



## Analysis of initial literacy depending on the type of family

### Análisis de la alfabetización inicial en función del tipo de familia

**Cristina De-La-Peña**

<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1176-4981>  
*Universidad Internacional de la Rioja (UNIR)*

**Nicolás Parra-Bolaños**

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0935-9496>  
*Institución Universitaria Marco Fidel Suárez (Colombia)*

**Juliana-María Fernández-Medina**

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2714-8430>  
*Instituto de Neurociencias y Neurorehabilitación Aplicada y Funcional (Colombia)*

**Received:**  
28/03/2017

**Accepted:**  
19/12/2017

**ISSN:** 1885-446 X  
**ISSNe:** 2254-9099

#### Keywords

Family Literacy; Emergent Literacy; Early Reading; Family Structure, Family Influence.

#### Palabras clave

Alfabetización familiar; alfabetización inicial; lectura temprana; estructura familiar; influencia familiar.

#### Contact:

[cristina.delapena@unir.net](mailto:cristina.delapena@unir.net)  
[inv.nbolanos@iumafis.edu.co](mailto:inv.nbolanos@iumafis.edu.co)  
[julianamfm@gmail.com](mailto:julianamfm@gmail.com)

#### Abstract

Family literacy is a topic of interest because of its influence on child development, enhancing or hindering the reading-writing process. The goal of this research is to describe the family educational practices and analyse the existence of significant relationship between literacy practices and the type of nuclear, large and single-parent families. The sample consisted of 60 families from different socioeconomic levels with children in early childhood education in the city of Medellin, which were administered. The results show that there are significant relationships between literacy practices and the type of family that uses them. Consequently, the professional educations have to design children's literacy programs as an effective teaching tool addressed at nuclear and large families.

#### Resumen

La alfabetización familiar es un tema de interés debido a su influencia en el desarrollo infantil, potenciando u obstaculizando el proceso lectoescritor. El objetivo de esta investigación es describir las prácticas educativas familiares y analizar la existencia de relación significativa entre las prácticas alfabetizadoras y el tipo de familias nucleares, extensas y monoparentales. La muestra estuvo conformada por 60 familias de distintos niveles socioeconómicos con hijos en educación infantil de la ciudad de Medellín, a las que se les administró el *Inventario de Prácticas Alfabetizadoras*. Los resultados muestran que existen relaciones significativas entre las prácticas alfabetizadoras y el tipo de familia que las utiliza. Consecuentemente, los profesionales de la educación tienen que diseñar programas de alfabetización infantil como una herramienta pedagógica eficaz dirigida principalmente a familias extensas y nucleares.

De-La-Peña, C., Parra-Bolaños, N., & Fernández-Medina, J. M. (2018). Analysis of initial literacy depending on the type of family. *Ocnos*, 17 (1), 7-20.  
doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.18239/ocnos\\_2018.17.1.1336](http://dx.doi.org/10.18239/ocnos_2018.17.1.1336)



## Introduction

Upon analysing the scientific literature, it is noted how important the role played by the family in the child's life is, especially as a protection or risk element that promotes or hinders the development process in its different spheres (motor, personal, social, emotional, linguistic and cognitive).

The family is the legitimate space where interaction between parents and their children allows for a series of actions called "literacy practices" to be generated. In the opinion of Rugerio & Guevara (2015), the literacy process starts as a result of the first interactions within the family. This literacy enables the child to build significant learning related to the acquisition and development of written and oral language through the experiences children have with written materials such as: story books, books, notes to communicate at home, etc. (DeBaryshe, Binder & Buell, 2000; Guevara, Rugerio, Delgado, Hermsillo & López, 2010; Kaufman, 2009; Marjanovič-Umeke, Fekonja-Peklaja, Sočana & Tašnerb, 2015; Morrow, 2009; Pears, Kim, Fisher & Yoerger, 2016; Purcell-Gates, Degener, Jacobson & Soler 2001; Teberosky & Soler, 2003).

In the last decades, several studies (Bazán, Sánchez & Castañeda, 2007; Eslava, Deaño, Alfonso, Conde & García-Señorán, 2016; Fajardo, Maestre, Felipe, León & Polo, 2017; Flórez, Restrepo & Schwanenflugel, 2009; Hamilton, Hayiou-Thomas, Hulme & Snowling, 2016; Hernández, Gomariz, Parra & García, 2016; Mullis, Mullis, Cornille, Ritchson & Sullender, 2004; Rugerio & Guevara, 2015; Suárez et al., 2011; Wasik & Bond, 2001) have shown that literacy practice within the family promotes the creation of abilities that are relevant to acquire essential skills for school life. More specifically, research reveals some improvements at a cognitive level, in terms of school performance, oral language, reading process and in the child's socio-emotional development. At a cognitive

level, Harris & Goodall (2007) and Wade & Moore (2000) identify improvements in childhood education children when their parents implement literacy practices at home. As far as academic performance is concerned, Fan & Chen (2001) and Flouri & Bucharan (2004) find better scores in grades obtained by those children whose parents have implemented literacy strategies at home with them. Regarding the development of oral language, several works (Armstrong et al., 2016; Armstrong et al., 2017; McKean et al, 2015; Treiman et al, 2015) show that upon being exposed to family literacy, children experience significant improvements in their level of oral language. With regard to the reading process, Rogoff (2002) & Gest, Freeman, Domitrovich & Welsh (2004) find that parental implementation of strategies such as shared reading, discourse and cooperation at home strengthen the reading-writing process. Finally, Allen & Daly (2002) found improvements in the level of social and emotional development in those children whose parents implemented literacy strategies at home.

These literacy practices implemented by the families are different depending on their socio-cultural context and on the type of family (Shively & Thomas, 2008; Treiman, Decker, Robins, Ghosh & Rosales, 2017). As far as the socio-cultural environment is concerned, several studies have analysed the relationship between the socio-economic level and the type of literacy implemented by the families. Duncan & Seymour (2000) find that those children from families of a low socio-economic level are less exposed to the letters of the alphabet, which results in literacy delay; Romero, Arias & Chavarría (2007) found that a low socio-cultural level is associated to a lower level of phonological awareness and vocabulary and when it comes to identifying letters or writing words. Other studies (Barca, Mascarenhas, Brenlla & Morán, 2012; Córdoba, García, Luengo, Vizute & Feu, 2011) find better academic performance in children from high economic levels and De-Coulon, Maschi & Vignoles (2008) find

that those families of a lower educational level are less prone to help their children in initial reading and writing literacy, which implies that their children have a lower level of cognitive and linguistic development compared to those children from families of a higher educational level. Some recent studies (Neumann, 2016; Strang & Piasta, 2016; Vanormelingen & Gillis, 2016) point out that the literacy environment is richer in those families of a higher economic level than in those of a lower economic level, which would explain the subsequent differences in the academic performance of their children. In particular, Shaub (2015) identifies the most frequent literacy strategy implemented by those parents of a higher socio-economic level, which is reading books to their children. In short, family literacy depends on the parents' socio-cultural and economic level.

There are very few studies on literacy practices depending on the type of family that make it possible to establish any links between the typology of the latter and the literacy strategies implemented. Additionally, the different types of family today (Tam, Findlay & Kohen, 2017) make it more complex to conduct any research. For this reason, this study focuses on three different types of family (De-León, 2011; Martínez, Álvarez & Fernández, 2009; Oliva & Villa, 2014; Wasik & Hermann, 2004; World Family Map, 2017): the nuclear family, made up of the couple and the children born of the marriage; the large family, made up of more than one nuclear unit and covers more than two generations based on blood ties, including the grandparents, parents, uncles, cousins, among others; and the single-parent family, made up of one of the parents and one child younger than 18.

Therefore, this research aims at analysing the family literacy practices in childhood education depending on the type of family (nuclear, large and single-parent). The different practices promoting the development of initial literacy implemented by the different types of families are analysed to that end.

This study has the following objectives:

- Objective 1. Describing the literacy practices implemented by the families in primary education depending on the type of family and the socio-economic level thereof.
- Objective 2. Checking the existence of a significant relationship between literacy practices and the type of family (single-parent, nuclear and large).

## Methodology

The empirical study of this research is described in this section; such description is arranged by participants, instrument, method and proceeding.

### Participants

The sample of this study was made up of 60 families of children in childhood education aged between 4 and 5 who attend different educational establishments of the city of Medellín, Colombia.

The sample was selected on the basis of an intentional, not probabilistic, approach. The distribution of the sample depending on the type of family was: 20 nuclear families, 20 single-parent families and 20 large families.

Given the huge differences in the city of Medellín in terms of socio-economic levels, the sample was equally distributed depending on the three socio-economic levels: 20 families were of a high socio-economic level, 20 families were of an average socio-economic level and 20 families were of a low socio-economic level. The criterion used to distinguish these three levels in Colombia is the geographical location where the families live (per capita income in Colombia is divided into areas): the families of a high level live in El Poblado and Laureles; the families of an average level live in La Castellana and La América; and the families of a low level live in Manriquez and Aranjuez.

The distribution of the sample depending on the type of family and their socio-economic level is arranged as follows:

- Single-parent families: four of a low level, nine of an average level and seven of a high level.
- Single-parent families: four of a low level, nine of an average level and seven of a high level.
- Large families: seven of a low level, seven of an average level and six of a high level.

The inclusion criteria of the sample were that they participated voluntarily in the study, that their children were in childhood education and attended educational establishments of the city of Medellín, belonging to any of the different socio-economic levels selected and not having any psycho-pathological condition.

## Method

This study is of a non-experimental nature but *ex post facto*, where relationships between variables are analysed without the involvement of the researcher, and is of a correlational nature, because it aims at identifying how two variables of a nominal nature are linked or related.

A quantitative methodology was used to collect data by using an *ad hoc* questionnaire, which allows for assessing specific behaviours such as the literacy practices implemented by the parents at their homes.

From a statistical point of view, given the qualitative data collected, percentages are used to assess how often the families participate in literacy practices and, on the other, the chi-square test is used to determine whether there is a significant relationship between the families and each literacy practice or not.

### Instrument

The inventory *Parent Reading Belief Inventory*, by DeBaryshe & Binder (1994) on family literacy

practices was provided to the families in order to collect data. This inventory includes questions about the family's beliefs, practices and literacy materials. The original questionnaire is made up of 55 categories organised in 7 sub-scales with a test-retest reliability of 0.79 per cent and its internal consistency being between 0.50-.85. In this study, the inventory was adapted to the population analysed by modifying some questions and organising it in 9 categories. It is thus an *ad hoc* questionnaire where each category is made up of 3-6 questions about the literacy actions implemented at home and there are different types of answers (schedule 1). In order to know more about the specific inventory used, the 9 categories are outlined below:

- Category 1: Purchase of children's books. This category measures the positive attitude of the families towards reading.
- Category 2: Reading practices. This category assesses the participation of the families in the reading activities.
- Category 3: Language practices implemented by the families. This category assesses the experiences of the parents with their children, using the language as a starting point for literacy.
- Category 4: Use of sophisticated language. This category measures the use of sophisticated language by the parents when they talk to their children.
- Category 5: Language command. This category assesses the level of language command of the parents.
- Category 6: Types of games and use of teaching materials. This category assesses the literacy resources found at home.
- Category 7: Text carriers. This category measures the literacy practices related to written language implemented by the parents with their children.
- Category 8: Models at home. This category assesses how efficient the parents are when implementing literacy practices.
- Category 9: Physical resources used for literacy purposes. This category refers directly to the physical resources to promote literacy found at home.

**Proceeding**

In first place, those families interested in participating were first contacted and the research proposal was explained to them, specifying that it would be carried out at their homes in order to perform observation and fill in the questionnaire regarding family literacy practices. In each visit to each house, the informed consent forms were handed over to the parents, their participation in the study was explained to them, as well as the ethical considerations of voluntary participation, the protection of their identities and their right to withdraw from the research. The researcher visited the families' houses to administer the inventory and the research lasted for 15 minutes approximately in each house. An attempt was made for the household conditions to be as good as possible in terms of lighting and sound.

The SPSS (*Statistical Package for the Social Sciences*) statistical software, version 20.0 for Windows was used for the statistical analysis of the data. Frequency measurements and percentages such are used for the descriptive analysis, and the chi-square test is used for qualitative variables of the relational analysis.

**Results**

The presentation of the results depends on the objectives of the research.

**Objective 1**

Describing the family literacy practices in childhood education. To achieve this goal, the results obtained in the descriptive analysis in per cent of the literacy practices depending on the type of family and the socio-economic level are described.

The percentages related to the implementation of different literacy practices depending on each category and type of family are shown in table 1.

Table 1. Percentages of literacy practices depending on the type of family

	Single-parent Family	Nuclear Family	Large Family
Category 1. Purchase of children's books	77.5%	63.7%	86.2%
Category 2. Reading Practices	51.6%	46.6%	11.6%
Category 3. Language practices implemented by the family	75%	60%	38.7%
Category 4. Use of sophisticated language	62%	39%	14%
Category 5. Language command	79%	50%	32%
Category 6. Types of Games and use of teaching materials	80%	90%	23.3%
Category 7. Text carriers	82.5%	60%	3.7%
Category 8. Models at home	65%	38%	15%
Category 9. Physical resources used for literacy purposes	100%	71.6%	0%

In short, the single-parent family obtains a greater percentage in all literacy practices, except for category 1, regarding the purchase of children's books, where the large family obtains a greater percentage followed by the nuclear and the single-parent family; and category 6, regarding the types of games and use of didactic materials, where the nuclear family obtains a greater percentage, followed by the single-parent and the large family. Therefore, the single-parent families implement literacy practices such as reading literacy practices, language practices implemented by the families, use of sophisticated language, language command, text carriers, models at home and physical resources used for literacy purposes more often, followed by the nuclear families and the large families.

The percentages related to the implementation of different literacy practices depending on each category and the socio-economic level are shown in table 2.

More generally, the socio-economic level obtains a greater percentage in all the catego-

Table 2. Percentages of literacy practices depending on the socio-economic level

	Low Level	Medium Level	High Level
Category 1. Purchase of children's books	15.8%	19.1%	18.7%
Category 2. Reading Practices	5.5%	6.1%	15.5%
Category 3. Language practices implemented by the family	20.4%	27.4%	27.5%
Category 4. Use of sophisticated language	13%	18%	26.3%
Category 5. Language command	15%	18%	28.3%
Category 6. Types of Games and use of teaching materials	15.2%	13.9%	19.7%
Category 7. Text carriers	17.5%	20%	22%
Category 8. Models at home	11.3%	14%	20.6%
Category 9. Physical resources used for literacy purposes	12.2%	18.3%	26.1%

ries of literacy practices, except for category 1, regarding the purchase of children's books, where the average level obtains a greater percentage, followed by the high and low level, respectively. As table 2 demonstrates, the higher the socio-economic level is, the more often literacy practices increases are implemented, except for category 1, regarding the purchase of children's books, and category 6, regarding the types of games and use of didactic material. Therefore, the families of a higher socio-economic level implement literacy practices such as reading literacy practices, language practices implemented by the families, use of sophisticated language, language command, text carriers, models at home and physical resources used for literacy purposes more often, followed by the families of an average and a lower level.

### Objective 2

Checking the existence of a significant relationship between literacy practices and the type of family (single-parent, nuclear and large).

To achieve this goal, the results obtained are described using the chi-square test ( $\chi^2$ ) and a significance level of 5% ( $p < .05$ ). When such significance is obtained, the corrected studentised residuals are analysed as they allow for a

more accurate interpretation of the relationship's significance. These corrected studentised residuals, averaging zero and having a standard deviation of one, tell us that those scores above 1.96 show more cases than there would have been if the variables analysed were independent and, on the contrary, those scores below -1.96 show less cases than expected under the independence criterion.

The results that show a significant relationship between the variables analysed are described in table 3 below.

As shown in table 3, there is a significantly greater number of single-parent families in category 1, purchase of children's books, compared to large and nuclear families that buy books when they go shopping, let their children pick books and buy 1-5 books every year.

In category 2, reading practices, there is a significantly greater number of single-parent and nuclear families compared to large families that read books to their children, ask them about what has been read and provide written materials.

In category 3, language practices implemented by the family, there is a significantly greater percentage of single-parent families compared to nuclear and large families that teach children's songs and correct their children's linguistic pronunciation.

In category 4, use of sophisticated language, there is a significantly greater percentage of single-parent families compared to nuclear and large families that let their children share their concerns. As far as explaining the rules is concerned, there is a significantly greater percentage of single-parent and nuclear families compared to large families that implements this literacy strategy.

In category 5, language command, there is a significantly greater number of single-parent and nuclear families compared to large families

Table 3. Results of the significant relationship between literacy practices and types of families

Literacy Practices	$\chi^2$	p	Type of Family
<b>Category 1</b>			
Books are included in the shopping list	17.81	.000	Single-parent
Let the child pick books	26.25	.000	Single-parent
Buys 1-5 books every year	19.75	.000	Single-parent
<b>Category 2</b>			
Read stories to the children	38.82	.000	Single-parent and Nuclear
Make question about what has been read	20.45	.002	Single-parent and Nuclear
Provide written materials	25.85	.000	Single-parent and Nuclear
<b>Category 3</b>			
Teach children's songs	17.14	.000	Single-parent
Correct linguistic pronunciation	10.41	.005	Single-parent
<b>Category 4</b>			
Explain the rules	55.26	.000	Single-parent and Nuclear
Share concerns	21.32	.002	Single-parent
<b>Category 5</b>			
Ask about his/her behaviour in the classroom	30.15	.000	Single-parent and Nuclear
Explain his/her tantrums	37.54	.000	Single-parent and Nuclear
Make questions about what he/she knows	40.50	.000	Single-parent
<b>Category 6</b>			
Have didactic materials at home	47.42	.000	Single-parent and Nuclear
Have crayons	23.07	.000	Single-parent
Use the materials throughout the week	32.66	.000	Single-parent and Nuclear
Draw at home	21.54	.001	Nuclear
Use the computer	51.49	.000	Single-parent and Nuclear
<b>Category 7</b>			
Make recipes with his/her son/daughter	21.66	.000	Single-parent
Read labels to his/her son/daughter	33.60	.000	Single-parent
Read signs to his/her son/daughter	34.66	.000	Single-parent and Nuclear
<b>Category 8</b>			
Write notes	17.14	.000	Single-parent
Read in the presence of his/her son/daughter	23.17	.000	Single-parent
Do house chores with his/her children	23.83	.000	Single-parent
Do the shopping list with his/her son/daughter	10.00	.007	Single-parent
<b>Category 9</b>			
Have a library at home	52.24	.000	Single-parent and Nuclear
Have a place to do his/her homework	40.17	.000	Single-parent

that ask their children how they behave in class and provide an explanation when they have a tantrum. As far as asking the child about what he/she knows, a significantly greater percentage of single-parent families compared to nuclear and large families implements this literacy strategy.

In category 6, types of games and use of teaching materials, there is a significantly greater number of single-parent and nuclear families compared to large families that have teaching materials at home and use them and also use a computer. As far as drawing at home is concerned, a greater percentage of nuclear families compared to sin-

gle-parent and large families implement this literacy strategy. Having pencils or crayons at home is more frequent in single-parent families compared to nuclear and large families.

In category 7, *text carriers*, there is a significantly greater percentage of single-parent families compared to nuclear and large families that make recipes and read labels to their children. Furthermore, the percentage of single-parent and nuclear families that read signs to their children is significantly greater compared to large families.

In category 8, *models at home*, there is a significantly greater number of single-parent families compared to nuclear and large families that write notes, read in the presence of their children, do house chores and do the shopping list with them.

In category 9, *physical resources used for literacy purposes*, there is a significantly greater number of single-parent families compared to nuclear and large families that have a specific place to do the homework for their children; and there is a greater percentage of single-parent and nuclear families compared to large families that have a library at home.

In short, the single-parent family implements all the literacy practices significantly more often.

## Discussion and conclusions

The family is the first cultural context for children and where the first steps that make literacy possible are taken, starting their literacy practices through shared reading of books with their families, approaching printed materials such as magazines, newspapers or labels and through making labels to communicate, etc. Urquijo, Navarro & García (2010) found a relationship between the resources used for literacy purposes and those reading-writing skills gained.

This study tries to describe literacy practices implemented by the families in childhood education and to analyse the significant relationship between literacy practices and the different types of family (single-parent, nuclear and large).

More generally, the results show that there is a significant relationship between certain literacy practices and the type of family that implements them. More specifically, single-parent families are significantly related to the implementation of literacy strategies of all the categories analysed (*purchase of children's books, reading practices, language practices implemented by the family, use of sophisticated language, language command, types of games and use of teaching materials, text carriers, models at home and physical resources for literacy purposes*). Nuclear families are significantly related to six categories (*reading practices, use of sophisticated language, language command, types of games and use of teaching materials, text carriers and physical resources for literacy purposes*) and the large families are not significantly related to the implementation of literacy practices. Therefore, depending on the sample size, single-parent families implement more literacy practices, nuclear families only implement some of them and large families do not implement any of them.

The absence of studies comparing the types of families and the implementation of literacy practices leads us to measure the study data against theoretical approaches in this respect. In this sense, the results obtained in this study showing that single-parent families implement significantly more literacy practices run in direct opposition to the theory of Bogess (1998) that single-parent families are in conditions of inequality from an educational and economic point of view compared to two-parent families and also in direct opposition to the approach of Azuara (2009) that nuclear families promote a more harmonious atmosphere to implement literacy practices. Therefore, the results of this

empirical study reflect a practical and daily reality nowadays that is different to the theoretical explanations. This may be well due to the own features of the sample used in this study or to the fact that the current configuration of the types of families are far from the theoretical concepts of families generated years ago. For this reason, more studies focusing on today's society are necessary, given the ongoing evolution of family structures, to enable us to identify how each type of family can contribute to the literacy of children in their early years.

Regarding the socio-economic level and literacy practices, the results obtained in this study showing that those families of a higher socio-economic level implement most literacy practices are in line with the data obtained in other studies (De-Coulon *et al.*, 2008; Neuman, 2016) in which those families of a higher socio-economic level are more prone to perform literacy practices with their children. Some authors (Duncan & Seymour, 2000; Strang & Piasta, 2016) even state that the reason for these results lies in the fact that the socio-economic level generated a richer literacy atmosphere in which children are more exposed to literacy than in other socio-economic levels.

The results obtained in this study provide educational professionals with information to create action plans in the field of literacy practices mainly aimed at nuclear and large families of an average and low socio-economic level. Cánovas, Sahuquillo, Cuñat & Martínez (2014) suggest setting up this type of plans through family guidance, by providing the parents with a guide to encourage their children's skills during childhood education. Nowadays there are action plans in place (Saracho, 2008; Shapiro & Solity, 2008; Sylva, Scott, Totsika, Ereky-Stevens & Crook, 2008) that promote literacy practices in the early years by enhancing the linguistic and conceptual skills of children. Any action plan aimed at those families that implement literacy strategies must include games such as 'I spy' or activities such as reading the name of objects from home, spelling words, describing everyday

objects, telling a story using objects from home, naming letters and numbers, telling words using syllables with the parents' support, identifying letters by their sounds, writing basic numbers and letters and their names, tongue twisters, riddles, singing songs, repeating words, shared reading, making posters of objects of rooms of the house, listening to stories being told, etc.

This exploratory study would yield more significant results if the sample size was bigger and the contaminating variables were controlled, as they may have a certain impact and they are not set forth in the study. For this reason, it would be interesting to conduct other exploratory studies that include more families, that bear in mind the relationship between literacy practices and academic performance in certain areas of the education of childhood education, and that analyse the technological methods and instruments that promote the implementation of such literacy practices at home.

## References

- Allen, S., & Daly, K. (2002). The effects of father involvement: A summary of the research evidence. *The FII-ONews*, 1, 1-11.
- Andrés, M., Urquijo, S., Navarro, J., & García, M. (2010). Contexto alfabetizador familiar: relaciones con la adquisición de habilidades prelectoras y desempeño lector. *European Journal of Education and Psychology*, 3(1), 129-140.
- Armstrong, R., Scott, J., Copland, D., McMahon, K., Khan, A., Najman, J., & Arnott, W. (2016). Predicting receptive vocabulary change from childhood to adulthood: A birth cohort study. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 64, 78-90. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2016.10.002>
- Armstrong, R., Scott, J., Whitehouse, A., Copland, D., McMahon, K., & Arnott, W. (2017). Late talkers and later language outcomes: Predicting the different language trajectories. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 19(3), 237-250. doi: <http://doi.org/10.1080/17549507.2017.1296191>.
- Azuara, P. (2009). *Literacy practices in a changing cultural context: the literacy development of*

- two emergent mayan-spanish bilingual children (Disertación Doctoral, University of Arizona, 2009). *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences*, 70(6-A), 1885.
- Barca, A., Mascarenhas, S., Brenlla, J., & Morán, H. (2012). Contextos de aprendizaje, determinantes familiares y rendimiento escolar del alumnado de educación secundaria en Galicia. *Revista amazónica*, 9(2), 370-412.
- Bazán, A., Sánchez, B., & Castañeda, S. (2007). Relación estructural entre apoyo familiar, nivel educativo de los padres, características del maestro y desempeño en lengua escrita. *Revista Mexicana de Investigación Educativa*, 12, 701-729.
- Cánovas, P., Sahuquillo, M., Cuñat, C., & Martínez, C. (2014). Estrategias de intervención socioeducativa con familias: Análisis de la orientación familiar en los servicios especializados de atención a la familia e infancia de la comunidad valenciana. *Educación XXI*, 17(2), 265-288. doi: <http://doi.org/10.5944/educxx1.17.2.11491>.
- Córdoba, L., García, V., Luengo, L., Vizúete, M., & Feu, S. (2011). Determinantes socioculturales: su relación con el rendimiento académico en alumnos de Enseñanza Secundaria Obligatoria. *Revista de Investigación Educativa*, 29, 93-96.
- DeBaryshe, B., & Binder, J. (1994). Evaluation of an instrument for measuring parents' beliefs about reading aloud to young children. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 78, 1303-1311. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1994.78.3c.1303>
- DeBaryshe, B., Binder, J., & Buell, M. (2000). Mothers' implicit theories of early literacy instruction: implications for children's reading and writing. *Early Child Development and Care*, 160(1), 119-131. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0030443001600111>
- De-Coulon, A., Maschi, E., & Vignoles, A. (2008). *Parents' basic skills and their children's test scores: Results from the BCS70, 2004 parents and children assessments*. London: NRDC.
- De-León, B. (2011). *La relación familia-escuela y su repercusión en la autonomía y responsabilidad de los niños/as*. Paper presented in XII Congreso Internacional de Teoría de la Educación, Barcelona, España.
- Duncan, L., & Seymour, P. (2000). Socio-economic differences in foundation level literacy. *British Journal of Psychology*, 91, 145-166.
- Eslava, A., Deaño, M., Alfonso, S., Conde, A., & García-Señorán, M. (2016). Family context and preschool learning. *Journal of Family Studies*, 22(2), 182-201. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13229400.2015.1063445>.
- Fajardo, F., Maestre, M., Felipe, E., León, B., & Polo, M. (2017). Análisis del rendimiento académico de los alumnos de Educación Secundaria Obligatoria según las variables familiares. *Educación XXI*, 20(1), 209-232. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5944/educXX1.14475>.
- Fan, X., & Chen, M. (2001). Parental Involvement and students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 13, 1-22. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009048817385>.
- Flórez, R., Restrepo, M., & Schwanenflugel, P. (2009). Promoción del alfabetismo inicial y prevención de las dificultades en la lectura: una experiencia pedagógica en el aula preescolar. *Avances en Psicología latinoamericana*, 27(1), 79-96.
- Flouri, E., & Buchanan, A. (2004). Early father's and mother's involvement and child's later educational outcomes. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74, 141-153.
- Gest, S., Freeman, N., Domitrovich, C., & Welsh, J. (2004). Shared book reading and children's language comprehension skills: the moderating role of parental discipline practices. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 19, 319-336. doi: <http://10.1016/j.ecresq.2004.04.007>.
- Guevara, Y., Rugerío, J. P., Delgado, U., Hermosillo, A., & López, A. (2010). Alfabetización emergente en niños preescolares de bajo nivel sociocultural: Una evaluación conductual. *Revista Mexicana de Psicología Educativa*, 1(1), 31-40.
- Hamilton, L., Hayiou-Thomas, M., Hulme, C., & Snowling, M. (2016). The home literacy environment as a predictor of the early literacy development of children at family-risk of dyslexia. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 20(5), 401-419. doi: <http://10.1080/10888438.2016.1213266>.

- Harris, A., & Goodall, J. (2007). *Engaging parents in raising achievement: do parents know they matter?* London: DCSF.
- Hernández, M., Gomariz, M., Parra, J., & García, P. (2016) Familia, inmigración y comunicación con el centro escolar: Un estudio comparativo. *Educación XXI*, 19(2), 127-151. doi: <http://10.5944/educXX1.14229>
- Kaufman, A. (2009). *Leer y escribir: el día a día en las aulas*. Colombia: Norma.
- Marjanovič-Umek, L., Fekonja-Peklaja, U., Sočana, G., & Tašnerb, V. (2015). A socio-cultural perspective on children's early language: a family study. *European early childhood education research Journal*, 23(1), 69-85. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1350293X.2014.991096>.
- Martínez, M., Álvarez, B., & Fernández, A. (2009). *Orientación familiar*. Madrid: Sanz y Torres.
- McKean, C., Mensah, F.K., Eadie, P., Bavin, E.L., Bretherton, L., Cini, E., & Reilly, S. (2015). Levers for language growth: Characteristics and predictors of language trajectories between 4 and 7 years. *PLoS One*, 10, e0134251. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0134251>.
- Morrow, L. (2009). *Literacy development in the early years. Helping children read and write*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Mullis, R., Mullis, A., Cornille, T., Ritchson, A., & Sullender, M. (2004). *Early literacy outcomes and parent involvement*. Tallahassee, FL: Florida State University.
- Neumann, M. (2016). A socioeconomic comparison of emergent literacy and home literacy in Australian preschoolers. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 24, 555-566. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1350293X.2016.1189722>.
- Oliva, E., & Villa, V. (2014). Hacia un concepto interdisciplinario de la familia en la globalización. *Justicia Juris*, 10(1), 11-20.
- Pears, K., Kim, H., Fisher, P., & Yoerger, K. (2016). Increasing pre-kindergarten early literacy skills in children with developmental disabilities and delays. *Journal of School Psychology*, 57, 15-27. doi: <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2016.05.004>.
- Purcell-Gates, V., Degener, S., Jacobson, E., & Soler, M. (2001). Impact of authentic adult literacy instruction on adult literacy practices. *Reading research quarterly*, 37, 70-92.
- Rogoff, B. (2002). *The cultural nature of human development*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Romero, S., Arias, M., & Chavarría, M. (2007). Identificación de prácticas relacionadas con el lenguaje, la lectura y la escritura en familias costarricenses. *Actualidades Investigativas en Educación*, 7(3), 1-15.
- Ruggerio, J., & Guevara, Y. (2015). Alfabetización inicial y su desarrollo desde la educación infantil. Revisión del concepto e investigaciones aplicadas. *Ocnos*, 13, 25-42. doi: [http://doi.org/10.18239/ocnos\\_2015.13.02](http://doi.org/10.18239/ocnos_2015.13.02).
- Saracho, O. (2008). Fathers and young children's literacy experiences. *Early Child Development and Care*, 178(7), 837- 852. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430802352251>.
- Schaub, M. (2015). Is there a home advantage in school readiness for young children? Trends in parent engagement in cognitive activities with young children. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 13, 47-63. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476718X12468122>.
- Shapiro, L., & Solity, J. (2008). Delivering phonological and phonics training with whole-class teaching. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 78(4), 597-620. doi: <http://doi.org/10.1348/000709908X293850>.
- Shively J., & Thomas, A. (2008). Understanding family literacy. In *Foundations in Family Literacy*. Alberta, CA: Centre for Family Literacy.
- Strang, T., & Piasta, S. (2016). Socioeconomic differences in code-focused emergent literacy skills. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 29, 1337-1362. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-016-9639-7>.
- Suárez, N., Tuero-Herrero, E., Bernardo, A., Fernández, E., Cerezo, R., González-Pienda, J.,...& Núñez, J. (2011). El fracaso escolar en Educación Secundaria: Análisis del papel de la implicación familiar. *Magister: Revista miscelánea de investigación*, 24, 49-64.
- Sylva, K., Scott, S., Totsika, V., Ereky-Stevens, K., & Crook, C. (2008). Training parents to help their children read: a randomized control trial. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 78(3), 435-455. doi: <http://doi.org/10.1348/000709907X255718>.

- Tam, B., Findlay, L., & Kohen, D. (2017). Indigenas families: who do you call family? *Journal of Family Studies*, 23(3), 243-259. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13229400.2015.1093536>.
- Teberosky, A. y Soler, M. (2003). *Contextos de alfabetización Inicial*. Barcelona: Horsori.
- Treiman, R., Decker, K., Robins S., Ghosg, D., & Rosales, N. (2017). Parent-child conversations about literacy: a longitudinal, observational study. *Journal Child Language*, 1-15. doi: <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000917000307>.
- Vanormelingen, L., & Gillis, S. (2016). The influence of socio-economic status on mothers' volubility and responsiveness in a monolingual Dutch-speaking sample. *First Language*, 36, 140-156. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0142723716639502>.
- Wade, B., & Moore, M. (2000). A sure start with books. *Early Years*, 20, 39-46. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0957514000200205>.
- Wasik, B., & Bond, M. (2001). Beyond the pages of a book: Interactive book reading in pre-school classrooms. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93, 43-50. doi: <http://doi.org/10.1037//0022-0663.93.2.243>.
- Waskik B., & Herrmann S., (2004) Family literacy: history, concepts, services In B. Wasik, (Eds), *Handbook of family literacy* (pp. 3.-22). Erlbaum Mahwah.
- World Family Map (2017). *Mapping family change and child well-being outcomes*. New York: Social Trends Institute.

## Schedule 1. Questionnaire of Literacy Practices

Instructions: please mark with a cross the answer that best suits you.

Questions	Answers		
<b>Category 1. Purchase of children's books</b>			
You include books or children's books when shopping.	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
You buy books or children's books in the book store.	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
You let the child pick books or other books when buying them.	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
How many children's books have you bought for your son/daughter this year (1-5)?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<b>Category 2. Reading Practices</b>			
You read children's books or tales to your children, frequently or always.	Always	Frequently	Never
You ask your children about the story or book read, frequently or always.	Always	Frequently	Never
You provide your children with written materials such as magazines, newspapers or directories, among others, frequently or always.	Always	Frequently	Never
<b>Category 3. Language practices implemented by the family</b>			
You teach children's songs to your children	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
You play verbal games such as poems, rhyme or riddles with your children.	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
You correct the way your children use the language (Pronunciation).	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
You play music or read children's books to your children.	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<b>Category 4. Use of sophisticated language</b>			
You explain the reason for rules to your children.	Always	Frequently	Never
You give an answer to the concerns of your children when they ask questions.	Always	Frequently	Never
You talk with your children about their emotions, sensations or feelings.	Always	Frequently	Never
You talk with your children about everyday life at home.	Always	Frequently	Never
You let your children share their concerns.	Always	Frequently	Never
<b>Category 5. Language command</b>			
You ask your children how they behaved at school, frequently or always.	Always	Frequently	Never
When your children have a tantrum, you provide an explanation and analyse the situation together, frequently or always.	Always	Frequently	Never
You tell your children how to behave depending on the place and the time, frequently or always.	Always	Frequently	Never
You ask your children questions about what they know, frequently or always.	Always	Frequently	Never
You let them tell about events that happen to them, frequently or always.	Always	Frequently	Never
<b>Category 6. Types of Games and use of teaching materials</b>			
You have teaching materials for your children at home, such as logical blocks, lotteries and puzzles, among others).	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
You have crayons, soft plastics, paper and scissors for your children at home.	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No
How many times per week do your children use these materials, frequently or always.	Always	Frequently	Never
Your children child draw, paint or create at home, frequently or always.	Always	Frequently	Never
You play children's games with your children such as roll, roll, mouse and cat or the clock, among others, frequently or always.	Always	Frequently	Never
Your children uses the computer to play games and perform other activities.	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No

<b>Category 7 Text carriers</b>			
You make recipes with your children.	Yes		No
You read common labels -such as the milk brand- to your children at home.	Yes		No
You read signs or labels to your children while you are walking.	Yes		No
You teach your children the letters of his/her name.	Yes		No
<b>Category 8. Models at home</b>			
You write notes to communicate at home and leave them in a visible spot.	Yes		No
You read the newspaper, magazines or other publications in the presence of your children.	Yes		No
You talk with your children about what you are reading or the news you are reading.	Yes		No
Your children do their homework by hand or using a computer.	Yes		No
You make a shopping list together with your children before going to the market.	Yes		No
<b>Category 9. Physical resources used for literacy purposes</b>			
You have a library or a shelf at home where books are placed.	Yes		No
You have a specific place to read or do other homework at home.	Yes		No
You have a computer at home.	Yes		No