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CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

Introduction

In various instructional modes, whether in a formal or informal setting, the ultimate aim is to create conditions that will result in changes in the behavior of a specific learner or group of learners. To effect these changes, the educator has to be concerned with various instructional methods that will assist learners in meeting their educational needs and objectives.

One group of potential learners that is of particular concern to Extension educators is young families. For many reasons this has, traditionally, been a difficult group to reach with adult education programs. From a study conducted in Indiana, Goble (1964) pointed out that some reasons young homemakers did not participate in adult education group learning activities were: a lack of knowledge of existing programs; child care responsibilities; a lack of appropriate group composition; a lack of group activities located in their community; a lack of confidence in their own group skills; and the belief that adult education programs were designed for older women. At the same time, young adults
have indicated an interest in Extension adult education programs, however they are unwilling or unable to participate in many group type activities. In a study conducted by Shultz and Riggs (1972), young homemakers expressed an interest in Extension programs. They further expressed a definite preference for receiving their adult education programs through printed materials that would permit them to learn at their own convenience. This indicates a need for self-instructional methods that provide for the needs of individuals to work at their own pace, without competing with anyone except themselves. This could also solve other problems: transportation, child care, and time away from home, that young adults, especially homemakers, may have.

One strategy for providing self-instructional materials that seems appropriate for getting adult education to young families is the use of self-instructional learning packages. With these packages the learner can become actively involved in an entire course or a specific behavioral objective in a subject matter area.

Statement of the Problem

In view of the importance of involving young families in Extension education programs, along with the fact that young adults have traditionally been a difficult audience to reach, it is imperative that various types of instructional methods be explored to provide information to this group. The major purpose of this study was to evaluate the
effectiveness of self-instructional learning packages as one method of providing subject matter to young families. More specifically, the study was designed to answer the following questions:

1. Can a self-instructional learning package be an effective method of providing subject matter to young families?

2. Is follow-up assistance needed by young families when using self-instructional learning packages? If follow-up assistance is needed, what type of assistance is most effective?

3. How will young families feel about receiving subject matter information via self-instructional learning packages?

Significance of the Problem

In the United States over 50 million young women and men are between the ages of 18 and 34 years old. Approximately 30 per cent of the total population is now in the 15 to 34 age group (1970 Census). In terms of numbers there are many young adults to be involved in adult educational activities. These numbers also add up to the probability of a larger proportion of new family units being formed.

In our nation there are 33 million women in the labor force. Many of these are members of young families; about half of all wives in their early twenties and 40 per cent of those in their late twenties are employed. Schram and Vaughn
(1976) point out, that with "equal rights" legislation and social pressure the employed homemaker is a reality that is here to stay. Employed homemakers seldom feel they have the time and energy for meetings and classes. They cannot take advantage of classes during the regular work hours, and after work they assume their other role as homemaker, therefore many are not willing to attend evening meetings and classes. Where young children are also involved many prefer to spend their time away from their employment with the children.

Programs need to be designed specifically for young families, based on their needs. These programs need to be delivered through various methodologies that are geared to the life styles and preferences of young families. McCormick (1969) found that a group of urban young homemakers in Cincinnati, Ohio, a larger proportion preferred television and correspondence courses as methods of study over classes. McCormick concluded, if educational programs are to meet the needs of this audience, content must have a high degree of specificity and instructional methods must be varied.

The interest of Extension professionals in reaching and teaching young families has increased in recent years. Assisting this group presents a real challenge, especially since many of the traditional methods have failed to provide for their needs. In 1958, the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) noted that an increasing
proportion of families in either the very young or older
groups requires special adjustments in educational programs
to provide the type of programs needed to help them. It also
pointed out that a wide range of methods and subject matter
would be needed to provide for the needs and interests of
young adults. Still, today we have many young families who
could benefit from Extension's teaching, as well as those of
other adult education agencies, that are not participating in
these programs. The keys to reaching some of them seem to be
in locating and identifying them; informing them of Extension
as an available resource; determining their needs; and
developing or utilizing effective methods of providing learn-
ing experiences for them.

For years group methods have been used widely by most
adult education agencies including Extension. However, a
proportion of Extension agents' time is focused on attempting,
by various methods, to provide individuals with self-instruc-
tional materials. Some of these methods include bulletins,
letters and news articles; while others are organized into
correspondence courses and instructional packages. Although
they are developed and used, little has been done in Extension
to evaluate the effectiveness of these self-instructional
methods with specific groups.

Self-Instructional learning packages have been used
by various other agencies of adult education, however very
little research on the effectiveness of these packages has
been found. That which does exist appears to be limited to structured or semi-structured groups such as Adult Basic Education learners and in-service education for professionals, e.g., teachers and nurses. Neither of these groups are representative of the young family audience that Extension is attempting to involve. Buttedahl and Verner (1965) point out, research indicates that adult education activities conducted by different institutions tend to involve different kinds of people in their program. It would be helpful to Extension educators if the effectiveness of self-instructional learning packages were evaluated. If it is found that this is an effective instructional method with Extension-type audiences, then it would give some credence for the development and use of more learning packages to teach young adults. On the other hand, if self-instructional learning packages prove to be ineffective, the time spend developing them could possible be devoted to other methods proven by research to be more useful in assisting Extension audiences.

The Objectives

The major objective of this study was to determine the effectiveness of the use of self-instructional learning packages with young family members in Virginia. More specifically the objectives were:

1. To determine if young families will use self-instructional learning packages as a method for
acquiring subject matter.

2. To determine if young family members who read the subject matter in the self-instructional learning packages gained more knowledge about the subject matter content than those who did not read them.

3. To determine if follow-up assistance to the self-instructional learning packages affects the time spent using the packages, the amount of learning that occurs and young families' attitudes about the use of organized self-instructional materials.

4. To determine if the variables age, formal educational level, employment status and income level of young families are related to the amount of learning they will acquire from self-instructional learning packages.

5. To determine if there are relationships between the variables age, formal educational level, and employment status of young family members and the time they will spend studying the self-instructional packages.

6. To determine if there are relationships between the variables age, formal educational level, and employment status of young family members and their attitude concerning the use of self-instructional learning packages as a method for receiving subject matter information.
Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated for testing in relation to the objectives of the study. They were based on a review of related literature, personal observations and consultations with members of the teaching and Extension staffs of The Ohio State University and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. The hypotheses were:

1. Parents of pre-school children who study the self-instructional learning packages and receive planned periodic follow-up assistance will score higher on a cognitive test than will those who study the packages with an option to ask for follow-up assistance; those who study the packages without follow-up assistance; or those who do not receive the packages.

2. Parents of pre-school children who study the self-instructional packages and receive a planned periodic follow-up assistance will score higher on an attitude test than will those who study the packages with an option to ask for follow-up assistance or those who study the packages without follow-up assistance.

3. Parents of pre-school children who study the self-instructional learning packages and receive planned periodic follow-up will spend more time
reading the materials than will those who study
the packages with an option to ask for follow-
up assistance or those who study the packages
without follow-up assistance.

4. There will be relationships between scores of
parents of pre-school children on a cognitive
post test and their age, educational level,
employment status and income.

a. Younger (below 30) parents of pre-school
children will score higher on a cognitive
test than will older parents of pre-school
children.

b. Parents of pre-school children with higher
levels of formal educational attainment will
score higher on a cognitive test than will
those with lower levels of educational
attainment.

c. Parents of pre-school children who are not
employed will score higher on a cognitive
test than will those employed part-time or
full-time; those employed part-time will
score higher than those employed full-time.

d. Parents of pre-school children with higher
incomes will score higher on a cognitive
test than will those with lower income.
5. There will be relationships between the time spent by parents of pre-school children studying the self-instructional learning packages and their age, formal education and employment status.
   a. Older (31 and over) parents of pre-school children will spend more time reading the self-instructional learning packages than will younger parents of pre-school children.
   b. Parents of pre-school children with higher levels of formal educational attainment will spend less time reading the self-instructional learning packages than will those with lower levels of educational attainment.
   c. Non-employed parents of pre-school children will spend more time reading the self-instructional learning packages than will those employed part-time or full-time. Those employed part-time will spend more time than will those employed full-time.

6. There will be relationships between the attitudes of parents of pre-school children regarding the use of self-instructional learning packages as a teaching method and their age, formal education and employment status.
   a. Older (31 and over) parents of pre-school children will score higher on an attitude
test than will younger parents of pre-school children.

b. Parents of pre-school children with higher levels of formal educational attainment will score higher on an attitude test than will those with lower levels of educational attainment.

c. Employed parents of pre-school children will score higher on an attitude test than will those not employed. Those employed part-time will score higher than those employed full-time.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations of this study are recognized:

1. The study was limited to a sample from one subgroup of young families: parents of pre-school children.

2. In obtaining the names of parents of pre-school children, ages of parents were not specified, consequently some of the parents of the study are above the age recognized as falling in the young adult age group.

3. The study was limited to variations in interpretations of the self-instructional learning
packages by sample.

4. The study was limited to the degree of assistance provided by Extension agent to the groups who were to receive their assistance.

5. Portions of the study were limited to variations in interpretations of supportive materials provided for Extension agent to assist some segments of the sample.

6. The study was limited to the extent subjects were not confined rigidly, no check was made as to the honesty of their performance on the post-test.

Definition of Terms

**Extension Agent.** A professional educator employed, by the Extension Division of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, to provide educational opportunities to meet the needs of the people in the cities and counties of Virginia.

**Local Extension Unit.** A county or city served by an Extension staff who provides educational opportunities to the citizen of that county or city.

**Parents of Pre-school Children.** Parents of children from Infancy through five years old, who have not reached the age for the first grade of formal education. These parents
are usually considered a sub-group of young families.

**Self-Instruction.** Any method that employs a self-contained, self-paced activity toward a stated objective using an approach that requires minimum interaction between the learner and a teacher.

**Self-Instructional Learning Packages.** A set of self-contained instructional materials that are designed to teach a single concept. The package guides the learner through self-study materials individually and independently (Sepede, 1972).

**Young Families.** A family, as used in this study goes beyond the traditional concept of the nuclear family of mother and father living together, caring for their own children. Young families as used here include:

- couples with or without children
- several adults living together
- single parents
- single adults living independent of the parental unit.

The ages 15 to 34 years old covers most individuals that fall into the young family group.
CHAPTER II

RELATED SCIENCE AND PRACTICE

Introduction

Self-instructional teaching methods are gaining significance in adult education as various organizations and institutions attempt to reach adults who are unwilling or unable to receive instruction through group methods. Some agencies are employing self-instructional methods in combination with group methods and individual consultation. As with other methods, self-instructional methods are based on the concept that learning is accomplished by the adult learner himself and that all learning experiences should actively involve the learner.

Self instruction can be defined as any method that employs a self-contained, self-paced activity toward a stated objective using an approach that requires a minimum interaction between the learner and a teacher. One self-instructional method that has been employed with adults is the use of learning packages to impart subject matter.
Learning Packages

Hofmelster and Reanes (1974: 55) define a learning package as a "systematized way of delivering content and process to learners." They note that the term package infers, materials that are self-contained and portable. This definition is supported by Sepede (1972), however, his definition seems more specific. According to Sepede, a learning package is a set of self-contained instructional materials that are designed to teach a single concept. It guides the learner through self-study materials individually and independently.

A learning package can be as sophisticated or simple as the designer determines is necessary or applicable under a set of given circumstances. They can provide various approaches or a single approach to teach a single topic in a coordinated series of learning experiences (Sepede, 1972). Hofmelster and Reanes note that, packages can be designed to use various support services, such as slides, films and the computer. On the other hand, they can be limited to "pencil-and-paper" packages. Packages do not have to be elaborate; they can contain a single guide and only one piece of printed material on the concept to be taught. Belland (1975) contends that many packages are limited to the printed format because this is the least expensive to design and most teachers and developers are most familiar with printed materials. They are
also the least expensive to use; they require no hardware such as a projector and computer. Belland, does point out that packets can be designed to use one medium or a combination of media where the learner has the opportunity to employ several of the senses at a given time.

Regardless of the medium used, Sepede (1972) declared that learning packages should contain: the major concept to be learned and some sub-concepts; behavior objectives; pre-test; content to be learned; various methodology to motivate the learner; and study activities to add depth to the learning experience. This view is supported by Parson, Trent, et.al. (1976) who developed some criteria for evaluating learning packages as a prelude to the development of packages for teaching 4-H volunteers. They suggest that learning packages be analyzed and evaluated in the following areas: objectives, subject matter, design characteristics, learning activities, adaptability, validity and evaluation. This group of authors, further note that the use of learning packages provide an opportunity for both the teacher and the learner to "mutually share" the responsibility for learning. The teacher, then becomes a facilitator of learning.

Advantages

Self-Instructional learning packages offer some advantages to both learners and the educator. Foremost, they permit a learner to proceed at his or her own rate of progress. Johnson (1971) pointed out that the learner can
take as much or as little time as is necessary to "grasp" a concept. This also eliminates the "wasting" of another learner's time, since each learner has his own unique rate of learning. Hiller and Hiller (1975) suggest that in self-instructional modular learning, time is a variable, not a constant.

Kuzsman and MacIsaac (1975) support this idea. They contend that learners can work at their own achievement level as well as according to their own particular learning style. These authors further note, that with learning packages learners "cease to be passive recipients of knowledge, and instead are very active participants in the learning process (p. 38)." Learners, then, learn how to learn because they are responsible for their own learning. Along these lines Johnson (1971) indicates that the use of learning packages permits the learner to be involved in a more highly individualized environment for learning.

Learning packages provide learners the opportunity to learn where they want to because they are portable. They can be designed where little or no hardware is needed. Self-teaching is the key, therefore the bodily presents of a teacher is not necessarily required.

Through the use of learning packages, learners can get information when it is needed. They do not have to wait for the beginning of a course. They can start in a program at any time. A learner can also study just a particular
skill and not "waste" time on that in which he is not interested.

Learning packages can include multimedia and methodologies. They can employ the use of tapes, slides, films, pictures, diagrams, charts and book articles as well as field trips, games, case studies and so forth (Johnson, 1971), (Kuzsman and MacIsaac, 1975) and (Belland, 1975).

Learning packages can be developed for use in any field of study. They have an added advantage in that once a package is developed it can be used with many individuals when they need it. This eliminates tying up the educator's time working on the same problem with various individuals at different times.

Limitations

Belland (1975) pointed out that some learners have more ability for self-direction and initiation of their own learning, than do others. Some are more intrinsically motivated while others depend on encouragement from others. Self-instructional learning packages do not provide for encouragement from others. Where a learner is motivated only by extrinsic forces and need the presence of others, self-instructional methods may not provide for his or her needs.

Kuzsman and MacIsaac (1975) suggest that many limitations associated with learning packages are not in the approach, rather, they "result from deficiencies in the procedure for writing...prescriptions." According to these
authors, the shortcoming is in writing learning activities that would result in the learner practicing the objective. Johnson (1971) notes that, what is needed is creative and skilled instructors to develop learning packages.

In *The Inquiring Mind*, Houle (1963) concludes that some adults participate in learning activities for the participation or social element. They want the contact with other people. Self-Instructional learning packages used independently do not provide for social contact.

**Related Research**

Many articles on the use of self-instructional learning packages have been written. Most are not research studies and they deal with the use of learning packages with children or college students. A search for related research revealed that few studies have dealt with the effectiveness of learning packages as an instructional method in adult education. Kotaska and Dickinson (1975) suggest, that research on the effectiveness of individual methods with adult audiences is sketchy and inconclusive.

A study to determine if the use of learning packages for in-service training of teachers would be more effective than a more conventional instructional method was reported by Meeks (1971). An experimental group was taught specific concepts by using prepared learning packages. The control group was taught the same concepts by "conventional"
techniques using the regular class instructor. All students kept records of the amount of time spent on the materials; the experimental group was surveyed to measure their attitude toward the packages. Meeks, noted that at the .10 level the results indicated that the learning package method of instruction was significantly more effective than the conventional methods. Opinions from students on the use of learning packages as an instructional method were favorable. No significant difference was found in the time spent in study by the two groups.

Dickerson and Roberts (1974) analyzed the effectiveness of prepackaged Instruction as an approach for in-service training of employed rehabilitation counselors. Two hundred and five subjects were placed in two groups: treatment and control. The study ended with analyses being done on three groups: experimental who took the package, experimental who did not take the package and control group. Pre-test and post-test were given to all subjects. The study findings showed that all groups improved their total information, however, the experimental group who took the learning units had significantly higher scores than the other groups. The authors concluded that a packaged instructional approach for in-service for this group appears promising, however they questioned how many would use the approach on a voluntary basis.
A study that indicates the effectiveness of learning packages from a different perspective was conducted by Hofmeister and Latham (1972). The study was to determine if through learning-teaching packages, parents of retarded children could assist in the training of their children. Parents were divided into experimental and control groups. A pre-test and three post-tests were given to all subjects. Test results were measured in terms of changes in the children's behavior. The experimental group scored significantly higher in all areas tested with the exception of one. Among their conclusions the researchers noted that the use of the mediated training packaged approach to education is worthy of further study as a method that could be utilized by many agencies.

In a similar study Hofmeister and Reanes (1974) analyzed the use of learning packages to aid parents of children falling in school to assist their children with school work. To check the effectiveness of the packages, measures were taken on the children. Post-test scores were significantly higher for the experimental group at the .05 level.

A study on the effect of a study guide on independent adult learning was presented by Kotaska and Dickinson (1975). Although the study does not directly relate to the effectiveness of learning packages as an instructional approach, it is relevant to the entire area of self-instructional learning
packages. The subjects in this study were 56 nurses who were divided into three groups: experimental who received the packet with a study guide; experimental who received the packet without a guide; and a control group. A post-test only design was used. Both experimental groups had significantly greater mean test scores than the control group. However, mean scores of the two experimental groups were the same. Kotaska and Dickinson concluded that the results suggested that this particular group of adults may be capable of guiding their own learning. The authors also indicated that variables such as time spent studying, skills in using independent learning materials and prior education were not measured.

Each of the studies cited lend some support to the use of self-instructional learning packages as an effective approach with young family members under the conditions proposed by this project. Previous research does indicate that this approach to education may be viable as one method among many.

The Study Variables

The primary independent variable of this study was the use of self-instructional learning packages. This was the only variable that was manipulated.

Other independent variables included the age, formal educational attainment, employment status, income level and of the parents involved in the research.
There were three dependent variables in the study: acquisition of knowledge, attitude about the method and time spent studying.

This section is developed to provide a rationale for the study variables.

Waldron (1968) and (Douglah, 1965) found that socio-economic status and educational attainment were significantly related to the participation levels of young adults in adult education activities. The researchers concluded that education perpetuates a desire for more education.

In studying two instructional methods with adults Porreca and Sleeman (1972) found that learners from higher socio-economic backgrounds had higher post-test achievement scores than those from lower socio-economic backgrounds.

Holladay (1970) in studying achievement in English found that students under 35 made greater achievement in most of the achievement tests than did students in 35-44 age groups. When adjustments were made for amount of education, use of non-English language, use of English, intelligence and language aptitude, students in their twenties ranked highest in adjustment achievement. Relevant to age, Douglah (1965) study noted that age was a factor influencing the participation in educational activities by females.

Several studies (Douglah, 1965) and (Carson, 1965) found that there is a significant relationship between the marital status of young adult males and participation in
educational activities. However, Douglah's study did not find marital status a factor in general. On the other hand, he did find that female participation in adult education activities was influenced by the number of children in the family.

Most of the research cited dealt with demographic variables as they related to participation in adult education activities. Although research was not found to support a rationale for a relationship between most of the variables and knowledge gained or achievement, the variables are included in the study. To determine if any Instructional method is effective with a given group of learners, some knowledge is needed on the relationships between their characteristics and end results from the method.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Population and Sample

Virginia has 112 local units of the Cooperative Extension Service. A local Extension unit can be defined as either a county or/and city served by an Extension staff. These units are divided into six Extension administrative districts, staffed by a district administrator and program leaders for each program area.

To obtain a sample for this study, each of the six districts were used as a stratum. An official list of all Extension units, by districts was obtained from the office of the Director of Administrative Management of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University's Extension Division. One unit from each of the six Extension districts was randomly selected for participation in the study. A stratified random sample of units was decided upon because this provided an opportunity for all districts to be involved.

Official permission to conduct the study in Virginia with the assistance of Extension staffs was obtained from Dr. William VanDresser, Dean of Virginia Tech's Extension Division. The proposed study was also discussed with other
state Extension administrators and district program leaders in Family Resources.

After the selection of the unit sample for the study, district administrators, program leaders and unit staffs were informed of the selections by the Director of Family Resources. (See Appendix A) Program leaders, Family Resources were asked to provide the names of an agent in each of the six randomly selected units who would be directly involved in the study. These agents were contacted and asked to provide a list of the names and addresses of parents, in their unit, with pre-school aged children. At this time agents were asked not to discuss the study with potential study participants.

Since young families as a group represents a broad classification that include many sub-groups, it was decided to specify one sub-group for the study sample. This group was parents of pre-school children.

The lists of parents provided by the Extension agents resulted in a total frame of 373. One unit did not provide a list, therefore five districts are represented in the study. From these lists a stratified random sample of 200 parents of pre-school children were drawn and asked to participate in the study. Each of the five Extension units in the sample were used as another stratum. Each name on all five lists were given a number and a table of random numbers was used to select subjects per unit.
The list provided by Extension agents probably did not yield a frame of all parents, in their units, with preschool aged children. Extension offices are not expected to have the names and addresses of every person in their unit. Therefore, the study was conducted with an accessible population consisting of the persons whose names were provided by Extension Agents.

Individual subjects were randomly assigned to one of four groups in the study. Treatments were then randomly assigned to each of the groups. This was accomplished by assigning identification to each group and conducting a drawing of the identifying marks. The order drawn determined whether the group was assigned to treatment 1, 2, 3, or 4. Each group consisted of 50 individuals: ten from each of the five units.

The lists of subjects and their assigned groups, with the treatment for each group was returned to Extension agents. They were asked to send the self-instructional learning packages to the three experimental groups over their signatures. The control group did not receive the self-instructional information at this time. The writer provided drafts of cover letters to be placed on the official Extension letterhead and sent out by agents as a part of their unit's program. (See Appendix B)

The self-instructional learning packages consisted of three lessons on parenting titled, "What's A Parent To Do?" The lessons were developed by Carol L. Anderson of Iowa State
University's Cooperative Extension Service. Additional information on guidance in parenting was taken from materials developed by Kent Hamdorf of The Ohio State University's Cooperative Extension Service. An Introduction and study guide for each lesson was prepared by the writer. The materials were developed to help parents understand the behavior of a child and to explore ways to guide a child toward becoming a self-directed individual who is responsible for his or her own actions. All materials were designed to be understood by parents with different educational levels. (See Appendix B) Agents were instructed to send one lesson per week to the subjects.

Subjects were asked to participate in the study therefore a major threat to the external validity of this study is the Hawthorne Effect. This limits generalizing the study results to other groups involved with self-instructional learning packages under different circumstances. However this could not be avoided since these were not established groups who would ordinarily expect to be tested on information sent to them by Extension Agents.

**Design**

The design for the study was one of experimental research. The post-test only, control group design, as designated by Campbell and Stanley (1966) was used. To control for threats to internal validity subjects were
randomly assigned to experimental and control groups; levels of the manipulated variables were also randomly assigned to each group. The schematic design of the study was:

\[
\begin{align*}
R & \quad X_1 & \quad 0_1 \\
R & \quad X_2 & \quad 0_2 \\
R & \quad X_3 & \quad 0_3 \\
R & \quad X_4 & \quad 0_4
\end{align*}
\]

The primary independent variable in the study was the use of self-instructional learning packages. There were four levels of the independent variable, they were:

Group 1. \((X_1)\) Individuals were provided with self-instructional learning packages and asked to study the information. A total of three packages were sent to subjects, one at a time for a three week period.

Group 2. \((X_2)\) Individuals were provided with self-instructional learning packages and asked to study the information. In addition they were told that they could call the Extension agent, during regular office hours, for assistance with the information, if they so desired.
Group 3. \((X_3)\) Individuals were provided with self-instructional learning packages and asked to study the information. In addition, subjects were given periodic follow-up assistance by telephone from Extension agents. Each week, Extension agents called each subject, in her unit, and discussed one major concept covered in the lesson. (All five agents were asked to cover the same concept. This information was prepared by the researcher. Subjects were also given the opportunity to ask questions or to discuss any ideas covered in the information.

Group 4. \((X_4)\) This was the control group. Individuals in this group did not receive the self-instructional packages at the same time as the other groups. However, they were asked to complete the same measurements as the other groups. Upon the completion of the measurements they were provided with the self-instructional learning packages.

The self-instructional learning packages were the same for all of the experimental groups. The intent of the
study was to determine not only the effectiveness of the self-instructional learning packages with young adults, but to also determine if follow-up assistance affects the effectiveness of the packages. Then, if follow-up is effective, what level of follow-up is desirable.

Four additional independent variables were also included in the study. They were: age, educational level, employment status and income level. These variables were included to determine if relationships existed between them and the dependent variables.

The major dependent variable of the study was knowledge gained about parenting from the self-instructional learning packages. This was measured by a multiple choice cognitive test on the subject matter content of the packages. Additional dependent variables were: the subjects' feelings about using self-instructional learning packages to receive subject matter information, this was measured by an Likert type attitude scale; and time subjects spent studying the information in the packages.

Data and Instruments

Data were collected through a mailed questionnaire sent to each subject. The questionnaire was composed of three parts: cognitive test, attitude scale and demographic data.
The cognitive test was a 30 item multiple choice test developed by the writer. It was designed to measure the subject's knowledge on the subject matter content of the self-instructional learning packages. The questionnaire was evaluated for content validity by Dr. Kent G. Hamdorf, Extension Specialist, Human Relations and Family Development, The Ohio State University.

Twelve parents of pre-school children in the Columbus, Ohio area were asked to complete the cognitive and demographic portions of the questionnaire without reading the subject matter content of the packages. This was done in an effort to determine if the information was generally known by young parents. It was felt that if the parents could correctly answer the questions without reading the subject matter, then the test would not measure information received as a result of the studying the packages. From this informal pre-trial testing of the questionnaire, some revisions were made.

Through the assistance of several Extension agents of The Ohio State University Cooperative Extension Service and several other agencies, forty-five parents of pre-school children in Ohio were asked to read the self-instructional learning packages and complete the questionnaire. A total of seventeen parents (N=17) returned the questionnaire. The results from the questionnaires were analyzed by the Instruction and Research Computer Center of The Ohio State University. Item analyses were used to determine which
Items in the questionnaire discriminated between the more knowledgeable parents and the less knowledgeable parents. It was also used to determine which items were too easy or too hard.

The Kuder-Richardson formulas 20, 21 and 8 were used to determine the coefficients of interval consistency. The initial thirty-six-item cognitive test had a K-R 20 of .759 (N=17), a K-R 21 of .671 and a K-R 8 of .811. The final cognitive portion of the questionnaire was revised to thirty items which yielded a K-R 20 of .782 (N=17), a K-R 21 of .749 and a K-R 8 of .825.

The demographic data of the questionnaire was developed to collect information on the age, educational attainment, employment status, income level, and marital status of the subjects. Other questions included the number of children in the family, the time spent reading the lessons and the parent's prior experiences with the Cooperative Extension Service.

An attitude scale was also developed to obtain information on the subjects' feelings concerning the use of organized self-instructional learning packages. This section of the questionnaire was also pre-tested by subjects who read the packages. The pre-test of this section had a Kuder-Richardson 8 of .776. The attitude scale was revised from nineteen items to fourteen items. The final scale of fourteen item yielded a Kuder-Richardson 8 of .845 (N=17).
The questionnaire (See Appendix B) was sent to both the experimental and control groups the fourth week of the study. A cover letter from Extension agents was sent with the questionnaire, however subjects were asked to return the completed questionnaire to the researcher. An addressed, stamped envelope was included for the return of the questionnaire. The names of the respondents were not asked for. Pre-addressed postcards were included with the questionnaire and respondents were asked to sign the card and mail them when they returned the completed questionnaire. This was done to assure the anonymity of the respondents and still provide some means to conduct follow-ups of non-respondents. When postcards were received, no follow-up was done. Subjects who had not responded were sent follow-up letters. The first follow-up letter was mailed to individuals who had not returned their questionnaire after three weeks. Two weeks after the follow-up letter was sent agents were asked to telephone those who still had not returned their questionnaire.

Respondents were told they could have the results of their own cognitive test, if desired. This desire was indicated by the respondent including his or her name and address on the first page of the questionnaire. Eighteen requested the results of their test. At the same time, these respondents were assured their test results would remain confidential.
Of the 200 questionnaires mailed to subjects, 114 (57 percent) were returned. Only 107 (54 percent) are included in the data analyses: two were unuseable because over half of the questions were not answered and four were received too late to be included in the analyses. The percent of returns by Virginia's Extension Administrative districts and units are shown in Table 1. Table 2 gives the number of returns by the four groups.

Table 1
Distribution of Questionnaires Returned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Percent Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Central</td>
<td>Amelia County</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>Hanover County</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>Greensville County</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>Carroll County</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Central</td>
<td>Giles County</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Distribution of Questionnaires Returned by Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number Returned</th>
<th>Percent Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of the data from the 54 percent of respondents are included in Chapter IV.

Statistical Analyses

Data from all three sections of the questionnaire were coded and transferred to data processing cards. The resources of the Instruction and Research Computer Center of The Ohio State University were used in writing programs for appropriate statistical analyses. Specific procedures used included analysis of variance, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients, and Kendall correlation coefficients. Each of these procedures and their use in the study are discussed in Chapter IV.

The .05 level of significance was used as a basis for all decisions in the test of significance.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of this study. The findings are outlined in terms of the study’s objectives and hypotheses. The chapter is divided into two major areas: characteristics of respondents and results of testing hypotheses. But first, a brief review of the research design is presented. Details of the design are discussed in Chapter III.

A post-test only control group design was used. Two hundred randomly selected subjects from names provided by Extension agents in five Extension units in Virginia were randomly assigned to one of four groups. Each group was then randomly assigned to four levels of the treatment:

- **Group 1.** Individuals were given self-instructional learning packages and asked to study them.
- **Group 2.** Individuals were given self-instructional learning packages and asked to study them. They were also told to call the Extension agent if they had questions or wanted to discuss the subject matter content.
Group 3. Individuals were given self-instructional learning packages and asked to study them. In addition, they were given periodic follow-up assistance by telephone from the Extension agent.

Group 4. Control group.

Subjects in the three experimental groups received the same self-instructional learning packages and questionnaire. The control group also received the same questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of three parts: a cognitive test, an attitude scale on the use of the self-instructional method, and demographic information. The control group was asked to not complete the attitude section of the test since they were not exposed to the self-instructional method.

Part I of the questionnaire consisted of an achievement test based on the subject matter content of the self-instructional learning packages. This test consisted of thirty multiple choice items. An individual's score on the test was the total number of correct responses. No responses and multiple responses were considered incorrect. The mean score for all respondents was 16.20. Scores ranged from a low of 5 to a high of 26.

Part II of the questionnaire was a 14 item, five-point attitude scale coded from one to five. Five indicated the most favorable attitude for a given item and one
indicated the least favorable attitude. The respondents scores ranged from a high of 62 to a low of 38 on the attitude scale.

One hundred and seven of the 200 subjects returned the questionnaire. Generally, the respondents could be considered a new audience to Extension educational programs. Over 80 percent were non-Extension homemaker club members and 50.5 percent said they had never been involved in any other Extension activity or program prior to the study. The findings presented here represent the 107 respondents. In view of the lack of prior contact by the respondents with the Extension Service, the rate of response was considered to be quite satisfactory.

Characteristics of Respondents

Demographic information was obtained about the respondents in Part III of the questionnaire. This included information on the variables formal education attainment, marital status, family income, age, membership in Extension clubs and previous participation in Extension educational activities and programs.

Information on some of these variables was needed to test hypotheses related to the respondents' test achievements, attitudes and time spent reading the self-instructional materials. Data were also used to provide general descriptions of the respondents. The following discussion and tables
present these descriptions.

**Education**

Table 3 gives the distributions of the number of years of education of the respondents by experimental and control groups. The educational levels of the respondents were from less than eight grade to advanced degrees. The median number of years of formal educational attainment was 12.1. Over 75 percent of the respondents had completed high school, while over 35 percent had some formal schooling beyond high school.

**Table 3**

Respondents by Years of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Education</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 8 grade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 grade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 grade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 grade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 grade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 grade</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marital Status**

Table 4 shows the distributions of the respondents' marital status by the four groups. Of all respondents 85.0 percent were married, while 6.5 percent were single, 4.7
percent separated and 3.7 percent divorced.

Table 4

Respondents by Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Children

The mean number of children per family for all respondents was 2.3. Thirty-three (30.8%) families had only one child and four (3.7%) had over five children. Table 5 gives the distributions of children per family by the experimental and control groups.

Table 5

Respondents by Number of Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over Five</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means = 2.3  1.8  2.5  2.4
SD    = 1.5  1.0  .83  1.4
Residence

Table 6 shows the residents of the respondents by experimental and control groups. Of all respondents, 47.7 percent lived in rural non-farm homes, while 29.9 percent lived in small towns with a population under 10,000. Only 2.8 percent lived in towns or cities with populations between 10,000 and 50,000, while 5.6 percent lived in the suburb of a city over 50,000.

Table 6

Respondents by Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Non-Farm</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town under 10,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town, 10,000-50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb over 50,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City over 50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment Status

Over half, 53.3 percent of the respondents were not employed outside of the home. Twenty-nine percent were employed full-time, while 16.8 percent were employed part-time. Table 7 shows the distributions of the four groups of respondents by their employment status.
Table 7
Respondents by Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Employed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income

Table 8 shows the income distributions of the respondents in each group. The median income for all respondents was in the $10,000 and $14,000 category.

Table 8
Respondents by Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under-$6,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000-9,999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-13,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,000-17,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18,000-21,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,000-25,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,000-29,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000-33,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-34,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age

The mean age of all respondents was 28.4. The youngest respondent was 16 years old and the oldest was 45
years old. Table 9 shows the ages of the respondents in each of the four groups.

### Table 9

**Respondents by Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 &amp; over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means = 26.5  27.3  28.9  30.6  
SD =  3.8  4.9  4.8  6.7

**Time Spent Reading the Self-Instructional Materials**

The respondents spent a mean time of 1.9 hours reading the self-instructional materials, with one respondent reporting 6 hours reading the information. Table 10 gives the time spent reading the self-instructional materials by respondents in the three experimental groups.
Table 10
Time Spent by Respondents in Experimental Groups Reading the Self-Instructional Learning Packages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means = 2.4  1.4  2.2
SD = 1.2  .8  .8

To the question: who read the self-instructional materials and completed the questionnaire, 63.6 percent said it was read by the mother; 1.9 percent said father and 6.5 percent said both parents. The control group did not receive the self-instructional materials, however most of the questionnaires from this group were also completed by the mother. Only two were completed by the father and two by both parents.

Most of the respondents in this study were females. Their median number of formal educational attainment was 12.1 years. Over 75 percent have completed high school and 35.5 percent have some formal education beyond high school. Over 85 percent were married and the mean number of children was 2.3. Some 47.4 percent lived in rural non-farm homes. Over 25 percent lived in small towns with populations under 10,000.
Most, 53.3 percent were not employed, however 29.0 percent were employed full-time. Over half, 75.7 percent have incomes under $18,000. The median income was in the $10,000 and $14,000 category. The mean age of all respondents was 28.4; the ages ranged from 16 to 45. Finally, all were parents of pre-school aged children.

**Group Difference**

The four groups in the study were considered similar. Analysis of variance showed no significant difference between the means of the groups on the variables age, educational level and income.

**Results of Testing Hypotheses**

This section presents a discussion of the finding as they relate to the hypotheses of the study. The discussion will include major statistical analyses used to test the hypotheses and the results of the analyses.

**Experimental Hypotheses**

The major objective of the study was to determine the effectiveness of the use of self-instructional learning packages as a method of providing subject matter information to young families. The effectiveness of the self-instructional learning packages was measured in terms of the knowledge gained by the subjects as a result of studying the packages. The subjects' attitudes about using this method
and the time they spent reading the materials were also considered important factors in evaluating the self-instructional method. The study further attempted to determine if follow-up assistance with the self-instructional learning packages was needed or if it added to the effectiveness of the method.

Three experimental hypotheses were advanced to evaluate the effectiveness of the self-instructional learning packages with parents of pre-school aged children. This section gives the results of testing these hypotheses.

**Hypothesis 1**

**The research hypothesis.** Parents of pre-school children who study the self-instructional learning packages and receive planned periodic follow-up assistance will score higher on a cognitive test than will those who study the packages with an option to ask for follow-up assistance; those who study the packages without follow-up assistance or those who do not receive the packages.

**The null hypothesis.** There will be no significant difference in the mean scores on a cognitive test between the four groups: those who use the packages with planned periodic assistance; those who use the packages with an option to ask for assistance; those who use the packages without assistance; and those who do not receive the packages.
Table 11 shows the analysis of variance of means of the achievement test scores by the four groups. The calculated F value of 4.7 with the probability of .004 denotes that the means of the four groups differ significantly. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. A post hoc analysis, the Scheffe test, was computed to determine where the means differed. The Scheffe test indicated that the mean of the control group (group 4 - $M=13.5$) differed from the mean of those who received the package with an option to call for assistance (group 2 - $M=17.9$) and those who received periodic follow-up assistance by telephone (group 3 - $M=17.8$).

Although the null hypothesis was rejected, the results of the statistical test did not fully support the research hypothesis. It was expected that the group receiving periodic follow-up would score higher on the cognitive test than those of the other groups. This was not true, the means of the three experimental groups did not differ significantly. The group that received periodic assistance and the group with an option to ask for assistance did score higher than the control group.
Table 11

Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores of Achievement Test Scores of the Four Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>358.7636</td>
<td>119.5879</td>
<td>4.700</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2620.7161</td>
<td>25.4438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>2979.4795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means with a common superscript do not differ significantly at the .05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 2

The research hypothesis. Parents of the pre-school children who study the self-Instructional learning packages and received planned periodic follow-up assistance will score higher on an attitude scale than will those who study the packages with an option to ask for follow-up assistance; or those who study the packages without follow-up assistance.

The null hypothesis. There will be no significant difference in the mean scores on an attitude scale between the three groups: those who use the packages with planned periodic assistance; those who use the packages with an option to ask for assistance or those who use the packages without assistance.

Table 12 shows an analysis of variance computed on the mean scores of the attitude scale for the three experimental groups. The F ratio of .554 with the probability of
.577 Indicates that the means of the three groups did not differ significantly. The null hypothesis could not be rejected.

The writer had expected group 3, who received periodic assistance from Extension agents, to have the most favorable attitude relative to the use of the self-instructional method. It was also expected that the group who received the materials without an opportunity for assistance would have the least favorable attitude about the method. The finding did not support this.

Table 12
Analysis of Variance of Mean Scores of Attitude Scale by The Three Experimental Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29.3092</td>
<td>14.6546</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>0.5768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1955.9827</td>
<td>26.4322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1985.2917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means with a common superscript do not differ significantly at the .05 level of significance.

Hypothesis 3.

The research hypothesis. Parents of pre-school children who study the self-instructional learning packages and receive planned periodic follow-up will spend more time reading the materials than will those who study the packages.
with an option to ask for follow-up assistance or those who study the packages without follow-up assistance.

The null hypothesis. There will be no difference in the mean time spent studying the self-instructional learning packages by the three groups: those who use the packages with planned periodic assistance; those who use the packages with an option for assistance or those who use the packages without assistance.

An analysis of variance was computed to determine if the mean time spent reading the self-instructional materials by the groups differed significantly. Table 13 shows the F value of 7.707 with the probability of .009. This indicates that the means of the group differed significantly, therefore the null hypothesis was rejected. The Scheffe test pointed out that the means of those who read the materials with an option to call for assistance (group 2 - M=1.4 hours) differed significantly from the means of those who received periodic assistance (group 3 - M=2.2 hours) and from those who did not have an opportunity for assistance (group 1 - M=2.4 hours).

The researcher had hypothesized that the group who received planned periodic assistance would spend more time studying the materials, than those of the other two experimental groups. Again the findings did not support this. The group receiving periodic assistance had a mean time for reading the materials that did not differ from the mean time
spent by those who were not offered an opportunity for follow-up. Group two who had an option to ask for assistance spent the least time reading the materials.

**Correlational Hypotheses**

Additional objectives of this study were to determine if certain characteristics of the parents of pre-school aged children are related to knowledge gained from reading the self-instructional material; their attitude about the method and the time they spent reading the materials. Three correlational hypotheses were advanced to explore the relationships of certain characteristic variables with achievement test score, attitude scale score and time spent reading the information. This section presents the results of testing these hypotheses.

**Table 13**

**Analysis of Variance of Mean Time Spent Reading the Self-Instructional Materials by the Three Experimental Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.6169</td>
<td>7.3084</td>
<td>7.707</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>67.3288</td>
<td>0.9483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81.9457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means with a common superscript do not differ significantly at the .05 level of significance.*
Hypothesis 4

The research hypothesis. There will be relationships between scores of parents of pre-school children on a cognitive test and their age, educational level, employment status and income.

a. Younger (below 30) parents of pre-school children will score higher on a cognitive test than will older parents of pre-school children.

b. Parents of pre-school children with higher levels of formal education attainment will score higher on a cognitive test than will those with lower levels of educational attainment.

c. Parents of pre-school children who are not employed will score higher on a cognitive test than will those employed part-time or full-time; those employed part-time will score higher than those employed full-time.

d. Parents of pre-school children with higher incomes will score higher on a cognitive test than will those with lower incomes.

Null hypothesis 4-A. There will be no significant relationship between the ages of parents of pre-school children in the four groups and their scores on a cognitive test.

Since both variables, age and achievement test scores, are measured in interval data, Pearson product-moment
coefficients were calculated. Table 14 gives the correlations, between age and achievement test scores for the three experimental and control groups.

Table 14

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients
Between Age and Achievement Test Scores
of Respondents in the Four Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation coefficients were not significant at the .05 level of significance for the three experimental groups. The null hypothesis of no relationship between age and achievement test scores was not rejected for the three experimental groups. However there was a relationship between age and achievement test scores for the control group. For this group, as age increased test scores tend to increase. Therefore the null hypothesis was rejected for the control group. The expected relationship of younger parents scoring higher on the cognitive test was not supported. Actually no relationship existed for the three experimental groups. The relationship between age and education found in the control group is the opposite of that expected, older parents tended to score higher on the
achievement test.

Null hypothesis 4-B. There will be no significant relationship between the educational level of pre-school children in the four groups and their scores on a cognitive test.

Kendall correlation coefficients were calculated to determine if a significant relationship existed between education and achievement test score. Table 15 gives the results of the correlation coefficients.

Table 15
Kendall Correlation Coefficients Between Education and Achievement Test Scores of Respondents in the Four Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>tau</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation coefficients for all groups were significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis of no relationship between education and achievement was rejected. As hypothesized there was a relationship between education and achievement for all groups: as education increased, achievement test scores increased.

Null hypothesis 4-C. There will be no significant relationship between the employment status of parents of
pre-school children in the four groups and their scores on a cognitive test.

Table 16 shows the results of calculating the Kendall correlation coefficients to determine if a significant relationship exist between the employment and achievement test scores of the parents. Employment status was ranked ordered: employed full-time, employed part-time and not employed.

Table 16

Kendall Correlation Coefficients Between Employment Status and Achievement Test Scores of Respondents In the Four Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>tau</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The calculated correlation coefficients for groups 2, 3 and 4 were not significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was not rejected for these three groups. However a significant relationship did exist for group 1 who received the packages without an opportunity for assistance. For this group employed parents tended to score higher on the achievement test than did those who were not employed. The findings for this group does not support the research hypothesis. It was expected that non-employed parents would
score higher on the achievement.

**Null hypothesis 4-0.** There will be no relationship between the achievement test scores of parents of pre-school children and their income.

Kendall correlation coefficients were calculated on the ranked group incomes and achievement test scores. The results are showed in table 17.

**Table 17**

Kendall Correlation Coefficients Between Income and Achievement Test Scores of Respondents in the Four Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \tau )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation coefficients for all four groups were significant at the .05 level, therefore the null hypothesis was rejected. The research hypothesis was supported by the findings, as income increased achievement test scores also increased.

**Hypothesis 5**

The research hypothesis. There will be relationships between the time spent by parents of pre-school children studying the self-instructional learning packages and their age, formal education and employment status.
a. Older (31 and over) parents of pre-school children will spend more time reading the self-instructional learning packages than will younger parents of pre-school children.

b. Parents of pre-school children with higher levels of formal educational attainment will spend less time reading the self-instructional learning packages than will those with lower levels of educational attainment.

c. Non-employed parents of pre-school children will spend more time reading the self-instructional learning packages than will those employed part-time or full-time. Those employed part-time will spend more time than those employed full-time.

**Null hypothesis 5-A.** There will be no significant relationship between the age of parents of pre-school children and the time they spent reading the self-instructional materials.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were computed. Table 18 gives the results of this computation for the three experimental groups.
Table 18

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients Between Age and Time Spent Reading the Self-Instructional Materials by Respondents in the Three Experimental Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation coefficients were not significant at the .05 levels of significance for either of the three experimental groups, therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected. The findings of no significant relationship between age and time spent reading the self-instructional materials did not support the research hypothesis. Older parents were expected to spend more time reading the materials. Actually, there was a tendency for younger parents to spend more time reading the materials for those in groups 2 and 3. The control group was not included in this computation because they did not receive the self-instructional materials prior to returning the questionnaire.

**Null hypothesis 5-B.** There will not be a significant relationship between the education of the parents of pre-school children and the time they spent reading the self-instructional materials.
Table 19 shows the results of the Kendall correlation coefficients calculated to determine the relationship between the educational levels of the respondents and the time they spent reading the self-instructional materials.

Table 19
Kendall Correlation Coefficients Between Education and Time Spent Reading the Self-Instructional Materials by Respondents in the Three Experimental Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>tau</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The calculated correlation coefficients for the three groups were not significant at the .05 level of significance, therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected. The research hypothesis was not supported, however for those with an option for assistance and those given periodic assistance the tendency was in the direction that was expected. As the educational level increased the time spent reading the materials decreased.

Null hypothesis 5-C. There will be no significant relationship between the employment status of parents of pre-school children and the time they spend reading the self-instructional materials.
Table 20 gives the results of Kendall Correlation coefficients computed between the employment status and the time spent reading the self-instructional information for respondents in the three experimental groups.

Table 20

Kendall Correlation Coefficients Between Employment Status and Time Spent Reading the Self-Instructional Materials by Respondents in the Three Experimental Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>tau</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation coefficients were not significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis could not be rejected. The research hypothesis was not supported, however there was a tendency for those employed who received the packages without an opportunity for assistance (group 1) to spend less time reading the information. For those with an option to ask for assistance (group 2) and those given periodic assistance (group 3) employed parents tended to spend more time reading the information.

Hypothesis 6

The research hypothesis. There will be relationships between the attitudes of parents of pre-school children regarding the use of self-instructional learning packages as
a teaching method and their age, formal education and employment status.

a. Older (31 and over) parents of pre-school children will score higher on an attitude test than will younger parents of pre-school children.

b. Parents of pre-school children with higher levels of formal educational attainment will score higher on an attitude test than will those with lower levels of educational attainment.

c. Employed parents of pre-school children will score higher on an attitude test than will those not employed. Those employed part-time will score higher than those employed full-time.

**Null hypothesis 6-A.** There will be no significant relationship between the age of parents of pre-school children and their score on an attitude test.

Table 21 gives the results of Pearson correlation coefficients computed to determine if a relationship existed between the parents' age and their attitude about the self-instructional method.
Table 21
Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients
Between Age and Attitude Scale Scores of Respondents in the Three Experimental Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>tau</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The writer failed to reject the null hypothesis, there were no significant relationships between the ages of parents and their feeling about self-instructional learning packages as a method of receiving subject matter information for any of the groups. The research hypothesis stated that older parents would have more favorable attitude toward the self-instructional method than the younger parents. The findings did not support this expectation. There was a very slight tendency for a more favorable attitude with younger parents for those in groups 2 and 3.

Null hypothesis 6-B. There will be no significant relationship between the education of the parents of preschool children and their attitude about self-instructional learning packages as an instructional method.

Kendall correlation coefficient was calculated for each of the three experimental groups. The results of these calculations are shown in table 22.
Table 22
Kendall Correlation Coefficients Between Education and Attitude Scale Scores of Respondents in the Three Experimental Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>tau</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The null hypothesis of no relationship was rejected for group 1 who received the self-instructional learning package without an opportunity for follow-up assistance. However it was not rejected for group 3 which was given periodic follow-up assistance on the package information and group 2 which was given an option to ask for follow-up assistance from Extension agents. The relationship between education and attitude for group 1 was as expected. For this group attitudes were more favorable as the educational levels increased. Although the null was not rejected for group 2 and group 3 the opposite tendency is reflected: attitude scores increased as the educational levels decreased.

Null hypothesis 6-C. There will be no significant relationship between the employment status of the parents of pre-school children and their scores on an attitude test.

Table 23 gives the results of Kendall correlation coefficients computed to determine the relationship between the employment status of the parents and their scores on an
an attitude scale.

Table 23
Kendall Correlation Coefficients Between Employment Status and Attitude of Respondents in the Three Experimental Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>tau</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>&lt;.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>&gt;.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>&gt;.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kendall correlation coefficients between employment status and attitude were not significant at the .05 level for those with an option to ask for assistance (group 2) and those who were given periodic assistance (group 3). The null hypothesis was not rejected for these groups. There was a significant relationship between employment and attitude for those who were not offered an opportunity for assistance (group 1). For this group employed parents tended to have more favorable attitudes than did non-employed parents, about the self-instructional method for receiving subject matter information. The research hypothesis was not supported.

Other correlation coefficients were calculated between selected variables. These variables included: time spent reading the materials with number of children, number of children with achievement, number of children with attitude, and residence and achievement. No significant
relationship was found between any of these variables.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

THE PROBLEM

A concern of the Cooperative Extension Service is the use of various instructional methods that will assist learners in meeting their educational needs which will ultimately result in behavioral changes of a learner or group of learners.

A group of potential learners that Extension educators are interested in assisting is young families. Young families have been a difficult group to get to participate in adult educational programs, however young homemakers have indicated an interest in Extension programs. At the same time, many have been unwilling or unable to participate in group activities. Various reasons have been given for their lack of participation. Among these reasons are a lack of transportation, child care, employment, a lack of group activities located in their community and a belief that adult education programs are designed for older people.

Some young family members have expressed a preference for receiving their adult education programs through printed media that they can study at their own convenience. Programs
need to be designed for young families based on their needs and delivered through various methodologies. There is a need to study and evaluate various instructional methods that may be effective in providing information to young families.

The major objective of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of self-instructional learning packages as one method of providing subject matter to young families. The study was designed to answer three questions:

1. Can a self-instructional learning package be an effective method of providing subject matter to young families?

2. Is follow-up assistance needed by young families when using self-instructional learning packages? If follow-up assistance is needed, what type of assistance is most effective?

3. How will young families feel about receiving subject matter information via self-instructional learning packages.

The Objectives

The specific objectives of the study were:

1. To determine if young families will use self-instructional learning packages as a method for acquiring subject matter.
2. To determine if young family members who read the subject matter in the self-Instructional learning packages gained more knowledge about the subject matter content than those who did not read them.

3. To determine if follow-up assistance to the self-Instructional learning packages affects the time spent using the packages, the amount of learning that occurs and young families' attitudes about the use of organized self-Instructional materials.

4. To determine if the variables age, formal educational level, employment status and income level of young families are related to the amount of learning they will acquire from self-Instructional learning packages.

5. To determine if there are relationships between the variables age, formal educational level and employment status of young family members and the time they will spend studying the self-Instructional packages.

6. To determine if there are relationships between the variables age, formal educational level and employment status of young family members and their attitudes concerning the use of self-Instructional learning packages as a method for
Methodology

A stratified random sample of six Extension units in Virginia, representing the six Extension administrative districts, was selected for the study. One unit did not participate; the final sample represented five of the six districts. Extension agents in the five units were asked to provide a list of the names and addresses of parents of pre-school aged children in their unit. These lists provided a total frame of 373 parents. Using each unit as a stratum, a sample of 40 parents from each unit was randomly selected and asked to participate in the study. This provided a total of 200 subjects for the study.

The study design can be described as experimental research. The post-test only, control group design was used. Subjects were randomly assigned to experimental and control groups; levels of the manipulated variables were randomly assigned to each group. The schematic design was:

\[
\begin{align*}
R & \quad X_1 & 0_1 \\
R & \quad X_2 & 0_2 \\
R & \quad X_3 & 0_3 \\
R & \quad X_4 & 0_4
\end{align*}
\]

The primary independent variable in the study was the use of self-instructional learning packages. There were
four levels of this variable:

Group 1 \((X_1)\). Individuals were given self-instructional learning packages and asked to study them.

Group 2 \((X_2)\). Individuals were given self-instructional learning packages and asked to study them. They were also told to call the Extension agent if they had questions or wanted to discuss the subject matter.

Group 3 \((X_3)\). Individuals were given self-instructional learning packages and asked to study them. In addition they were given periodic follow-up assistance by telephone from the Extension agent.

Group 4 \((X_4)\). Control Group.

Subjects in the three experimental groups received one self-instructional learning package per week, with information on parenting over a three week period. The self-instructional learning packages were designed to be understood by parents with different educational levels. The packages contained subject matter developed by Carol L. Anderson of the Iowa State University's Cooperative Extension Service. Additional information was developed by Kent G. Hamdrof of The Ohio State University's Cooperative Extension Service. Study guides for each of the three lessons were
Data were collected during the fourth week of the study from both the three experimental and the control groups by a three part mail questionnaire.

Part I of the questionnaire consisted of a 30 item multiple choice cognitive test based on the subject matter content of the self-instructional learning packages. An Individual's score on the test was the total number of correct responses.

Part II of the questionnaire was a 14 item five-point attitude scale coded from one to five, with five indicating the most favorable attitude for a given item and one indicating the least favorable.

Part III of the questionnaire asked for demographic information on the respondent. Variables included were: formal education, marital status, number of children, residence, employment status, family income, age, membership in Extension Clubs and previous participation in Extension educational activities. Additional questions were, who read the information in the packages and how much time was spent reading the materials.

Kuder-Richardson formulas 20, 21 and 8 were used to determine the reliabilities of parts one and two of the questionnaire. The thirty items cognitive test yielded a K-R 20 of .782 (n=17), a K-R 21 of .749 and a K-R 8 of .825. The fourteen items attitude scale yielded a K-R 8 of .845.
Extension agents in the five units involved in the research made all contacts with the subjects. These contacts included sending all of the self-instructional learning packages and providing follow-up by telephone to the subjects in group 3. The follow-up included specific subject matter information provided by the researcher. In addition they sent the questionnaires to the respondents and sent follow-up letters and made telephone calls to obtain the return of the questionnaires. A major weakness of the research was that subjects were asked to participate in the study. This was necessary because there were no existing Extension groups composed of the audience the research was designed to involve.

Questionnaires were returned by 114 subjects or 57 percent. Two of these were unusable and five were too late to be included in the analysis. Over half of the respondents had not had any contacts with the Extension Service prior to the study. Therefore, the response rate was considered satisfactory.

Computer programs from the Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (1975) were used to analyze the data at the Instruction and Research Computer Center of The Ohio State University. Data were analyzed according to the objectives of the study. Statistical analyses used were analysis of variance, Pearson product-moment correlation and Kendall correlation coefficient.
Findings

Of 200 questionnaires mailed, 114 were returned, however only 107 were used in the analysis procedures. All 114 respondents were parents of pre-school aged children. Data from the respondents on demographic variables provided the following descriptions.

Formal Education. The median level of formal education was 12.1 with a range of 9. Over 75 percent of the respondents had completed high school, while 35 percent has some formal schooling beyond high school.

Marital Status. Of all respondents 85 percent were married. Only 6.5 percent were single, 4.7 percent were separated and 3.7 percent reported they were divorced.

Number of Children. The mean number of children per family was 2.3. Thirty-three (30.8 percent) of the families had only one child, while 4 families (3.7 percent) had over five children.

Residence. Some 47.7 percent of the respondents lived in rural, non-farm homes. Only 2.8 percent lived in towns or cities with populations of 10,000 to 50,000. Twenty-nine percent lived in small towns with populations under 10,000 and 5.6 percent lived in the suburbs of a city with a population over 50,000.
Employment Status. Over half, 53.3 percent of the respondents were not employed. Some 16.8 percent were employed part-time with 29 percent reporting full-time employment.

Income. The median income for all respondents was in the $10,000 and $14,000 category. A little over 75 percent had incomes under $18,000 and 3.8 percent (one family) reported an income over $34,000.

Age. The mean age of the respondents was 28.4. The youngest respondent was 16 years old and the oldest was 45.

In most of the families parents reported that self-instructional materials were read and questionnaires completed by the mothers. Data show that 63.6 percent of the respondents were mothers, while 1.9 percent were fathers and 6.5 percent were both parents. In the control group, who only completed the questionnaires, two were fathers and two were both parents, the remainder were mothers.

Eighty percent of the respondents reported that they did not belong to an Extension Club. Slightly over half, 50 percent, said they had never been involved in an Extension program or activity prior to the research project. The respondents used an average of 1.9 hours to read the self-instructional materials and complete the questionnaire.
Hypotheses of the Study

Hypothesis 1.

Parents of the pre-school children who study the self-instructional learning packages and receive planned periodic follow-up assistance will score higher on a cognitive test than will those who study the packages with an option to ask for follow-up assistance; those who study the packages without follow-up assistance; or those who do not receive the packages.

The first hypothesis of this study was formulated to determine if young families who read the self-instructional learning packages would (1) gain more knowledge about the subject matter content than those who did not read them and (2) determine if follow-up assistance with self-instructional learning packages would affect the amount of knowledge gained.

An analysis of variance of mean achievement test scores showed a calculated F ratio of 4.70 with a probability of .004. This denoted that the means of the four groups were unequal. A Scheffe post hoc analysis indicated that the means of the control group differed significantly from the group who had an option to ask for assistance and the group given periodic assistance. However, there were no significant difference between the means of the control group and the group with no opportunity to ask for assistance. No significant difference was found between the means of the three
experimental groups. The research hypothesis was not fully supported. It was expected that the group receiving periodic follow-up assistance would score higher than all of the other groups.

**Hypothesis 2.**

Parents of pre-school children who study the self-instructional learning packages and receive planned periodic follow-up assistance will score higher on an attitude test than will those who study the packages with an option to ask for follow-up assistance, or those who study the packages without follow-up assistance.

The second hypothesis of the study was formulated to determine if follow-up assistance with the self-instructional learning packages would have any affect on the parents' attitudes about using self-instructional learning packages to receive subject matter information.

An F test was calculated to determine if the means of the three experimental groups differed significantly on an attitude scale. An F value of .554 with the probability of .577 indicated that the means did not differ significantly. The null hypothesis was not rejected.

**Hypothesis 3.**

Parents of pre-school children who study the self-instructional packages and receive planned periodic follow-up assistance will spend more time reading the materials
than will those who study the packages with an option to ask for follow-up assistance or those who study the packages without follow-up assistance.

The formulation of the third hypothesis was to determine if follow-up assistance to self-instructional learning packages affect the time parents will spend reading the self-instructional materials.

An F ratio of 7.707 with a probability of .009 was the calculated results from an analysis of variance of means time spent reading the information by the three experimental groups. A post hoc analysis revealed that the means of the group who received periodic assistance and the group who was not offered an opportunity for assistance did not differ. The group with an option to ask for assistance spent the least time reading the materials.

**Hypothesis 4.**

There will be relationships between scores of parents of pre-school children on a cognitive test and their age, educational level, employment status and income.

a. Younger (below 30) parents of pre-school children will score higher on a cognitive test than will older parents of pre-school children.

b. Parents of pre-school children with higher levels of formal education attainment will score higher on a cognitive test than will those with lower levels of educational attainment.
c. Parents of pre-school children who are not employed will score higher on a cognitive test than will those employed part-time or full-time; those employed part-time will score higher than those employed full-time.

d. Parents of pre-school children with higher incomes will score higher on a cognitive test than will those with lower incomes.

Hypothesis 4-A.

No significant relationships were found between age and achievement for the three experimental groups: those without an opportunity for follow-up assistance with the self-instructional materials; those with an option to ask for assistance; and those provided with periodic follow-up assistance. However, there was a relationship between age and achievement for the control group. They showed a correlation coefficient of .36 with a probability of .03. For this group older parents tended to score higher on the achievement test.

Hypothesis 4-B.

Kendall correlation coefficients between education and achievement test scores were computed for the four groups. The correlation coefficients for all of the groups were significant at the .05 level. For each of the groups as the educational level of the respondents increased, their achievement test scores increased.
Hypothesis 4-C.

Computed Kendall correlation coefficients showed no significant relationships between the employment status of parents and their achievement test scores at the .05 level for those with an option for follow-up assistance with the learning packages, or those given periodic assistance, nor the control group. A significant relationship was found between employment status and achievement for those who were not offered an opportunity for assistance. For this group, employed parents scored higher on the achievement test. Although there were no significant relationships for groups three and four, the employed parents also tended to score higher.

Hypothesis 4-D.

Significant relationships were found between income and achievement, at the .05 level, for all four groups. The finding indicated that as incomes increased, achievement test scores also increased.

Hypothesis 5.

There will be relationships between the time spent by parents of pre-school children studying the self-instructional learning packages and their age, formal education and employment status.

a. Older (31 and over) parents of pre-school children will spend more time reading the self-instructional
learning packages than will younger parents of pre-school children.

b. Parents of pre-school children with higher levels of formal educational attainment will spend less time reading the self-instructional learning packages than will those with lower levels of educational attainments.

c. Non-employed parents of pre-school children will spend more time reading the self-instructional learning packages than will those employed part-time or full-time. Those employed part-time will spend more time than those employed full-time.

Hypothesis 5-A.

No significant relationships were found between age and time spent reading the self-instructional learning materials for either of the three experimental groups. However, there was a slight tendency for younger parents to spend more time reading the materials in the group composed of those with an option to ask for assistance and those who received planned periodic follow-up assistance.

Hypothesis 5-B.

Calculated correlation coefficients for the three experimental groups were not significant at the .05 level. For group two and group three the tendency was as educational
levels increased, the time spent reading the materials decreased.

**Hypothesis 5-C.**

There was no significant relationships between the employment status of parents and the time they spent reading the self-instructional materials. However for the group which had an option for assistance and group which received periodic assistance employed parents tended to spend more time reading the materials than the group without an opportunity for assistance.

**Hypothesis 6.**

There will be relationships between the attitudes of parents of pre-school children regarding the use of self-instructional learning packages as a teaching method and their age, formal education and employment status.

a. Older (31 and over) parents of pre-school children will score higher on an attitude test than will younger parents of pre-school children.

b. Parents of pre-school children with higher levels of formal educational attainment will score higher on an attitude test than will those of lower levels of educational attainment.

c. Employed parents of pre-school children will score higher on an attitude test than will those not employed. Those employed part-time will score
Higher than will those employed full-time.

Hypothesis 6-A.

The results of Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient calculations showed no significant relationships between the age of parents in the three experimental groups and their feelings about using self-instructional learning packages as a method of receiving subject matter. However, there was a slight tendency for more favorable attitudes among younger parents for those in the group with an option to ask for assistance and the group given periodic assistance.

Hypothesis 6-B.

A significant relationship between education and attitudes was found for group one, who was not offered an opportunity for assistance. For this group attitudes were more favorable as education increased. There were no significant relationships between these variables for those given periodic assistance or those who had an option to ask for assistance.

Hypothesis 6-C.

The Kendall correlation coefficients calculated between the employment status of parents and their attitude regarding the self-instructional method showed no significant relationship at the .05 level for either group 2 who was offered an option to ask for assistance, nor group 3
who was given periodic assistance. For group 1 who was not offered an opportunity for assistance the null hypothesis was rejected. Employed parents, tended to have more favorable attitudes about receiving subject matter information via the self-instructional method.

Conclusions

The percentage of returns of the questionnaires was considered satisfactory for the audience the study was designed to involve. However, a 57 percent return rate did not provide a sufficient basis for making broad generalizations to the entire group of parents of pre-school aged children.

The following conclusions were derived from an interpretation of the data from the respondents of the study:

1. Some young adults will use self-instructional learning packages as a method of receiving subject matter information.

2. Parents of pre-school children who were sent the self-instructional materials demonstrated that some knowledge was gained on the subject matter information in the packages. Self-instructional learning packages can be an effective instructional method for some young families.
3. Follow-up assistance, by telephone, to self-instructional learning packages tended to increase, but not significantly, the package effectiveness.

4. Follow-up assistance to the self-instructional learning packages did not result in more favorable attitudes about receiving subject matter information via self-instructional learning packages.

5. Follow-up assistance to the self-instructional learning packages tended to increase the time spent reading the materials by the respondents.

6. Although the data revealed that there was no relationship between the employment status of parents, there was a slight tendency for employed parents to score higher on the subject matter test, spend more time reading the self-instructional materials and have more favorable attitudes about the self-instructional learning package as a method of receiving subject matter information.

7. The age of parents was not related to the knowledge gained from the self-instructional learning packages, the time they spent reading them or their attitudes about the instructional method.
8. Self-instructional learning packages are most effective as educational and income levels increase.

9. Education and income were not related to the amount of time parents will spend reading self-instructional materials.

Recommendations

The following recommendations have been formulated by the researcher as a result of the findings of this research.

1. More self-instructional learning materials should be developed by the Cooperative Extension Service and other adult education agencies for use with specific groups of young families.

2. The availability of self-instructional learning materials should be made known to the audience they are designed to reach.

3. Follow-up assistance is not essential with the self-instructional learning materials. However in the study there was a slight tendency for those with an opportunity for follow-up to score higher on the knowledge test. Some respondents also asked for their tests to be scored and returned to them. This indicate that some feedback should be provided for interaction between the learner and the educator.
4. **Self-Instruction learning packages** should be offered to young families on an individual basis, this allows them to study at their own pace.

5. The information from this study should be provided to Extension agents who work directly with young families. It should also be provided to subject matter specialists who develop materials for different audiences.

6. Further research using self-instructional methods should be conducted with other subgroups of young families, such as single parents, young singles, new parents and newlyweds.

7. Further research is needed to define or explain exactly the incongruities of the findings on knowledge gained through the use of self-instructional learning packages.

8. Since this study dealt only with printed medium further research, with self-instructional learning packages with multimedia should be conducted. This would help in evaluating the effectiveness of the method.

9. The study should be replicated, using the same design used in this study, with another sample of
young families that would also include parents in urban centers.
APPENDIX A
TO: Program Leaders, Family Resources, and Selected Counties

Dear Co-Workers:

A research project is being undertaken by Laretta King to examine the effectiveness of self-instructional materials with a specific group of young adults. Through a stratified random sample the following Extension units were drawn to participate in this study:

Carroll
Greensville
Arlington
Amelia
Giles

To conduct this research, cooperation between Laretta and the Extension agents involved will be necessary. Some specific assistance will be needed from you. A summary of your involvement is enclosed. Laretta will follow-up with more specific details with each agent who will be directly involved in the study.

Your help in this project will provide information that will help evaluate one teaching method with young families. Your cooperation and assistance will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Ruth P. Harris
Director, Family Resources

Encl. Summary of Agent's Involvement

cc: Dr. W.R. Van Dresser
District Agents
Unit Chairman
Dr. C.J. Cunningham
Ms. Laretta E. King

The Virginia Cooperative Extension Service by law and purpose is dedicated to serve all people on an equal and nondiscriminatory basis.

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer
Purpose of the Study

In view of the importance of involving young families in Extension education programs, along with the fact that young adults have, traditionally been a difficult audience to reach, it is imperative that various types of instructional methods be explored to provide information to this group. The major purpose of this study is to determine the effectiveness of self-instructional materials as one method of providing subject matter to young families. More specifically, the study is designed to answer the following questions:

1. Is self-instructional materials an effective method of providing subject matter to young adults?
2. Is follow-up assistance needed by young adults when using self-instructional materials? If assistance is needed, what type of assistance is more effective?
3. How will young adults feel about receiving subject matter via self-instructional materials.

To answer the above questions your assistance is very important, since you are the one who comes in contact with the young families of your unit.

Agents Involvement

1. Provide a list of parents of pre-school children in your unit.
2. Mail letters to parents asking them to participate in the project.
3. Mail self-study materials to parents. This will include three mailings once a week for three weeks.
4. Call ten parents once a week for three weeks.
5. Be open to receive calls from an additional ten parents for three weeks. Keep a record of the parents who call in.
6. Mail questionnaires to parents at the beginning of the fourth week.
7. Mail follow-up letters if needed.
TO: Program Leaders, Family Resources

Dear Co-Workers:

Earlier this year I talked with you concerning a research project I wanted to undertake with your assistance. For several reasons the proposed idea has undergone some changes. I have had to narrow the audience down to a specific group of young families. The proposed audience is now parents of pre-school children.

The plans still include the involvement of one unit in each district. These units have been randomly selected. They are:

Carroll  Hanover  Amelia
Greensville  Arlington  Giles

From each of these units one Extension agent needs to be directly involved. Would you please let me know within two weeks at my Ohio address which agent can work with the project? I will try to avoid unnecessary extra work for the agents involved. However, it will be necessary for several letters and the subject matter materials to be sent out to the participants. I will prepare drafts of the letters, but would like for them to be sent out locally under the agent's signature. It will also be necessary for agents to call ten persons, who are involved in the project, once a week for a three-week period.

If you have any questions concerning the project please write me at the above address. My home telephone number is: (614) 228-3192. If I am not at the above number, I can be reached at (614) 422-5227.

Your cooperation with this project is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Laretta E. King

cc: Dr. W.L. Flowers, Jr.
Dr. Ruth D. Harris
Miss Grace O. Jennings
Extension Agent
P.O. Box 229
Amelia, Virginia 23002

Dear Miss Jennings:

A few weeks ago your office received a letter from Dr. Ruth Harris asking for your assistance in conducting a research project that I am undertaking. Miss McCoy informed me that she has asked you to work with me on the project.

I hope that you will be able to assist me with the project. I will try to avoid asking you to do a great deal of extra work, however it will be necessary for you to send out some letters and subject matter materials. It will also be necessary for you to make ten telephone calls per week for three weeks. I will prepare a draft of all letters and some suggestions for the telephone discussion.

The project will deal with the use of self-instructional materials with parents of pre-school children. Please refer to the outline of agent's involvement that Dr. Harris sent. More specific details of your involvement will be sent to you later this week.

To begin, I will need a list of names and addresses of parents of pre-school children in your unit. This list should be as large as possible. I hope it will reflect the population of your unit and will include single as well as married parents from different income groups. It would be helpful if you could send me this list as soon as possible. Will one week give you enough time?

From this list 40 individuals will be randomly selected and asked to participate in the study. You will be sent the names of those selected and the information for them. Prior to this, please do not discuss the project with potential participants.

Please let me know immediately if you have questions concerning the study. If necessary, you can call me collect at area code 614, 228-3192. Your assistance with the project will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Laretta E. King

cc: Miss Mary H. McCoy, Dr. Ruth Harris, Dr. W.L. Flower
To:  Selected Extension Agents
     Ms. Elizabeth Adams          Ms. Grace O. Jennings
     Ms. Jody Burtner             Ms. Rebecca Johnson
     Ms. Betty Eyler

Dear Co-Workers:

I really appreciate your assistance with my research project. I hope that you will view your assistance as an opportunity to provide an educational experience to a special sub-group of young families.

I have tried to limit the amount of extra work I'm asking you to do. I have prepared all letters and material to be sent out. Of course all letters are to be put on your letterhead and sent out under your signature. The project is to be treated as a regular Extension activity.

As soon as I receive your list of pre-school parents I will set up each group and send you the materials for them. I will try to be very specific in my directions.

At this time I am sending you a detailed list of your involvement in the project. I hope that each item on the list is clear. If you have questions please contact me immediately.

Thanks again, you'll be hearing from me again soon.

Sincerely,

Loretta E. King
AGENT'S INVOLVEMENT

I appreciate your willingness to assist with the research project: The Effectiveness of Self-Instructional Learning Packages with Young Families.

I realize you are very busy and I have tried to minimize the extra work that's involved in the project. A detailed list of your involvement follows:

1. Send three different lessons on parenting to 30 parents of pre-school children who have been randomly selected for the study. These are to be sent out once weekly. Also send the three lessons to an additional 10 parents at the conclusion of the project.

The persons receiving the lessons on parenting will be divided into four groups, through random assignment (I will do this from the list that you send to me). Each group of individuals are to be worked with as follows.

Group 1. Will be sent the self-study materials and be asked to read them.
Group 2. Will be sent the self-study materials and be asked to read them. In addition they will be told they can call your office if they have questions or want help on the information in the self-study materials. Please help callers by answering their questions.

*You are asked to keep a record of those who call in. This record will be a simple check sheet.

Group 3. Will be sent the self-study materials and be asked to read them. In addition you are asked to call these ten individuals once each week after they have received the materials. This call is to see if they have questions and to discuss further one concept or idea presented in the materials.

*The concept to be discussed will be sent to you. It does not have to be followed word for word as long as the general idea is discussed.

The following questions are to be asked:

a. Do you have any questions about what you have read in the publications?

b. Are there any points you want clarified?

c. Are there any ideas you would like to discuss further?

(These questions can be followed by a brief discussion on the suggested concept.)
Group 4 will be sent the lessons at the completion of the project. In other words they will not receive the self-study material at the same time as the other groups.

2. Return any quiz sheets (these are at the end of each lesson) to participants if they are sent in. Participants are told it is not necessary to send these in, but if they do, please correct or make comments and return them.

3. Send out questionnaires at the end of the three weeks period (the fourth week). Participants are asked to return the questionnaire directly to me. I will furnish a self-addressed, stamped envelope for each individual.

*Please note: Group 4 will receive the same questionnaire as the other groups, at the same time. After they return the questionnaire they are to be sent the self-study materials.

4. Send out follow-up letters if questionnaires are not returned.

*I have prepared drafts of all letters and some information for each telephone conversation. All materials and letters will be sent to you with directions concerning who is to receive each item at a given time.
To: Selected Extension Agents:

Ms. Elizabeth Adams  Ms. Grace O. Jennings
Ms. Judy Bartner   Ms. Rebecca Johnson
Ms. Margaret Collins

Dear Co-Workers:

Thank you for your cooperation in sending me the list of parents, in your unit, with pre-school aged children. I apologize for taking so long to get the study materials to you, after running you to send the list to me. However, I have been waiting for all of the lists to come in, with the hopes that each unit could start approximately the same time. At this time I have decided to ask those of you who I have heard from to start with the project as soon as possible, because I would like to get the materials in the mail before the Christmas holidays. This way I may get some returns of the questionnaires early in January.

Enclosed you will find a copy of each publication you are to send out. Attached to each publication is the cover letter to be sent with it. The three publications: What's A Parent To Do? will be sent to you from Dr. Harris' office. Sufficient copies of the mimeographed leaflets to go with the publications are enclosed. Please note that there are two cover letters for the first set of self-study materials; group two get a different letter from group one and three. I have noted at the top of each letter which group gets that particular letter.

I have randomly selected those who are to be asked to participate in the study. A list of these names, by groups, are also enclosed. The individuals are not to be told about the groups. I have also prepared four sets of address labels for sending the materials to the participants. Please check these to be sure that I have the names and addresses correct. I hope that by preparing the labels this will eliminate some of the extra work.

The questionnaires and pre-addressed envelopes for returning them will be sent to you before they are needed. The question has been asked about postage to mail the questionnaires to the participants. I will provide this postage.

I hope that you can arrange to get this material in the mail very soon. I will be writing you soon from Blacksburg, so you will know how to contact me there if you need to.

Sincerely,

Loretta E. King
Ms. Elizabeth Adams  
Ms. Judy Burtner  
Ms. Margaret C. Collins

Dear Co-Worker:

Enclosed are the final materials to be sent to the participants in the project: What's A Parent To Do? They include the questionnaires, pre-addressed stamped envelopes and pre-addressed post cards. Cover letters to accompany the questionnaires are also included. Please note that their are two different cover letters: one is to be sent with the questionnaires to groups 1, 2, and 3; group 4 is to get a different letter. I have indicated on each letter which group gets the letter.

Names are not required on the questionnaires, however they are color coded, so that I can distinguish each group. Please distribute the questionnaires as follows:

- Group 1.........................White
- Group 2.........................Blue
- Group 3.........................Pink
- Group 4.........................Yellow

I have also marked on the back of each questionnaire the district your unit is in. This is just to indicate the responses by districts. None of these codes: color or district, will indicate which questionnaire belongs to a respondent. However, I wanted you to know why the questionnaires are different colors, as well as why I had your districts on them.

Postage is included to mail the questionnaires. The amount is based on the weight as indicated by the U.S. Post Office. If it is not sufficient please let me know immediately, and I will get the additional postage or money to you. The weight is based on all materials (questionnaire, pre-addressed envelope and post card and cover letter) in a business size envelope, such as the ones included in this package.

I wish this could be the last materials that I ask you to mail, however I am sure that some follow-up letters will have to be sent to most of the participants to try to get as many as possible to return the questionnaire. This will probably be in late January or early February. Again I will prepare all labels and letters for follow-up, as well as provide postage.

Have a joyous holiday season, I hope I do not have to bother you again before 1978.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Cc: Program Leaders, Dr. Ruth Harris, Dr. W.L. Flowers
APPENDIX B
TO: Selected Parents of Pre-School Children

Dear

As a parent of a young child we know that you are concerned about raising your child to become a responsible, well adjusted person. This is also one of our concerns. Therefore, we are always trying to find ways of presenting information that may be helpful to you as a parent. To be more effective in our efforts to provide you with this information we need your help.

Would you be willing to assist in a research project designed to improve our efforts in providing educational materials to young families such as you? You can help us by reading some publications and completing a questionnaire on the information in the publications.

Enclosed is the first lesson in a series of three lessons titled, What's A Parent To Do?. It is a short series that we think you will enjoy and find useful. Your participation in this project is entirely optional, however, we do hope you will study all of the lessons. The other two lessons will be sent to you, one at a time.

At the end of each lesson you will find a short quiz sheet. You can return this to us, but it is not required. We have developed some questions of our own that we will send to you at the end of the series.

Your help is very important in this project. The results will help us in meeting your needs as a young family.

Sincerely,
TO: Selected Parents of Pre-School Children

Dear

As a parent of a young child we know that you are concerned about raising your child to become a responsible, well-adjusted person. This is also one of our concerns. Therefore, we are always trying to find ways of presenting information that may be helpful to you as a parent. To be more effective in our efforts to provide you with this information, we need your help.

Would you be willing to assist in a research project designed to improve our efforts to provide educational materials to young families such as you? You can help us by reading some publications and completing a questionnaire on the information in the publications.

Enclosed is the first lesson in a series of three lessons titled, What's A Parent To Do? It is a short series that we think you will enjoy and find useful. Your participation in this project is entirely optional, however we do hope you will study all of the lessons. The other two will be sent to you, one at a time.

As you read the lessons please feel free to call me at my office if you have questions or want to discuss any of the ideas presented. My office hours are from a.m. to p.m. The telephone number is . I will be happy to discuss any of the lessons with you.

At the end of each lesson you will find a short quiz sheet. You can return this to us, but it is not required. We have developed some questions of our own that we will send to you at the end of the series.

Your help is very important in the project. The results will help us in meeting your needs as a young family.

Sincerely,
TO: Selected Parents of Pre-School Children

Dear Parent:

Thank you very much for assisting us in the research project: What's A Parent To Do. As we noted earlier, the project was designed to improve our efforts to provide educational materials to young families such as your. We really appreciate you taking the time to complete the questionnaire and returning it to us.

Enclosed is the entire series of short lessons titled, What's A Parent To Do? that we promised to send you. If you requested the return of your questionnaire these will be sent at a later date, when we have compiled all of the information on them. Thanks again for your assistance, we hope that you will find the enclosed publication useful and enjoyable. They are designed to require very little time to read through them.

For additional information on parenting please feel free to contact our office.

Sincerely,
What's a parent to do? brings you some ideas and concepts to explore as they relate to you and your child. A first step to effective parenting is to know and understand your child and his or her uniqueness. Parenting is both an action and an attitude toward raising children. Parenting can be defined as what the parent does in the process of being a parent.

All of us have our own beliefs about what the role of a parent should be. These beliefs are the results of our experiences, what we have read or heard, our culture and our own relationships with our parents as child.

In order to do the best job of parenting it maybe necessary to look at and reassess our beliefs, actions and attitudes. It may be that we need to challenge some of the "old fashioned" methods and ideas about raising children.

It is our hope that these lessons and activities will start you to assessing your own ideas about parenting and result in enhancing your relationship with your child.

A General Guide for Lesson I

1. Many myths about parenting exist. Some are unrealistic and can harm the parent-child relationship. Read the leaflet Some Common Myths About Parenting. A study of these myths and their counterparts provides a basis for examining one's own "pet ideas" about parenting.

2. Guidance, discipline and punishment; three key words in dealing with children. Read pages 1 through 5 thoroughly and complete the suggested activities. This information provides a background for the entire series of lessons. Note the suggestions on page 4 for marking important ideas.

3. Understanding what makes your child a unique person is important to understanding why your child reacts to the world around him, as he does. Pages 6 through 9 provides some guides that will help you get to know your child better. The simple activities will help to pinpoint your own child's growth and development.

4. Why do children misbehave? The reasons are many and different from one time to another. Pages 10 through 14 provide some insight as to why children act as they do.
SOME COMMON MYTHS ABOUT PARENTING

MYTH 1: A child must not question or disagree with his parents.

FACT: To encourage mutual respect between parent and child, questioning and/or disagreement should be encouraged. An understanding of, but not necessarily agreement with, each person's point of view should result.

Denying a child the right to question or to disagree with parents:
- Places the parent in the position of a dictator.
- Silences the child, which in and of itself does not mean agreement.
- May create guilt feelings in the child.
- Denies the child the opportunity to learn to reason.
- Builds feelings of resentment.

MYTH 2: Punishment, guilt and blame are effective methods of child management.

FACT: For a long time, some parents have punished their child in anger, letting the child think he was bad for misbehaving, and instilling guilt for not being obedient.

Physical punishment, blame and guilt tend to create emotional disturbance and misconduct rather than reduce them. Discipline should be applied by a parent in a deliberate, calm and reasonable manner, focusing on the problem rather than on the child.

MYTH 3: Children learn more from what a parent says than from what a parent does.

FACT: Actions speak louder than words, and children are better imitators than listeners.

MYTH 4: A child must not be frustrated.

FACT: Frustration is a part of life, and it should not be denied the child. Instead, a parent should try to help the child learn how to handle frustrations, if possible, or otherwise live with frustration.

MYTH 5: Spare the rod and spoil the child.

FACT: Unfair and excessive penalties are likely to cause resentment in the child, who may then deliberately defy the parents, either consciously or subconsciously.
MYTH 6: Children can "upset" their parents.

FACT: A child’s actions can frustrate parents, but only the parents can "upset" themselves.

MYTH 7: A child must earn a parent’s love.

FACT: A sincere parent expresses love in the parent-child relationship and as a result, the child need not worry about being loved. Having this security, a child can then concentrate on what is at hand.

MYTH 8: A child should be calmed first, a parent second.

FACT: A parent who is overly excited cannot deal rationally and effectively with a child.

MYTH 9: A child’s misbehavior is normal.

FACT: Any lively child will get into some mischief, but a happy child is not likely to misbehave, or do something which the child knows is against the parent’s wishes.

MYTH 10: A child and his behavior are the same.

FACT: A parent must realize the difference between the behavior of the child and the human being in the child. The child should be accepted as a person who is worthy of a parent’s respect and dignity; only the behavior should be found unacceptable. Objectional behavior may occur because of a child’s:

- low intelligence
- ignorance or lack of skill
- emotional instability
- attempt to get even
- effort to be noticed
- seeming inability to live up to parental standards

The wise parent considers why the misbehavior is occurring.

Once the reason for misbehavior has been established, the parent can begin to help the child correct the misbehavior.

Taken from: PRACTICAL EDUCATION FOR PARENTING By Kent G. Hamdorf
What's a Parent to Do?

A Program for Fathers and Mothers

by Carol L. Anderson

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY of Science and Technology
Cooperative Extension Service
Ames, Iowa...September 1972...Pn 544A
Most persons have some opinion about these three subjects. Magazines and newspapers run articles about them. Millions—including parents—read the articles and hear opinions of others.

Parents wonder if they are doing what they should with their children. They often question their own decisions and their own actions dealing with guidance, discipline and punishment of their own children.

You know, of course, no one can write a cookbook on guidance of a child. There’s no standard recipe that will yield a self-disciplined child if, say, you just add a tablespoon of love at age 4 months and a cup of understanding at 2 years.

A child is unique, fundamentally neither good nor bad. A child learns to do things that make him feel good; he learns patterns of actions that make him feel good. You praise him for helping take leaves—in his own way—and he has a good feeling, a feeling that you like what he does and you like him.

No two children are alike. Ask a mother of three youngsters, and she will tell you that she could not handle temper tantrums or flower-picking the same way with each child. One child seeks firm guidance; another reaches the same end result with gentle attention.

A parent is an individual, too. You have feelings and needs. When the child does something you like, you feel good. You feel something, too, when a child does something you don’t like.

Why This Self-Study?

These materials were developed as a way to help parents do these things:

1. To learn more about each child by being more observant and thoughtful about the child’s behavior and by discussing these observations in light of what experts have to say about children’s behavior at various ages.
2. To explore reasons for guidance.
3. To gather some ideas of ways to work with and to guide your child toward the goal that the child will eventually be self-directed, making decisions for his own level of development and accepting responsibility for the results.
Yes, that means fathers as well as mothers are invited to share in this learning experience.

Read the material as a couple if possible. However, since time does not always allow you to do things together, read it alone; but share your thinking with your spouse. Set aside a time when just the two of you, uninterrupted, can talk through your thoughts.

To help you remember important ideas or something you question, use the following code. It will help you both to remember parts that affected you.

Mark Findings and Decisions in Margin*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>? Don't understand</td>
<td>↑ Talk over later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☓ Is this usable??</td>
<td>↔ Share with friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>! Important</td>
<td>↓ Hey, let's try this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Use the symbols in the margins

To get you thinking about the topic, what do these three terms mean to you?

1. Guidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Wife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Wife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Punishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Wife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GUIDANCE

The end product of guidance is a child who is self-directing and bearing responsibility for decisions and behavior. The adult who guides a child works himself out of a job.

The nature and amount of guidance relate to the level of development of the child and consider the needs and goals of the youngster. The needs and goals of the guiding adult are considered, too; like the child, he has feelings and desires.

DISCIPLINE

Discipline has to do with rules set up by adults. Basically, it is a teaching situation in which the parent helps a child learn to act in ways that are acceptable to the society.

Usually the child does not help set the rules. Not always, but the child’s level of development and immediate needs are kept in mind.

The young child has external forces that help him change his behavior from unacceptable to acceptable. As the child grows older, it is expected that he will be able to discipline himself.

Take the example of learning to play the piano: It may take a great deal of external force to learn (both practice to play, and the child enjoys playing the piano and practices for that reason.

PUNISHMENT

Punishment is means used by an adult to change a child’s behavior. It may be physical—spanking, slapping or hurting in some physical way. It may be psychological—threatening a pleasure, saying, “I won’t love you if you eat with your fingers.”

There are problems involved in use of punishment to change behavior. The child may not know for sure what behavior he is to change. He knows something is wrong but may not know what to change. For example: Last time John turned the water hose on his sister, Father laughed; this time Father spanked John. Punishment weakens the child’s tendency to repeat the undesired act—at least, when the punishing adult is nearby—but the child may repeat the behavior when no adults appear to be around. Punishment may be necessary in some situations. A tetanus shot may seem like punishment to the child who stepped on a rusty nail.

Newspaper columnist Sydney J. Harris makes this observation about discipline:

“When parents talk about discipline, they mean a rigid set of rules to prevent the child from misbehaving. But the only discipline worthy of the name lies in providing a solid framework of ideals—not for the child to live up to, but for the parents to live within. You can beat a child until he is black and you are blue, but it cannot make him any better than the examples he sees around him every day.”

After writing your thoughts on page, compare your thinking to the definitions here. How are they alike? Different?

(Make notes.)
STOP what you are doing.  
LOOK at your children. Yes, observe them carefully to see how they grow and what they are really like.  
LISTEN to them. Listen to what they are saying to you: verbally and nonverbally.  
But first let's talk about growth. Children grow in four ways: physically, socially, emotionally and mentally. Ideally, growth might look like:

Since every child is unique, the four parts of growth are uneven. At a given time, they might look like:
Growth makes children act the way they do right now, and it will continue to affect their behavior throughout life. They change every day as they face different situations and cope with their surroundings.

Growth of a child might be compared to a kernel of corn. You plant the seed, give it water, air, sunshine and plant food. You hope and have faith the kernel will sprout. The plant needs to be nurtured throughout its life span as storms, insects and weeds create crisis situations which may alter or slow the growth. The plant turns to the source of strength, the sun, in time of need.

Think of your child in such a process of growth. To help you start your thinking, use the following check list. Add other characteristics you see.

Age _______ Sex _______

Physical—What can your child do? (Check the activities your child can presently do.)

- crawl
- stand up
- walk
- run
- jump
- climb
- draw
- dress self
- feed self

Physical growth can be seen in height and weight changes, muscle development, coordination and activity. The child goes through a process of steps before he walks alone. He experiences creeping, crawling, pulling himself up, sliding around furniture, stepping and, finally, that independent step.

Social—How does your child get along with others?

- plays alone
- watches others
- plays alongside others
- plays with others
- takes turns
- shares

Social growth relates to the way children react to the people around them. First social contacts are usually with parents and other family members. Children go through stages in which they prefer to play alone. They move to watching other children. Playing may mean another child is in the room, but both will be happy only when they have a similar toy and stay on opposite sides of the room. They seem to say to one another, "You do your thing, and I'll do mine." Playing together and sharing toys comes later when the child feels relatively secure and generally trusts himself.

Emotional—Which emotions are expressed by your children?

- love
- anger
- fear
- jealousy
- guilt
- joy
- understanding
- excitement

...
How do they express the emotions?

Emotional growth is developing some of the abstractions in life: happiness, joy, love, anger, fear, sympathy, jealousy and disappointment. Every person experiences these feelings at times. The child has difficulty expressing them constructively unless encouraged.

When a child becomes angry, he often lacks words to express what he feels. You can encourage him to release his anger by pounding nails into soft wood, slamming a punching bag or pillow or pounding vigorously—rather than slapping another child. Keep in mind that adults release their anger by slamming doors, punching bread dough or hitting a fist on the table.

What ideas do you have for letting a child release his feelings?

Mental—How well does your child talk and relate in the world? (Check the items that your child can presently do.)

- babytalk
- single words
- sentences
- questions

How does he play?

- imitates others
- explores

What does he play with?

- experiments

How long does he stay interested in one thing?

Mental growth is commonly known as learning. Teaching and learning are a life-long process. In the early years, the child uses his senses to learn about the surroundings. Such things as rocks, grass and balls seem to go to the mouth. He feels, smells, sees and talks about the blade of grass to learn what it is all about.

Adults usually use their sense of vision to identify an object quickly. However, if a piece of artificial turf was placed on this page, you would probably fail to see how closely it resembled grass.

As the child grows, he is able to deal more with abstractions. Love is certainly abstract; it cannot be captured and placed in a box. The child learns to feel it through repeated demonstrations.

The child learns by imitation, by trying over and over again, and by experimenting.

He is, after all, on his personal timetable. Growth has some characteristics that can be recognized at certain ages. If your child hasn’t shown the characteristics as yet, or went through them several months ago, there’s no reason to panic.
BIRTH TO TWO YEARS
- Seeks to discover if world is safe
- Trust through feeding, exploring and established routines
- Dependent on adults
- Needs abundance of smiles, laughter and reassuring pats
- Dramatic physical changes
- Decreasing sleep time

TWO YEARS
- Negative (says "No" many times)
- Possessive or "That's mine"
- Noisy
- Seeks to get his own way
- Curious and explores
- Choice making almost impossible
- Reasoning isn't very useful, he can't make up his mind

Look, I can set the table.

THREE YEARS
- Tries to please those important to her
- Conforms to suggestions
- Can be reasoned with
- Attentive when spoken to, especially when called by name
- Makes choices
  I always seem to be "out of bounds"

FOUR YEARS
- Questions and more questions
- Seeks friends, but has problems getting along
- Assertive and boastful at times
- Tattles frequently
- Self-centered
- Enjoys exploring with made-up words
  Will you let me try my idea?

FIVE YEARS
- Friendly with friends (usually) and parents
- Businesslike
- Dependent
- Lores to feel independent
- Dressing up lets her express her moods and feelings
- Short-time projects are interesting and entertaining
When children misbehave, we sometimes wonder what is really going through their minds. By looking at some of the reasons, we may become more understanding.

Imaturity

Two-year-old Melinda had been helping her father care for the roses. As he prepared to enter the most beautiful in the flower show, Mr. James nursed the prize plant along and could see that the flower would truly be beautiful when the blossom opened. Two days before the show, Melinda came bustling into the house with the slightly opened flower in her hands. She made the above statement. As you may guess, Mr. James was angry—to say the least, the blossom hardly had a stem. Knowing he would be unable to enter the flower, he (Fill in what you think happened.)

Melinda, at 2, just did not understand what was right or wrong. What seemed to be bad to the adult appeared to be a loving, acceptable thing to do. Melinda thought her father would be happy because he spent so much time with the flower.

Do your children sometimes lack maturity in their decisions and end up in trouble?
Growing Independence
Independence of children may be compared to a funnel.

Dependence
At birth, a child is totally dependent on adults. As he grows, he becomes more and more independent. He seeks boundaries to test his independence. Two is a typical age for echoing "No" when the child might mean "Yes." He is exerting his independence. At times it may bother you, but remember he is trying to become independent.

How does a 3-year-old show his independent desires? (Write down what you have seen.)

... a 4-year-old?

... a 6-year-old?

Yes, different ways for each age.

Curiosity
Curiosity gets children into some pretty difficult situations. The same can be said for adults.

Curiosity leads a child to want to know "why." What will happen if one pulls the dog's tail when he is sleeping under the car? The dog may snap and frighten the child so he doesn't try it again.

On the other hand, a child may get by with being curious about the kind of cookies in the jar until he is caught catching or drops the lid and it shatters into a million pieces. We think the child is misbehaving, but really he is curious about things in the world.
Boredom

When an activity is repeated over and over again, the child can become tired of it and try something different. The result may be trouble. Brian normally enjoys paint time with paper. On Tuesday, he started to paint and suddenly Jane was crying because he was painting her shirt. Brian was seeking a new way to express his painting talent, and it wasn’t approved by anyone. Mother has to act, since she cannot tolerate having Jane’s clothes all painted. What would you do?

Since the child may be bored, try other ways of painting to increase the interest. You might have him paint the fence, house, or sidewalk with water. The child could use grass or leaves for a brush. List some other materials you might use for painting.

Attention

Children love the spotlight, as adults do. They will think of all kinds of ways to get you to watch them. Recognizing them, or having them help give Aunt Hilda a napkin for coffee, means they have some attention. Being noticed is worth changing punishment.

Built-up Resentment

Children become angry at times because they consider what you have done to be unfair. Tom feels Nancy received more help, so he took his scissors and cut a chunk of hair from Nancy’s head. He acted out a feeling he may not have even understood.
Impulsiveness
Chasing a ball into the street is an impulsive act. The ball is rolling, and the child wants to get it before it gets further away. Everyone is impulsive at times. A child frequently acts without thinking through the consequences. Without meaning to be, the child is in forbidden territory; as a parent, you act hastily, too.

What kinds of impulsive acts have your children done in the past week? How did you react? Write down your reactions.

Influence of Friends
Friends! Oh, how helpful sometimes. Two boys playing catch with a spitball start to encourage one another to throw it higher and higher. Suddenly instead of hitting the wall, they put the ball through the upstairs window. They get carried away, and their behavior "leads them into temptation."

Inability to Communicate
How do you as a parent feel when your child utters those words?
Your first impulse may be that you can't let this happen. But remember, the child is not really able to say what he feels, so he comes out with what he can. He probably doesn't hate you; rather he may hate what you have done to stop his action.
Why are the children misbehaving in these cases? Write down your reactions.

1. Your family has visited your widowed mother on Sunday afternoon for several years. Suddenly 10-year-old Jill announces that she is not going and wants to stay home.

2. The children have been watching you prepare supper. Suddenly the phone rings, and you go into the next room and start to visit with a friend. You hang up and walk back to the kitchen to find the children coloring on the refrigerator.

3. A new baby comes home from the hospital. Neighbors and friends come by with gifts and flowery compliments as 3-year-old Melinda stands by. No one pays much attention to her. Suddenly she jumps on her big tricycle and drives it into the middle of the living room, bumping furniture on the way.
To see how you rate in making decisions on guiding your children, answer the questions below. Cut the page off on the dotted line, fold it as indicated on the back, staple or tape it closed, and add a stamp. Place in the mail. Your extension home economist will check your responses and return your ideas promptly.

For the first three questions, circle T (true) or F (false), whichever you think is correct. In the blank spaces, write down why you answered as you did.

T F 1. Children need assistance in learning how to face the challenges and obligations of living.

T F 2. A child's relationship with the parents forms the basis for his attitude toward other people.

T F 3. A parent can expect a child to challenge authority regularly from the time the child is about 15 months of age, if not earlier.

Pretend you are sending your sister or mother a short letter after a trying day with the children. Indicate why they might have cleaned all of the pans out of the cupboard, ran around answering "No" to everything you suggested and refused to pick up the toys.

Your Name ___________________ Address ___________________
City ___________________ State ______ Zip Code __________
TO: Selected Parents of Pre-School Children

Dear

We hope that you found the first lesson of What's A Parent To Do? both useful and enjoyable.

The second lesson of this series is enclosed for your study. The subdivisions of this lesson include:

- Looking Ahead
- The Elements of Guidance
- The Pendulum Swings

To find out what these topics are all about, read lesson two. We think you will find some interesting ideas that can help you in your special job as a parent.

We encourage you to complete each of the activities suggested in the lesson. These are designed to help you see and understand your child, as well as to help you think through some of the type of problems parents often have to deal with. At a glance, these problems may seem simple and insignificant. However, how you as a parent handle each situation in your parent-child relationships can have a lifetime impact on the child.

We certainly hope that you will find lesson II helpful.

Sincerely,
All parents want their children to develop into responsible, self-thinking individuals. Responsibility cannot be taught, it must be given. Children should be treated with dignity and respect. Traditional discipline for children meant the parent was the person who made and enforced the rules, and the child submitted to the rules. In many instances, this style of parenting resulted in children who grew up lacking self-confidence as well as non-responsible decision makers.

To achieve responsible, self-thinking qualities in a child the parenting style needs to be one where social equality is recognized and used in the parent-child relationships. Parenting based on democratic principles provides opportunities for the child to make decisions, within limits, and to be accountable for these decisions.

Democratic parents don't just happen, they become democratic through learning, which includes analyzing and trying new ideas and skills in their jobs as parents.

A General Guide for Lesson II

1. What do you want your child to be like in ten years? Only you can answer this question. Pages 3 through 8 of Lesson II provides some general ideas of the kind of person we all hope a child will become. This section also gives some ways to help a child develop into this desirable person.

2. What is involved in the concept of guidance? For some answers to this question read pages 9 through 11. Be sure to add your own ideas to the ideas presented in this lesson.

3. Who should control the situation in parent-child relationships. Read about the different type of controls when dealing with a child on pages 13 through 15.

Be sure to complete all of the different activities presented in Lesson two. They are designed to help you think through the relationship you have with your child and the type of person you want your child to be.
A Program for Fathers and Mothers

by Carol L. Anderson

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY of Science and Technology
Cooperative Extension Service
Ames, Iowa ... September 1972 ... Pm-5448
What do I hope my child will be like in 10 to 15 years?
(List some of your thoughts.)

When your child is pre-school or early school age, it is difficult to imagine what he will be like in five, 10 or 15 years. But there is a way of getting by on this very little into the crystal ball and see what you hope you might hold.

Don't read on until you have some some thinking.
To let you compare your thinking, we have listed several things we would want to see in a child 10 to 12 years from now. Compare your thoughts and ours.

1. Managing his feelings and emotions. Every person has many feelings, including anger, love, happiness, and fear, just to mention a few. Through experiences and the family environment, children learn to express and deal with their feelings.

   When 4-year old Johnny is angry because his Mother picked on him when he told her not to pull Sue's hair, he is encouraged to take a soft piece of wood and hit nails into it. Mother helps Johnny release his feelings by talking and using positive action rather than letting him keep the anger.

   When 20-year old John becomes angry because Sue dates another guy, he is able to talk with her and express his displeasure.

2. Thinking for himself. Life is full of newness, and what one thinks today is outdated shortly or will need to be rethought tomorrow.

   Thinking for himself, a person explores possibilities and asks questions before making a decision.

3. Solving routine and difficult problems. Problem solving is as much a part of life as air and water. Some problems are routine, such as, "Do I wash clothes today or with tomorrow's clothes?" Some are difficult.

   For the young child trying to clean a sock-butt or peel a potato, he is at a disadvantage. As the child matures, he is faced with more difficult problems, such as all the other John and Nancy faced. Problems are ever present, and so is a decision or different, especially, when responsibility is accepted for the outcome.

4. Finding and developing personal potential. The early years of a child's life are important for developing potential. Offering the child a variety of experiences - such as a trip to the woods, a new pet, a creek in the pasture or staying home to listen to the snow fall - opens new insights for the youngster.

5. Reacting constructively to change. Times change people so that he is different from before. Remember the first zoo trip when an animal roared and frightened the child, he remembers this for a long time when the same sound occurs, whether on radio, TV or live.

6. Contributing to himself, community and country. Every person is worthwhile and has a contribution to make. However, sometimes a great deal of searching takes place before a contribution is found.

   Helping a brother learn some of these things cannot be done by a single mother. Let's compare goals for development to a building.

   4
Affection is the foundation of guidance. When present, the child knows that he is loved regardless of what he does. It is actions that are followed.

A warm family - pleasurable, wishing to be like those we admire - is essential for growth.

When a parent answers questions truthfully, keeps promises, shares experiences and shares confidence in living, he is setting a good example. Much of what is learned is "caught rather than taught." To be effective, parents talk, cuddle, and talk with the children. The lines of communication are kept open.

When affection is present, a child can take a spanking even if it is the first report, and know that he is still loved and cared for by his parents.

Show your affection in actions as well as by using kind and patient words.

We want to travel from A to B, but have a considerable distance to go. Before starting, we need it packed, and packed

Let's look at some of the ways to help a child.

Respect is two-sided. The child respects the parent, and the parent respects the child. To gain respect, you show respect to your children. This implies that in your daily dealings you are consistent in your behavior.

Children have a place to store their toys just like you. They have a place to store their mail and let you read it to them when they are unable to read. They respect your mail and privacy.

Respect isn’t learned in 10 minutes. It takes time and patience.

How do you feel when you make this statement?

"Can’t you control your temper?"

Then... after a while...

Now compare how you feel when you say

"Karen, I know you have had a difficult day. I’ll help you pick up your toys."

Appreciation can be in a parent; what moisture is to corn, too much can seem to be "gushy" and unreal, which hurts; it misses the point.

In a day's time count the number of times you say "don’t," "stop," or "be quiet."
Change the following statements so the child is receiving approval. Write down your thoughts.

1. Mother to daughter: "Why do you have to make such a mess when coloring?"

2. Father to son: "Johnny, stay out of my tools. You always leave them everywhere."

3. Father to daughter: "Can't you even sit still? Can't you see I'm trying to concentrate on reading the paper?"

4. Mother to daughter: "Don't suck your thumb. You'll be sucking it when you're 10 years old."

5. Mother to son: "You're as messy as your father. Why can't you learn to pick up your clothes?"

6. Father to son: "Can't you walk around the puddles instead of sailing through the middle? You'll never learn."
1. The mother might look at the characteristics of a child and see that making a relevant activity is not always the goal. The fun of exploring with color, using the tools in different ways, and having a clue to show father can be rewarding. Mother praises the child for what she has done or tried.

2. Why might Johnny leave the tools out? How can father encourage Johnny to put them back? Might he have a storage space at Johnny's level? Perhaps a rule that only two tools can be taken at one time before others are returned from the storage area? Father could say, "Johnny, you select two tools, use them and bring them back." Or we could give the tools together.

3. An adult needs time for being alone and so does a child. Encourage a child to rest at this time. If the child is younger, father might make her an ice pop, read a couple of sentences to her and then encourage her to find a book and look at the pictures. Or he can calmly say that he wants to read the paper now and will play with her in 10 minutes. Maybe he could use a clock so that when the bell rang, the child would know it was her turn to play with father.

4. The mere mother mentions the thumb, the more it becomes a security symbol. Thumb sucking is like scaring. Children can go through this stage, and the less said the faster it disappears. Why is the child sucking her thumb? Does she need this because she is insecure? Or has it become a habit?

5. The image of father certainly isn't being improved. In front of the children, a sieve is never used alone. Father could say, "Let's set up your toys today together, but not before you are responsible." Or "Your toys are to be used for playing on Saturday." The choice is not necessarily of substantial, because if he works in a noisy room, he is the one to find things.

6. "Walking through guilt is fine, but if we deny you have done wrong."
HELP is the final step to reaching A and B.

Parents question how they can tell if they are doing too much or too little for the child.

The individual child is your clue. Again, watch him to learn the answers to such questions as:

- Why is he asking for help?
- Is he seeking attention, praise, or does he really lack the ability to complete the task?
- Are there others in the family who receive more of your time?
- Do you stress independence? How?
- Do you intrinsically enjoy his dependence? Why?

In summary, to get a child from A to B, or to young adulthood, the task is marked and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>Child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides</td>
<td>Develops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help</td>
<td>Abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>Self-Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affection</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, to get a child from A to B, or to young adulthood, the task is marked and

Adapted from: Principles of Child Guidance, Cornell University, 1957.
When guiding children, provide generous portions of:

- A kiss, a walk among the trees, a shared secret, a pat on the back are all ways of expressing love for another.

How do you show your children you love?

*Describe or write out your response.*

Respect

Children are people, worthy of the same respect you show another adult. Respect them for the stage of development they have reached, respect them and they will respect you. Deliberately model respect, not just in front of the whole neighborhood, but even this little in their presence. When respect is modelled, the child develops confidence in his abilities, and others.

Write down ways you let your child know you respect him.
Patience. Yes, with children you need patience. Some things have to be taught again and again before they become a part of the child’s life. When a child needs more than one experience to learn, keep cool.

Understanding—
the key that unlocks many doors

Listen to what the child is saying. She or he wants you to see when out walking by talking in the same way. Know what your child is like from two to twelve years for others. The child has good listening and to be able talk with him and will suggest how keep the channel of communication open.

Acceptance

Accept your child for what he is. Perhaps you hoped for a handsome athlete, no fruit fly, and were surprised with a rather way talking, understanding girl. Accept her rather than wishing she were something else. Help her to bring out her individual talents so they may be loved and used.

How do you show your children you accept them as they are?

Describe...

Firmness and Fairness

Love and understanding, not confusion. The expression of это is no exception.
When making rules, you think of the individual child and your level of tolerance. Rules and limits are like routines that direct a person from one place to the next, helping him to be aware of existing conditions. Quesions may block a particular path, but the unexpected event may add some newness to the person's life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tues</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thurs</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSISTENCY**

Oh, how difficult consistency is but it's one principle a person needs to keep in mind. No two families wake up being different every day. Some days they are perfect, while others are unremarkable.

To make a child feel secure and free of confusion, be consistent. This way, the child can predict your behavior. "I'll be up Monday, Wednesday, and Friday."

Your family may set a family meal: eating breakfast together at 7 a.m., dinner at 6:30 p.m., and snacks in the evening. The child knows the day's routine, and if the same thing happens tomorrow, then tomorrow will be breakfast and not have a chance for a snack until noon time.

Next day, Karen is late. She is told in a matter of fact way that, since she knew what was said the day before, she will not eat till noon. She becomes hungry and asks for food, but Mother refuses. The next morning, Karen arises for breakfast at 7 a.m.

If illness or some other problem arises, the relaxation of the rule can be granted. Once the situation is back to normal, consistency takes over again.

Emergency's arise, children change, and situations enter the pattern. The parents must be flexible at each one separately, and making a decision. A child should be more involved in rational discussions more evident. When a child is 2 and walks a little into the street, you do nothing. The child ultimately learns to do so. When the child has learned safety rules and is aware of some of the consequences, he is able to not, a bare into the street.
Parents come in as many varieties as children. Parents have needs, goals, desires and values that are met while working with children.

It's a difficult role at times because one must basically be children's problems, not solve them, and cannot always be liked by the children every waking minute of the day. One sometimes has to make decisions that are unpopular with the child.

Let's turn to three types of parents commonly found in our society. Comparing parents to a stretch of highway we find:

**Adult Control**

Adapted from *Childhood Education*, January 1957
Discipline of many years ago was much different than today. Father was the leader and the law, and he made all of the decisions. In fact, he often did it himself before the children, so they would know where they stood. Children were overprotected and were unable to express their thoughts and feelings. The saying "children should be seen but not heard" described this situation. The children were expected to obey, regardless of how they felt.

There are disadvantages to this type of control:

1. A child may grow up never questioning the "whys." The child will probably obey commands in order to make a decision. Really, a normal decision will be difficult to make as the person wonders what someone in authority will think.

2. Some children, as they become more independent, swing to the opposite extreme. They must be the same so-called "black sheep." When they have the ears of their own, they might become extremely child-centered and allow their children to get by with most anything rather than finding the answer.

3. Children are unable to explore, to discover and learn what some of their limitations are as well as personal consequences of action.

The opposite extreme is child control. Here the child moves freely in any direction he chooses. The child becomes confused when he tries to play with children that have had other types of parents.

The child is not made aware of realistic limits to which he must eventually adjust as he begins to live in the world. Playing with a garden hose, the child-oriented child is just as likely to soak an old piece of clothing to go to work as to soak a person in a fishing net.

This child finds learning difficult. He spends much of his time testing to discover if limits do exist.
Some parents exert child control as a means of dealing with their children. They are able to make a choice between "helping children effect limits appropriate to the situation" and "letting them have their own way."

In the child control situation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limit set: &quot;Put bike in garage before dusk.&quot;</td>
<td>Limit broken and parent doesn't act.</td>
<td>Limit forgotten</td>
<td>Reset limit</td>
<td>Broken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Democratic Control**

- Make rule clear, consistent
- Enforce limits and rules
- Writing the clear rules
- Enforce all
- Accepting responsibility for decisions

Using some control based on the child's needs, with both firmness and flexibility, provides a secure environment. Support, limits, and limits with consequences are key in helping children understand expectations and self-discipline. The rules are used for teaching and learning, not enforcing.
Guidance by democratic control is difficult. It requires understanding and patience on the part of the parent. The parent has to remember that “boys will be boys” and “girls will be girls.” When a child has a clean sheet on and goes out to the sandbox, he can’t keep it clean for long as he wanders to construct a sand castle.

Just as certain that water and sunshine alone, children will wallow through the mud puddle rather than around it. Water attracts a child.

Destructive behavior is not permitted. Release is encouraged by having the child make a painting, picture, or casting and water-surface bowl.

With the present writing dependence and changes in our lives, children have to be protect for the new and unexpeclted. Parents start the training process leading to responsible and cooperative living.

What would you do?
Indicate how you would handle the following.

1. Mrs. Jones, your neighbor, has two children, June, 4, and John, 5. Mrs. Jones has planted a garden without the assistance of the children. June, the children go to the backyard to play and always end up playing near or in the garden, snuffing or picking the leaves and vegetables. To keep the children in line, every hour Mrs. Jones goes to the door and shouts, “I have just had it with you, I have had it with you kids!”
2. Johnny tries Persistently for a piece of candy. Mother knows that he wants it, but says she can't have any. After several times of questioning, Johnny falls to the floor and starts to scream and shout. But, her Mother does not like to see him so she says, "Here, Johnny, I guess one piece of candy won't hurt you. Now stop crying."

3. Dad comes rushing into the house furious. He has discovered his best shoe in the backyard, rusted from being out in the rain the night before. But, the 4 year old son quickly races to his room, he knows what is wrong.

4. John and Steve sit on the same side of the dinner table. Suddenly, they fall into the usual pattern of kicking and hitting one another. Dad says sharply, "Go to your room so the rest of us can eat in peace!"
IF YOU'D LIKE TO READ MORE ...  
To see how you rate in making everyone else in your children's lives feel safe, put the tape off on the left side, fold, and place it on the back shelf of the vehicle and set a stage. Place in the next Your entry in home comment will check your responses and return your ride promptly.

For the first three questions, circle T (true) or F (false) whichever you think is correct. In the blank space, write down why you answered as you did.

T F 1. Love of children is enough to guide children.

T F 2. Discipline does not permit the tender affection made possible by mutual respect between a parent and a child.

T F 3. A parent does not need to respect a child even though the child needs to respect the parent.

What would you do?

4. John and Steve sit on the same side of the dinner table. Suddenly they are listening to the radio. What do you think they are hearing? Write on this line what you might try.

---

Change the following statements on the child is receiving approval.

5. Don't bang on the piano. You'll drive everyone insane.

6. You're so loud! Why do you have to continually break my expensive knock knacks? I've told you a hundred times to stay away.

---

Your Name: __________________ Address: _____________________________
City: __________________ State: ______ Zip Code: ____________
TO: Selected Parents of Pre-School Children

Dear

Enclosed is the third and final lesson of What's A Parent To Do? We certainly hope that the entire series has been useful to you as a parent.

One of the most important jobs of any parent is providing guidance for their child. We realize that these three lessons have only "skimmed" the top of the entire area of guidance, however we hope that you will continue to seek additional information that will help you to analyze and develop your own parenting style.

Next week we will send you a questionnaire on the information presented in What's A Parent To Do? We hope that you will complete it and return it to us. It is designed to help us provide you with additional information.

Sincerely,
Lesson III

When your child does something you approve of, how do you react? When he does something you disapprove of, how do you react? How do you teach your child acceptable behavior from non-acceptable behavior?

To many parents, teaching a child means rewarding him when his behavior is acceptable and punishing him when his behavior is not acceptable. It should be recognized by parents that reward and punishment in providing guidance when working with children can have undesirable side effects. The rewarded or punished child can become dependent, fearful and unsure of himself.

The best way to direct a child's behavior is through discipline: teaching the child the rules that people live by and helping him to adopt these rules of his own accord. When working with and teaching a child, parents should always keep in mind that discipline involves the guiding of a child toward self-discipline. Discipline is the method used to direct the child in choosing acceptable behavior, developing control and self-discipline.

A General Guide for Lesson III

1. Rewards can be used in guidance. This does not mean always rewarding acceptable behavior. It does mean encouraging positive behavior by making the child feel good when he exhibits behavior that you approve of. Pages 2 through 4 present some ideas on how rewards can play a part in positive guidance.

2. How do you discipline your child? Pages 5 and 6 give some common discipline methods used by parents. It is also pointed out that these frequently used actions may not be effective. On the same page (6) you will find some suggestions that may help you in your approach to disciplining your child.

Remember, complete each activity suggested in the lesson. They are designed to help you in your job as a parent.
It is an approach based on rewarding good behavior rather than punishing the undesirable. Of course, it isn’t that simple— it isn’t either rewarding good or punishing bad. It has to do with the emphasis— giving by reward as the major strategy.

Consider a parent you know—perhaps yourself. What is the ratio of praise to reprimand? Typically, little may be said when a child behaves the way the parent desires; but just wait till the child does something the parent doesn’t like!

Positive Guidance: Encourage Good Behavior

Here are some fundamentals involved in using rewards to encourage good behavior.

Reward immediately. When the child behaves in a way you approve, reward him right then. For the child to seek to please you, he needs to know what things will gain a reward.

Reward tangibly—something the child enjoys. For one child, going for a walk may be pleasant; for another, a trip to the park may be great; another may love to paint—or do something that is different, but special for him.

Reward progress. Behavior changes slowly; learning deepens with repetition. So reward progress; don’t wait until the goal is reached. Encouragement may be vital along the way. For example: Your goal may be dry diapers after a night of sleep. When the child’s diaper is only damp in the morning, not soaked, reward that much progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diaper soaked:</th>
<th>No reward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diaper damp:</td>
<td>Reward by talking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaper dry:</td>
<td>Reward by reading a story</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To a large degree the strongest rewards are things that make the child feel good inside.
You may say: "Pick up your dolls and find a story and we will read." Or, "Thank you for helping wash the plates; they are sparkling clean."

A smile may mean that only the two of you share a secret.

A chance to help in the kitchen may mean that the two of you will be able to talk together.

Going to the park for a picnic or to the woods can be a time to enjoy nature and activity.

One principle of reward in positive guidance is simply this: When a child gets a reward for an act, he will be likely to repeat that act in order to get another "good" feeling.

Consider two examples of positive guidance at work:

A child knocks a glass of milk to the floor. Others jump, and someone giggles. The child gleefully claps his hands and laughs, too. You know accidents happen, so perhaps you say nothing. But at the next meal, the child asks for a glass of milk to the floor, hoping to get the same "good" feeling. This time, though, no one laughs, and Father shows his disappointment. The child begins to learn that this behavior is not accepted; he does not get the "good" feeling.

Tom comes into the kitchen when Mother is placing silverware on the table. He asks if he can help and places two spoons on the table. Mother thanks him. Father comes into the room and comments on the fact of Tom helping Mother. Before the next meal, Tom appears to help again, and both parents praise him. He keeps helping, because he likes the feeling he gets when his parents are pleased by what he does.

BUT... to keep positive behavior going, do not give rewards every time.

Going back to the example of Tom: Every third or fourth meal someone may mention that Tom is a "good helper," and Mother thanks him. Tom will probably continue to help with the table, working for that occasional time that he gets the praise and the "good" feeling. Behavior that is occasionally rewarded is the most difficult to extinguish.

Another type of behavior that is difficult to change is that taught by punishment. For example, the child who is guided by punishment into being quiet and subdued may not easily become outgoing and aggressive at a later time when the parents wish he had those characteristics.

Now look at your own children. What are they doing that you like? What are you doing to encourage them to repeat the actions you like? How do you let them know you like their actions?
Listen to yourself. What kind of words do you use to reward your child's "good" behavior?

What are some additional words that you might use to reward your child?

Children Reward Themselves

Children do not always need adults to reward what they do. They reward themselves and others.

Watch a child learning to ride a bicycle. He struggles to keep the bike upright for even a short distance. As he is able to balance it, he is encouraged (or rewarded). He spills often, and has to pick up his bike and his feelings. Suddenly, he keeps it moving upright for 100 feet. Reward "Gosh, I really did it!" He tries again and again, each success is a reward. He finds he can go a greater distance without falling. Occasional success encourages the child to try again.

Watch your own child to see how he rewards himself. What are the obvious ways?

What are the not so obvious ways?

How do you reward yourself?

In the obvious ways?

The not so obvious ways?
Regardless of how well you plan, trouble does happen, and you have to deal with it on the spot rather than waiting for Dad to come home. Discipline is frequently used with children when trouble happens.

Punishment, too, is frequently used and it is used to associate unapproved conduct with a lack of "pay-off" or satisfaction. As a rule though, punishment is not necessary if the child understands the mistake and will not have a tendency to repeat it.

Some disciplinary actions frequently used:

1. **IGNORING**
   Sara, age four, goes into a temper tantrum, stamping her feet, jumping up and down. Mother goes about her work saying nothing and pretending not to see the action. Shortly Sara decides to stop when no one pays attention and she goes to help Mother.

   Ignoring the behavior is not paying attention to the antisocial act. If the child will not physically hurt himself, this can be effective.

   **Problem of this method**—if the child prefers to be alone, ignoring may not be a disciplinary action, but rather a chance to withdraw from others.

2. **DISAPPROVAL**
   Facial expressions or that certain frown or tone of voice quickly tell a child how you feel about an act. A child soon learns that a sharply used snap of the finger means the "end of the rope" has been reached.

3. **WITHHOLDING PLEASURE**
   "If you leave the table to play—no more food."
   or
   "You pick up the blocks and Daddy will take you to see the kitty."

   Under 3 years of age, this technique is useless. The child will forget and go off to another activity.

   His idea of time is forever, and tomorrow might just as well be forever. Consequences take place immediately.

   When withholding a pleasure, be matter-of-fact in your normal voice.

4. **THREAT**
   "If you throw one more thing, I'll do something you dislike."

   Really, how effective is this? Blackmail doesn't work at any age, because too frequently the threat isn't carried out. The threat may be effective for a couple of minutes, but as soon as the child realizes nothing will happen, he turns his hearing off and is busy at the same behavior.

   **AVOID**—"I won't love you if..." You are upset with what the child is doing, not with him as a person.
5. BODILY PUNISHMENT

(more commonly spanking)

Spanking is rarely effective in guiding behavior. Yes, a specific result may be stopped, but what feelings and thoughts remain within the child?

Spanking or a quick slap is used sparingly with young children who cannot be reasoned with. Your 2 year-old tries reaching for the range burners. You quickly slap the fingers to teach the child specifically that trying to touch burners is not tolerated.

At about age 3, reasoning ability develops to a level where you and the child can talk about misbehavior. The goal of guidance is to change the desire, not just the behavior.

Now, look at your children again:

What are your children doing that you like?

What are your children doing that you dislike?

What are you doing that causes them to repeat the act?

How can you change your approach so the action will stop? Or continue if you approve.

1. Give security of limits.
2. Work with the child rather than against him.
3. Accept the child's decision if you give a choice. (Give realistic choices.)
4. Listen to yourself and to your child.
5. Show your love in ways that a child can understand.
6. Keep demands consistent, yet flexible.
7. Know your child. He is an individual with his own timetable of development.
8. Recognize the urges that bring out acts.
10. Set a good example.
To see how you rate in making decisions as to guiding your children, answer the questions below. Clip the page off on the dotted line, fold it as indicated on the back, staple or tape it closed, and add a stamp. Place in the mail. Your extension home economist will check your responses and return the material promptly.

For the first three questions, circle T (true) or F (false), whichever you think is correct. In the blank space, write down why you answered as you did.

T  F  1. "Law of Reinforcement" means that if an individual likes what happens as a result of his behavior, he will be likely to repeat that act.

T  F  2. Yelling, nagging at, and spanking a child can become a habit and may not be effective.

T  F  3. Consistency is the most difficult part of guidance, but the most necessary in order to change behavior or keep a behavior going.

By now you have probably tried some different ways of reacting to your children and have found some ways that are working. Tell us what you tried, how long did it take to change behavior?

Your Name____________________ Address____________________
City____________________ State_________ Zip Code__________

AND JUSTICE FOR ALL
APPENDIX C
TO: Selected Parents of Pre-School Children

Dear

For the past three weeks you have been reading some information on parenting. We hope the information is useful to you as a parent.

In our first letter to you concerning this series we asked if you would participate in a research project designed to help us determine how we can better meet your needs as a young family.

Enclosed is a questionnaire on parenting. Would you be willing to take a little time from your busy day and answer these questions as a part of the research project? A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for you to return the questionnaire. It would be very helpful if you could return the questionnaire in one week. The questionnaire is not designed to test your ability. It is designed to evaluate the possible effectiveness of the information you received.

Your name is not required on the questionnaire. However, if you would like the results of your own questionnaire, include your name and address at the top of the first page of the questionnaire. The results of your questionnaire will be known only by you and the researcher.

You may note that the questionnaire is to be returned to Laretta King at an Ohio address. Ms. King is an Extension Specialist at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Blacksburg, Virginia. However, she is currently studying at Ohio State University, thus the Columbus address. She is going to compile the research project information.

For record keeping purposes, as you return the questionnaire please sign the enclosed self-addressed postcard and mail it. This will not indicate which questionnaire is yours, it will only let us know that you did participate in the project by returning the questionnaire.

Your participation in this project is greatly appreciated. It will help us in determining how to better meet your needs as well as the needs of many young families such as you.

Sincerely,
TO: Selected Parents of Pre-School Children

Dear

Would you be willing to help us in a research project designed to help us provide you with educational materials, developed to meet your needs as a young family?

Enclosed is a questionnaire developed to help us determine the kind of information young parents might need. Would you answer these questions and return it to us in the stamped self-addressed envelope? We will send you the publications that the questions were taken from in a few weeks.

Our purpose in asking you to answer the questions before reading the publications is to determine if the information is generally known by young parents. The questionnaire is not designed to test your ability. It is designed to evaluate the possible effectiveness of the publications you will receive.

Your name is not required on the questionnaire. However, if you would like the results of your own questionnaire, include your name and address at the top of the first page of the questionnaire. The results of your questionnaire will be known only by you and the researcher.

You may note that the questionnaire is to be returned to Laretta King at an Ohio address. Ms. King is an Extension Specialist at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Blacksburg, Virginia. However, she is currently studying at Ohio State University, thus the Columbus address. She is going to compile the research project information.

For record keeping purposes, as you return the questionnaire please sign the enclosed self-addressed postcard and mail it. This will not indicate which questionnaire is yours; it will only let us know that you did participate in the project by returning the questionnaire. It would be helpful if you return the questionnaire in one week.

Your participation in this project is optional, however your assistance is very important to this research project. It will help us in determining how to best meet your needs as a young family.

Sincerely,
To: Selected Parents of Pre-School Children

Dear Parent:

Recently you received a questionnaire titled, What's A Parent To Do?. We would like very much to have you complete and return the questionnaire. If you have not already returned the questionnaire, we would appreciate it if you would take a few minutes during your busy day and complete it and return it in the pre-addressed, stamped envelope you received.

The returning of your questionnaire is very important to the research project. As we noted in an earlier letter, your reply will eventually help us in providing additional educational programs for young families such as you. Again, your reply to the questionnaire will be confidential. You do not need to include your name, however please sign and return the postcard if you complete and return the questionnaire. The postcard will indicate you participated in the research project.

We appreciate your cooperation and thank you for completing and returning the questionnaire.

Sincerely,
Directions: Circle the letter of the correct option following each statement.

1. Discipline for children is:
   a. a teaching situation in which reward and punishment is used to help a child learn the rules people live by.
   b. a teaching situation in which parents help a child learn to act in acceptable ways.
   c. a teaching situation in which parents help a child learn to love and getting along with others.
   d. a teaching situation in which parents help a child learn to accept punishment as a "fact" of life.

2. Physical growth in a child includes learning to:
   a. walk, share, jump and dress self.
   b. run, understand, share and walk.
   c. run, walk jump and dress self.
   d. run, walk, understand and dress self.

3. To expect positive behavior a child's progress should be encouraged because:
   a. it causes good behavior.
   b. it makes the child want to continue.
   c. it teaches discipline.
   d. it eliminates the need to punish.

4. Positive guidance is based on a system of encouragement that is:
   a. immediate
   b. progressive
   c. tangible
   d. all of the above

5. For a child to feel secure and to understand what is acceptable behavior a parent should:
   a. always be firm.
   b. be flexible.
   c. stick to the rules, but be flexible.
   d. never bend the rules.
6. To discipline young children, the wise parent:
   a. let the child understand early in life who is the "boss".
   b. teach the child the rules people live by, and help him to
      accept them of his own accord.
   c. ignore non-acceptable behavior while the child is young, in
      time he will learn better behavior.
   d. let the child alone, he will explore, discover and learn what
      is acceptable behavior.

7. Rewarding a child for acceptable behavior should be used with
   caution, however, it can be useful because:
   a. it is given immediately and therefore it teaches the child to
      be prompt.
   b. it causes a good feeling in the parent.
   c. it teaches progress.
   d. it causes a good feeling in the child.

8. To discipline children, they need some controls. The most effective
   type of control is:
   a. adult control.
   b. democratic control.
   c. child control.
   d. a combination of all of the above.

9. The end-product of guidance is:
   a. a child who will eventually act within a given set of rules.
   b. a child who becomes self-directing and responsible for his
      decisions.
   c. a child who reacts positively when rewarded for acceptable
      behavior.
   d. a child who not only accepts his parents rules, but also
      establishes his own rules.

10. Three principles (or guides) of positive guidance are:
    a. love, respect and punishment.
    b. affection, self-respect and approval.
    c. ignoring, disapproval and withholding pleasure.
    d. love, disapproval and reward.

11. Rules and limits are important in a child's life because:
    a. they keep the child from harming himself.
    b. they let the child know what is acceptable behavior and what
       is not.
    c. they help the child learn to feel secure.
    d. they help the child understand that adults always know best.
12. Positive guidance is based on:
   a. punishing non-acceptable behavior.
   b. rewarding acceptable behavior.
   c. both rewarding acceptable behavior and punishing non-acceptable behavior.
   d. praise and punishment.

13. In guiding a child, parents should:
   a. never spank the child.
   b. sometimes apply bodily punishment (spanking).
   c. always be consistent and flexible.
   d. always ignore non-acceptable behavior and show disapproval.

14. To understand their child, parents should:
   a. know children's normal growth pattern.
   b. be sure that their child grows evenly in all four areas of development.
   c. establish rules as guides for their child.
   d. be observant and study their child's behavior.

15. In providing guidance for a child, parents should:
   a. find one approach that works and stick to it.
   b. always attempt a different approach.
   c. try various approaches depending on the situation or problem.
   d. use no more than one approach in a given situation.

16. A child sometimes displays non-acceptable behavior to:
   a. explore alternatives.
   b. get attention from others.
   c. present his point of view.
   d. discover what he can "get away with".

17. Each child's behavior pattern can be analyzed:
   a. according to hereditary factors.
   b. according to his age group (two-year olds are negative).
   c. according to his individual uniqueness.
   d. according to his total environment.

18. Mental development in a child includes learning to:
   a. identify items and make sentences.
   b. make decisions and imitate others.
   c. understand abstract meaning and ask questions.
   d. all of the above.
19. Each child learns according to:
   a. a given age group.
   b. his environment.
   c. his own timetable.
   d. the way his parent guides and teach him.

20. One of the most difficult aspects of guidance is:
   a. establishing rules and regulations.
   b. making choices.
   c. providing appropriate rewards for acceptable behavior.
   d. being steadfast (unwavering, firm).

21. Guidance directed by child control could result in:
   a. a child who cannot adjust to limits in the world he lives in.
   b. parents who are democratic.
   c. a child who makes his own decisions.
   d. parents who make decisions that are popular with the child.

22. To help develop responsibility in children, parents should:
   a. demand.
   b. ask, not demand.
   c. sometimes ask.
   d. sometimes demand.

23. One problem with using punishment to change a child's behavior is:
   a. the child may actually enjoy the punishment.
   b. the child may not know what behavior he is to change.
   c. punishment may damage the child's personality.
   d. the child does not learn acceptable behavior.

24. Often when the young child says "no":
   a. he is testing his independence.
   b. does not know "right" from "wrong".
   c. needs his parents' reassurance.
   d. trying to get attention.

25. An important element in guidance is:
   a. to recognize only acceptable behavior in a child.
   b. do not accept or tolerate unacceptable behavior from a child.
   c. to accept a child for what he is.
   d. to reject the child when his behavior is not acceptable.
26. To influence a child toward acceptable behavior:
   a. let the child know he is only a child.
   b. respect the child's feelings and thoughts.
   c. tell the child you are the adult.
   d. talk to the child.

27. Behavior that is difficult to change is that which has been taught by:
   a. punishment.
   b. occasionally reward.
   c. both a and b.
   d. constant reward for positive behavior.

28. The strongest rewards for acceptable behavior are:
   a. things that make the parent feel good inside.
   b. things that make the child feel good inside.
   c. things that make both the parent and child feel good inside.
   d. things that make the child feel respect for the rights of others.

29. A young child might misbehave because he:
   a. is growing independent.
   b. does not want to be independent.
   c. does not understand independence.
   d. is totally dependent on his parents.

30. At any given time, the four ways that children develop are:
   a. always the same.
   b. usually the same.
   c. usually different.
   d. always different.

Directions: Please circle the number on the right which best describes your feeling about using self-study material to receive subject matter information. The scale points are strongly agree (5), agree (4), undecided '3), disagree (2), strongly disagree (1).

Please respond to every item.
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I was not motivated to complete the information in the packet.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I would prefer to get this same information at a group meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I would like to receive other kinds of information and activities through self-study packages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I feel that my friends would like to receive different types of information through self-study packages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I like reading the information at a time that is convenient for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I would prefer to get out of my home to receive information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I would recommend the use of self-study materials to my friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I would like to be involved in other self-study projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I like to have information coming directly to me at my home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I would prefer to study this information with my friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I would like for the Extension agent to call me to see if I'd like to discuss the self-study materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. I would prefer to call the Extension agent if I have a question about the information in the self-study package. 5 4 3 2 1

14. I like self-study materials because I can get information without going to a meeting. 5 4 3 2 1

Directions:
Please check (✓) the correct answer for each of the following items.

1. Check the highest level of formal education you have completed.
   _____less than eighth grade
   _____eighth grade
   _____ninth grade
   _____tenth grade
   _____eleventh grade
   _____completed high school
   _____technical school
   _____some college
   _____college degree
   _____graduate school

2. What is your marital status?
   _____single
   _____separated
   _____married
   _____widowed
   _____divorced

3. How many children do you have?
   _____one
   _____three
   _____two
   _____four
   _____five
   _____over five
4. Where do you live?
   ____farm  _____town or city between 10,000 and 50,000
   ____rural non-farm  _____suburb of a city over 50,000
   ____small town under 10,000  _____city over 50,000

5. What is your employment status?
   ____Employed full-time  _____Not employed
   ____Employed part-time

6. What is your family income?
   ____Under $6,000  _____14,000-17,999  _____26,000-29,999
   ____6,000-9,999  _____18,000-21,999  _____30,000-33,999
   ____10,000-13,999  _____22,000-25,999  _____over $34,000

7. What was your age at your last birthday?

8. If married who read the self-study material and completed the questionnaire?
   ____mother (wife)  _____father (husband)  _____both (both)

9. How many hours did you spend reading the self-study materials?

10. Are you a member of an Extension homemaker club?
    ____yes  ____no

11. Have you ever been involved in any other Extension activities or programs?
    ____yes  ____no
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