7,000 mailers are unaccounted for. We do not know if they reached the recipient or if the recipient chose not to respond. Since pre-paid postage was applied to all the mailers, 80% of the postage cost was unnecessarily spent. In the same vein, a similar number of books mailed by the Office of Commonwealth Libraries probably never reached their intended recipient as no return address was provided for the original packages of books mailed. Clearly, a more cost-effective postal mailing strategy could be applied for future evaluations.

Of the Book Mailer Questionnaires that were completed and returned, all respondent filled them out correctly; indicating the questions were understandable and instructions for return procedures were easy to follow. We were treated to spontaneous commentary from teachers across the Commonwealth that gave us insight not only to what worked, but what didn't work. For example, a small number of teachers mentioned not liking the selected book or preferring a book with a 'story line.' Commentary such as this leads us to believe some detailed instruction on *how* to use a (concept) book might be necessary for future program book selections.

The website was a work in progress throughout much of the program. One particularly important lesson learned was to make sure the site was up and running before the program starts. Assessing the website through the online statistical manager, Deep Matrix LiveStat, was fairly easy to use and if reports are generated and consulted on monthly basis, they could serve as a valuable tool for maintaining the website's usefulness. The feedback page we designed was problematic partially due to the timing and partially due to the website's design.

Fortunately, due to another research project running concurrently with the One Book evaluation, we were able to obtain valuable literacy information from a sample of low income families. Specifically, the knowledge gained regarding library usage (or lack

thereof) and the differing levels of literacy skills of children in child care versus those who are not.

PILOT EVALUATION PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED

On the whole, the pilot evaluation of the first year of the One Book program encountered few problems. However difficulties arose in two of the components that were outlined in the pilot evaluation proposal. These included feedback from the web site survey and attempts to establish children's story book sales by Harper Collins, publisher of *Inside Mouse*, *Outside Mouse*. We address each problem separately.

As noted earlier, the website survey proved to be an unfruitful effort. In spite of the relatively high traffic through the One Book website, many visitors did not complete the survey. Perhaps this was due to the placement of the survey on the feedback page or perhaps it was due to the website having two feedback options and visitors chose to respond to the larger, more prominently displayed page. In light of this happening, we suggest that future websites for the One Book program have alternate methods for tracking user profiles in order to best serve the intended clientele.

The original outline of the pilot evaluation also included an examination of children's story book sales in Pennsylvania by Harper Collins, the publisher of *Inside Mouse*, *Outside Mouse*, compared to another demographically similar state to help assess the impact of the program. According to the 2000 Census, data indicated the most comparable state to be Ohio. As such, it was our intention to assess children's story book sales in Pennsylvania and Ohio to see if there had been a marked impact on overall children's book sales in Pennsylvania.

However, contacting the publisher of *Inside Mouse*, *Outside Mouse* proved to be insurmountable. Several attempts were made via email and telephone to various individuals within the company to inquire about children's book sales in the two states. Unfortunately, email communications and telephone voice mail messages were not returned. As such, we could not complete this component.

As an alternative to the publisher's book sales, circulation statistics for 2005 and 2006 were obtained from two library districts, Summerset and Allegheny Counties. Both districts reported an increase in children's book circulation (increase of 2,138 and 1,484 respectively).

In light of these findings we offer the following recommendations for shaping the program and future evaluations:

Program Recommendations

1. The One Book, Every Young Child state-wide program should be continued.
2. Consideration should be made to delay the start of the intervention (and promotion of the intervention) in some districts of the Commonwealth in order for the evaluation to assess the impact of the intervention.

3. Local libraries have great potential for use as an effective statewide delivery system for literacy programming. This kind of a delivery system might be especially useful for literacy interventions targeting low-income communities, those most in need of these services.
4. Prepare the website to be ready to accept visitors at the start of the program. Have all the materials readily available and confirm the links go to the intended files prior to the introduction of the website address.
5. Prepare district libraries for accessing children's story book circulation statistics by implementing a system that will help to account for the One Book program's impact on the local libraries.

Evaluation Recommendations

1. Future evaluations of the One Book Program can be more effective if a Logic Model is introduced prior to the evaluation. What are the goals of the program, how are they to be accomplished, and how will anyone know if these goals are attained? Once this model is clear, then choices concerning evaluation will also be clear.
2. Future evaluations of the One Book program can be more effective when control groups or communities are included as part of the intervention design. To ensure that all libraries and communities receive the program benefits, control group participants can receive the program/intervention after, rather than before, the outcome measurements are complete.
3. Measures of program benefits might also include measurement of the effects of the program in the selected communities on the libraries, parent reports of children's literacy skills, child care teacher reports of children's literacy skills, and reports of child care teacher literacy activities in the classroom.
4. Future evaluations of the One Book promotional author tours that involve modeling interactive activities with children could include a short survey to be completed by audience members immediately following the presentation. Such an evaluation can provide a fount of information regarding the information found most and least useful and the likelihood of conducting similar activities with children in their care.
5. Measures of effects on library involvement could include circulation statistics for children's story books and usage of library resources (e.g., web site and One Book program partners) provided by the One Book program.
6. Book recognition by parents can be an effective measure of the effectiveness of the program. However, the program book needs to be compared with other books similar in shape, size and color, as well as title novelty. Classic childhood stories

- (such as Three Billy Goats Gruff) can lead to artificial responses of book recognition.
7. Changes in children's literacy interest, motivation and skills could be effectively and efficiently assessed using parent reports.
 8. Future evaluations of the One Book program could delve deeper into the *type* of activities early childhood educators are conducting with the children in their care. While most teachers said they already conducted activities related to story books, the type of activities and the extent of the interaction between the children and adults were unknown.
 9. Future evaluations of the website should re-consider the placement of the visitor profile survey. An alternative could be for the site to require visitors to sign in with an email address so a follow-up email survey can be sent to them after they complete the website visit.
 10. Confirm the addresses of actively operated child care facilities in the Commonwealth prior to a mass mailing. The number of returned unopened Book Mailer Questionnaires (n = 444) cost the Commonwealth about \$700 in unnecessary postage stamps. The initial cost of postage for mailing the books and activity posters plus the expense of printing additional questionnaires could be avoided in the future. It is recommended that a bar coded return mailing label be used for future mail surveys. The bar code allows the post office to bill the client only for the postage actually used.

REFERENCES

- The Annie E. Casey Foundation, KIDS COUNT State Level Data Online, www.kidscount.org. Retrieved on August 10, 2006.
- Boudreau, Donna. (2005). Use of a parent questionnaire in emergent and early literacy assessment of preschool children. *Language, Speech, and Hearing in Schools*, 36. 33-47.
- Dale, Philip S. (1991). The validity of a parent report measure on vocabulary and syntax at 24 months. *Journal of Speech and Hearing*, 34. 565-571.
- Dickinson, David K. & DeTemple, Jeanne. (1998). Putting parents in the picture: Maternal reports of preschoolers; Literacy as a predictor of early reading. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 13. 241-261.
- Neuman, Susan (1999). Books make a difference: A study of access to literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 34 (3). 286-311.
- Raikes, Helen, Pan, Barbara Alexander, Luze, Gayle, Tamis-LeMonda, Catherine S., Brooks-Gunn, Jeanne, Constantine, Jill, Tarullo, Louisa Banks, Raikes, H. Abigail, Rodriguez, Eileen T. (2006). Mother-child book reading in low-income families: Correlates and outcomes during the first three years of life. *Child Development*, 77 (4). 924-953.
- Sonnenschein, Susan & Munsterman, Kimberly. (2002). The influence of home-based reading interactions on 5-year olds' reading motivations and early literacy development. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 17. 318-337.
- Whitehurst, Grover, J., & Lonigan, Christopher, J. (1998). Child Development and emergent literacy. *Child Development*, 69 (3). 848-872.

Appendix A

Author Visit Utilization Form

ID #: _____

ONE BOOK, EVERY YOUNG CHILD

Author Visit Utilization Form

The Department of Education, Office of Commonwealth Libraries has funded a team of researchers at Temple University to conduct a pilot evaluation of the One Book, Every Young Child program.

In order to better understand the impact of the author's visit component of the One Book, Every Young Child program we ask that you assign one person at your site to complete this brief utilization form during the course of Lindsay Barrett George's visit and return it within one week of the author's visit. Please complete a separate form for every program at which she appears.

All information will be kept completely confidential and only used for research purposes.

Thank you for your participation.

Please return this form in the enclosed self addressed envelope to:

Michelle Harmon
Temple University
616 Weiss Hall
1701 N. 13th St.
Philadelphia, PA 19122

ONE BOOK, EVERY YOUNG CHILD

Author Visit Utilization Form

Date of Author's Visit: _____ / _____ / 2006
Month Day

About your Organization:

1.) Name of Site: _____

2.) Type of Organization:

- _____ Library
- _____ Museum
- _____ Family Literacy
- _____ Head Start
- _____ Child Care Facility (not Head Start)
- _____ Early Childhood Education Conference / Workshop
- _____ College
- _____ Other (please specify: _____)

3.) County: _____

4.) Please provide the number of programs made available for children birth to 6 between April 2005 and April 2006?

Number of programs: _____

About the Author's Visit

5.) Length of Author's visit: _____ minutes / hours (circle one)

6.) Please place a check mark next to the items that indicate which activities took place during the Author's visit:

- _____ Reading from the *Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse* book
- _____ Reading from other children's books
- _____ Hands-on activity for those attending to take part
- _____ *Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse* book signing
- _____ Question and Answer session with the author
- _____ Informal meet and greet with the author
- _____ Other, please specify: _____

ID #: _____

7.) Did the author stay at the site longer than originally scheduled to speak with attendees or site staff?

_____ Yes

_____ No

_____ Don't Know

8.) Number of adults in attendance: _____

9.) Number of children in attendance: _____

10.) Is there a hands-on activity at this site visit? _____ Yes _____
No

10a.) If Yes, Number of people that took part in hands on activity: _____

11.) Number of *Inside Mouse*, *Outside Mouse* books sold during author's visit:

Number of books sold: _____

Please provide the following information:

Name of person completing form: _____

Phone contact: (_____) _____ - _____ ext.: _____

Thank you for completing and returning this form.

Appendix B

Book Mailer Questionnaire

- 13.) Phone number: (_____) _____ - _____
- 14.) Zip code: _____ 15.) County: _____
- 16.) Is this program: _____ For Profit _____ Not for profit
- 17.) Total number of children cared for at site: _____
- 18.) Total number of children receiving child care subsidies at site: _____

Thank you.

Appendix C

Website Survey

Website User Feedback Page Questions

1) How did you learn about this website?

- One Book, Every Young Child button
- One Book, Every Young Child poster
- One Book, Every Young Child brochure
- Library promotional material
- Library web site link
- Museum promotional material
- Museum web site link
- Library of Congress web site
- Newspaper
- Web search engines (such as Google)
- Other

2) What aspects of the website did you review?

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> About One Book | <input type="checkbox"/> Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse | <input type="checkbox"/> Our Partners |
| <input type="checkbox"/> One Book Events | |

3) What resources of the website do you plan to use?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Will not use resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Finger plays and Songs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Booklists | <input type="checkbox"/> Calendar of Lindsey |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Activities | <input type="checkbox"/> Barrett George visits |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Crafts | <input type="checkbox"/> Links to other websites |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Games | |

4) Overall, how satisfied would you say you are with the resources offered on this website?

- Very satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

Please tell us a little about yourself...

1) Are you a... Parent
 Library Educator
 Museum Educator
 Early Childhood Professional
 Other, please specify: _____

2) Gender: Male Female

3) Age: _____

- 4) Education level: Some High School or Less
 High School Diploma / GED
 Early Childhood Certificate / Diploma
 CDA Credential
 Some College Credits
 Associate's Degree
 Bachelor's Degree
 Master's Degree
 Post Master's work
- 5.) Race... Black, African American
 Native American
 White, Caucasian
 Asian, Asian American
 Biracial or Multiracial
 Other
- 6.) Are you of Hispanic decent? Yes No

Appendix D

Parent Literacy Questionnaire

ONE BOOK, EVERY YOUNG CHILD

Parent Questionnaire

Directions: Please circle the number that corresponds to your answer. _____

1.) How often does your child ask you to read to him/her?

- Never/Rarely. 1
- On occasion. 2
- Weekly. 3
- Daily. 4
- Several times per day. 5

2) How often do you read to your child?

- Never/Rarely. 1
- On occasion. 2
- Weekly. 3
- Daily. 4
- Several times per day. 5

3.) Do you have a particular time that you generally read to your child(ren)?

- Yes. 1 [please continue with Question 3a]
- No. 5 [please skip to Question 4]

3a.) If yes, when do you typically read to your child? _____

4.) Does your child point to or talk about the pictures when you read stories?

- Yes. 1
- No. 5

5.) Does your child ask questions about characters or events during story reading?

- Yes. 1
- No. 5

6.) How often does your child pretend to read the story in a book (such as sitting with a book and producing speech that is similar to the actual story in the book)?

- Never 1
- Has but rarely 2
- Weekly. 3
- Several times per week. 4
- Daily 5

7.) How often does your child make up stories and tell them?

- Never/Rarely. 1
- On occasion. 2
- Weekly. 3
- Daily. 4
- Several times per day. 5

8.) How often does your child fill in words or lines from a story when reading with you? (when reading a book he/she knows well, says the next line or word before you read it)

- Not currently. 1
- Has but rarely.. . . . 2
- Occasionally. 3
- A few times per story. 4
- Very frequently per story. 5

9.) How often do you attempt to teach the names of the letters in the alphabet and/or alphabet sounds when reading?

- Not currently. 1
- Has but rarely.. . . . 2
- Occasionally. 3
- A few times per story. 4
- Very frequently per story. 5

10.) In comparison to other activities, how would you rate your child's interest in books?

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Activity Favorite
liked least activity

11.) Do you and your child(ren) do any related activities after reading a book? (For example: rhymes, cooking, finding things in the illustrations in your house or outside.)

Yes. 1
No. 5

12.) Does your child have books of his/her own?

Yes. 1 [please continue with Question 12a]
No. 5 [please skip to Question 13]

12a.) If yes, About how many does s/he own?

Number of books: _____

13.) Do you have a library card?

Yes. 1
No. 5

14.) How long does it take to travel to your local library?

5 minutes or less. 1
6-10 minutes. 2
11-20 minutes. 3
More than 20 minutes. 4
Don't know where public library is located. 5

15.) Do you borrow books from the public library?

Yes. 1
No. 5

16.) Do you and your child attend library programs?

Yes. 1
No. 5

17.) Do you regularly buy or subscribe to a newspaper or magazine?

Yes. 1
No. 5

18.) How many books do you have in your home (not including children's books)?

Number of books: _____

19.) Do you have access to the internet?

Yes. 1 [Please continue with question 19a]

No. 5 [Please skip to question 20]

19a.) If yes, where?

In your own home. 1

Some other place. 5

20.) Have you ever seen the books displayed in this room before?

Yes. 1 [Please continue with question 21]

No. 5 [Stop here. Thank you.]

21.) Which one(s) have you seen before? Please place a check mark next to all that apply.

_____ Muncha! Muncha! Muncha!

_____ Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse

_____ The Three Billy Goats Gruff

22.) Where did you see the book(s)? Please place a check mark next to all that apply

_____ Library

_____ Book store

_____ Child's school / child care program

_____ Friend's house

_____ I own the book(s)

23.) Have you ever read any of these books with your child(ren)?

Yes. 1 [Please continue to question 24]

No. 5 [Stop here. Thank you.]

24.) Which book(s) have you read? Please place a check mark next to all that apply.

_____ Muncha! Muncha! Muncha!

_____ Inside Mouse, Outside Mouse

_____ The Three Billy Goats Gruff

Thank you.